
**SMALL CRAFT HARBOURS
PACIFIC REGIONAL HARBOUR AUTHORITY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PRHAAC)**

RECORD OF DISCUSSION

Thursday, April 22 – Friday, April 23, 2010
Vancouver Room, Coast Coal Harbour Hotel, 1180 West Hastings Street, Vancouver, BC

PRHAAC Members:

Bob Baziuk, Steveston HA (via telephone)
Hiltje Ramsay, Port McNeill HA
Lutz Budde, Oona River HA
Rick Hill, Port Edward HA
Ben Maberley, Whaler Bay HA
Liz McLeod, Comox HA

SCH Ex-Officio PRHAAC Members:

Sarah Murdoch, A/Regional Director
Robin Richardson, Mgr Program Operations
Stacey Martin, Program Officer

Guests:

Liane O'Grady, A/Mgr Budget & Strategic
Planning, SCH

Regrets:

Linda Franz, Campbell River HA

DAY ONE: THURSDAY, APRIL 22, 2010

WELCOME/INTRODUCTION

- S. Murdoch welcomed PRHAAC members to the two-day session and thanked them for attending.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

- The agenda for the meeting was reviewed, with several amendments requested by S. Murdoch, in order to accommodate changes in the timing of the SCH budget announcement event at the Steveston Gulf of Georgia Small Craft Harbours site.
- In order to accommodate R. Richardson and B. Baziuk's participation in the SCH Pacific funding announcement event, S. Murdoch suggested the following changes to the Agenda: the *Preparation for Upcoming NHAAC Meeting* be moved to the afternoon of Day One, on Day Two the *Discussion on SCH Pacific's HA Reporting Requirements* be moved to the afternoon and the *Presentation & Discussion on Electronic Polling Session* be moved from Day One to the morning of Day Two.
- The Committee adopted the agenda, with the above changes noted.

REVIEW & APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 05/06, 2009 RoD

- The Record of Discussion from the November 05/06, 2009 PRHAAC meeting was reviewed and approved.

ACTION ITEM UPDATE

- S. Martin confirmed that the status of action items from the November 2010 meeting was provided to PRHAAC members in advance of the April 2010 session.

- S. Martin reviewed the update with Members, with additional information on the following discussed and/or provided:
 - **Action Item #3:** S. Martin distributed copies of the recently completed Marine Fuelling Study to PRHAAC members, on behalf of R. Richardson.
 - **Action Item #4:** H. Ramsay and L. McLeod requested that the upcoming post-NHAAC meeting PRHAAC teleconference call be rescheduled to the start of June, in order to better accommodate their schedules.
 - **Action Item #5:** Discussion took place on the potential for renewed SCH support for the Pacific Coast Congress and University of Alaska's on-line training initiative, in the form of possible funding or staff support for the development of certain modules. The idea of linking learning modules to the maintenance manual was also suggested.
 - **Action Item #10:** A brief discussion took place on the status of the draft signage catalogue that J. Mah presented to members at the November PRHAAC meeting. Members generally agreed that sufficient time had been provided to offer input and requested that SCH Pacific look to finalizing the document and distributing it to HAs as soon as possible. The need for SCH Pacific to ensure they have the resources and processes in place to support signage orders was also highlighted.

Action Item 1: SCH Pacific (S. Martin) to reschedule post-NHAAC PRHAAC teleconference call for the start of June 2010 and confirm new date and time with PRHAAC members.

Action Item 2: SCH Pacific (S. Murdoch) to liaise with H. Ramsay regarding potential role for SCH Pacific in support of online ports and marinas training modules.

Action Item 3: SCH Pacific (R. Richardson) to finalize and distribute signage catalogue to HAs in BC as soon as possible, with clear ordering instructions and guidelines included.

UPDATE ON THE SCH PROGRAM

- S. Murdoch advised Members that she was excited to be back with the Small Craft Harbours program and had been acting for K. Smith, in the role of Regional Director, since December 2009.
- She confirmed that K. Smith would be returning to his role as Regional Director in the summer, as early as June or as late as August.
- S. Murdoch then provided an update to the Committee on recent SCH activities, including:
 - **Economic Action Plan (EAP)** – S. Murdoch advised that SCH was in the process of completing the year one EAP reporting process and gearing up for the implementation of year two of the Plan. She confirmed that some projects originally identified for year two had been fast tracked and were already well underway and acknowledged that the

announcement of both years of EAP projects at the start of the program has assisted in delivery. S. Murdoch highlighted that virtually every HA will have had a harbour project of some kind over the two years of the EAP.

R. Hill enquired if the multi-year funding structure used for the two-year EAP signalled a change to the funding approach that would be used for the Program in future years. S. Murdoch responded that, unfortunately, the approach used for EAP did not signal a new way of doing business. She advised that, in fact, the government-wide trend was towards increased transparency and accountability measures. Good discussion followed on the need for Government to recognize the value-added aspect of community-based projects and their importance to the success of the SCH Program.

- **Standing Committee on Fisheries & Oceans (SCOFO)** – S. Murdoch advised that the Government’s Response to the SCOFO Report would be discussed later in the day, as per the Agenda. B. Mabberley requested that S. Murdoch enquire as to why those individuals involved in presenting to SCOFO were not notified by NHQ that the Response was available.

Action Item 4: SCH Pacific (S. Murdoch) to follow-up with M. Leduc regarding B. Mabberley’s notification suggestion.

- **DFO Reorganization** – S. Murdoch advised Members that in response to the Deputy Minister’s desire to emphasize synergies around service delivery, programs within DFO with an external client function had been reorganized under a new Ecosystems and Fisheries Management sector (EFM). She confirmed that nationally, this meant that M. Leduc, Director General of SCH, will report to the Associate Deputy Minister of the new sector, along with the heads of Habitat, Species at Risk and Fisheries & Aquaculture Management. She also highlighted that the Policy programs and the Oceans and Science programs would also be grouped, as would the Corporate Services programs.

S. Murdoch confirmed that the external client connection is positive and will put SCH in closer contact with programs that it needs stronger linkages with. She also reaffirmed that the reorganization was not a cost-savings initiative, but rather was about promoting synergies within the Department. She advised that as there were still many practical details to be worked out, it was anticipated that a second phase of the reorganization may be implemented at the regional level at a later date.

- **Review & Audit** – S. Murdoch advised that a series of reviews and audits take place throughout government on a five year cycle and this year DFO and SCH would be undergoing a number of these assessments. Firstly, she indicated that the whole Department would be undergoing a strategic review. Secondly, she indicated that a review of SCH’s Divestiture Program (SCH is currently in year three of the four year Disposal of Non-Core Harbours Program) would be also be undertaken. Finally, she advised Members that the SCH Program was also up for review and evaluation. She acknowledged that while these processes could be quite bureaucratic, they are still worthwhile to undertake on a cyclical basis. Members enquired if there would be any involvement of the advisory groups in the Program review and S. Murdoch replied that she was not sure if they would be engaged, but agreed that it may be a good perspective

to get, if the process permitted.

- **Regional Organization** – In regards to changes at the regional level, S. Murdoch confirmed that the Regional Director General of DFO, P. Sprout, would be retiring in June. She advised members that his successor had not yet been announced and indicated that there may be some individuals acting in the role prior to a permanent appointment being made. She also reminded members that the Associate Regional Director General (ARDG), P. Macgillivray, is currently heading up the Cohen Inquiry and would continue in that role even once K. Smith is back with SCH and no longer acting in the ARDG role. She indicated that there would likely be one or two new people identified to act in P. Macgillivray's position as ARDG, once K. Smith returned to his role as Regional Director, SCH Pacific.
- **SCH Pacific Staff** – S. Murdoch highlighted that staff in Small Craft Harbours in the Pacific Region had almost doubled in the past year. She acknowledged that some of the positions were temporary and national models were still in the development stage, but emphasized that in addition to increased Engineering and Program Operations support, the Program also currently has dedicated contracting, property and habitat staff assisting with EAP implementation and support.

S. Murdoch confirmed that A. Hill would be returning to SCH in July or August as a Program Officer, working alongside K. Rattan and C. Engel. R. Hill then confirmed that his tenure with the Port Edward Harbour Authority will continue, as he will be commuting between Prince Rupert and Vancouver.

S. Murdoch also advised members that A. Rowland had announced that he will be retiring in early 2011. As members are aware, V. Kahnamelli has been acting as the Regional Engineer for some time now, with A. Rowland stepping back and acting in more of a mentorship role. She indicated that prior to retirement A. Rowland would be taking some additional time off, leading some special projects and working on knowledge transfer with staff.

A brief discussion then took place regarding individual roles and the need to reconfirm staff contact information with HAs.

Action Item 5: SCH Pacific (S. Martin) to update the SCH Pacific staff contact list, to further include clarification of staff member roles and responsibilities, and distribute it to HAs.

- **Aquaculture** – S. Murdoch advised that DFO had been given an extension until December 2010 to implement the recent aquaculture decision to transfer responsibility from the provincial to federal government. She highlighted that lots of work was being undertaken to develop the organizational structure, regulations and policies and procedures associated with the transfer of responsibilities.
- **Derelict Vessels Committee** – S. Murdoch advised that L. McLeod and A. Childs had recently done an excellent job of providing an overview of the derelict vessels issue to DFO's RDG, Paul Sprout, who is quite familiar with the issue, and the Regional Directors of Fisheries & Aquaculture Management and Policy. L. McLeod added that

while the RDG had committed to looking at the policy associated with buy-backs and to taking vessels into consideration with any future buy-back initiatives, DFO was limited by its mandate in what it could do.

L. McLeod added that the next step for the Derelict Vessels Committee would be to meet with Transport Canada, in order to provide an overview presentation and highlight the issue with that Department. S. Murdoch pointed out that although SCH and HAs will carry on and continue to do things that make sense in regards to derelict vessels, the problem is not unique to HAs/SCH or even DFO. L. McLeod added that more pressure could be brought to bear on the issue by the Union of BC Municipalities, for instance, as the HA derelict vessel problem is a sub-set of a much larger issue.

Dockside Monitoring Program – S. Murdoch advised that contact had been made with all three monitoring companies in BC regarding local monitoring pilot projects and two have been engaged with DFO on the issue and identified potential sites. S. Murdoch advised that DFO was facilitating the process, but was not the leading the initiative. B. Maberley identified a concern that the dockside monitoring initiative was moving forward without the involvement or engagement of the Commercial Salmon Advisory Board (CSAB), who originally raised the idea of local HA monitors. S. Murdoch indicated that on her return to SCH, the talk had focused on working with existing companies, but that did not mean that the option of creating a fourth monitoring organization comprised of HA members wasn't an option. She confirmed that FAM is still interested at a senior level in pursuing this initiative and that she would follow-up directly with B. Maberley to discuss next steps in moving the HA monitoring initiative forward.

Action Item 6: SCH Pacific (S. Murdoch) to follow-up with B. Maberley directly regarding the status of the pilot HA Dockside Monitoring Program initiative and proposed next steps.

HAC UPDATE

- B. Maberley advised Members that all insurance renewal forms had been sent out to Harbour Authorities, with about 70-75% of HAs choosing to opt in to the insurance plan for the coming year.
- He shared that there were currently two D&O lawsuits underway, one of which involves the Campbell River Harbour Authority. Due to the insurance, the HAs are being supported through these legal actions and he indicated that he was pleased that the policy was in place to assist HAs.
- B. Maberley further advised members that the HAC would begin meeting with companies in late August/early September to discuss renewal of the insurance policy.
- R. Richardson suggested that the HAC request information in regards to claims history from the insurance provider. He highlighted that information on the frequency and type of claims made can help inform technical issues and project planning. B. Maberley confirmed they were actively seeking additional information from the provider and

agreed that over time, areas in which strengthened practices and policies are required may be identified.

HAABC UPDATE

- HAABC Director H. Ramsay provided the following update to Members:
 - **2010 Conference Feedback** – H. Ramsay advised that, while Conference feedback was generally positive, some negative feedback was received from exhibitors, who did not like the venue set-up and limited interaction with Conference attendees. She advised that the HAABC felt confident that exhibitors' concerns would be addressed at next year's Conference, which would be taking place January 25-28, 2011 at the Vancouver Island Conference Centre in Nanaimo, B.C.
 - **Contribution Agreement with SCH** – Good discussion took place on the new contribution agreement currently being negotiated between the HAABC and SCH took place, with S. Murdoch reminding members that M. Leduc must sign off on all new agreements, which must adhere to the Terms & Conditions of the Class Contribution Program, as set out by Treasury Board. S. Murdoch highlighted the successes of the pilot agreement but also acknowledged some lessons learned and the need to tie deliverables directly to specific budgets. She also emphasized the importance of clarifying the relationship between SCH and the HAABC, in light of the potential for perceived conflicts of interest.

In response to a question from L. McLeod, it was confirmed that SCH intended to advance quarterly payments, based on reporting to-date and cash flow projections provided by the HAABC. S. Martin confirmed that SCH was not able to provide a float for the HAABC, but were looking to improve upon the last agreement by establishing an advance payment schedule.

Action Item 7: SCH Pacific (S. Martin) to continue to liaise with L. Taylor, HAABC Administrator, regarding the new Contribution Agreement deliverables.

- **Miscellaneous** – Good discussion took place regarding the value of HAABC board member alternates and the potential for a succession planning committee to look at mentoring as a way to engage individuals and expose them to board activities. H. Ramsay also advised that she and L. Taylor, the HAABC Administrator, attended the recent Pacific Coast Congress conference in Bellingham, Washington and found it to be another informative session. S. Murdoch highlighted that the key to attendance at these events was the value of the information brought back and how it assists the HAABC and HAs in BC.

PROGRAM OPERATIONS UPDATE

- R. Richardson advised that many Operations items had already been discussed as part of the SCH and HAABC updates, however, he did thank members for their patience while the Operations group was being staffed-up. He confirmed that Program Officers C. Engel, K. Rattan, J. Mah and G. Sandha had all now been with SCH for about a year and A. Hill would also be returning at the end of the summer. He advised the group that

some roles and responsibilities were still being finalized, but that J. Mah and G. Sandha were now assisting the engineering group with minor works projects, providing liaison and linkages with HAs and performing some of the technical role previously filled by D. Rode. In addition, he highlighted that Program Operations staff were now attending HAABC zone meetings and taking advantage of that forum to communicate and liaise with HAs.

- R. Richardson also confirmed that along with EAP and HA support, divestiture would be a big priority this year, as the Program was entering year three of the four year funded Disposal of Non-core Harbours Program.
- He also confirmed that post-EAP planning was also underway and stressed the importance of improved coordination and integration of planning, indicating to Members that integrated harbour planning would be a post-EAP area of focus for his group and the Program as a whole.
- R. Richardson indicated that an additional priority identified for SCH was climate change, which S. Murdoch highlighted was also in the SCOF0 Report. In regards to climate change, R. Richardson indicated that a study on the issue was being undertaken nationally, but that at the regional level, he encouraged Members to track weather and take photos of severe weather events and provide them to SCH, in order to help inform the Program's response to changing weather patterns.
- R. Richardson indicated that SCH Pacific was also currently focusing on addressing the 'Undecided' harbours in the regional inventory. In regards to 'Undecided' sites, S. Murdoch advised that the current list was being reviewed and in cases where there is commercial fishing activity, sites may be moved to the 'HA Limited Potential' category and kept in SCH's inventory. Good discussion took place on the importance of understanding the differences between the Harbour Authority and Divestiture Programs when engaging with potential third parties and providing advice and perspectives on 'Undecided' harbours. As well, discussion took place regarding the designation of sites as HA or HA-potential. S. Murdoch reminded Members that while there is a recognition that the fishing industry and use of harbours on the coast have evolved from pure fishing to mixed-use, the primary users of HA-managed sites should be fish harvesters, which includes First Nations and aquaculture.
- Lastly, R. Richardson confirmed that new third party liability insurance brochures were now available and the new policy had been renewed in April, with certificates also available at that time.

Action Item 8: R. Richardson requested that PRHAAC consider tracking weather patterns at harbours and provide photos of severe weather events to SCH Pacific in order to help inform the Program's response to changing weather patterns.

REVIEW & DISCUSSION OF SCOFO REPORT & RESPONSE

- S. Murdoch confirmed that the Government Response to the Standing Committee on Fisheries & Oceans Canada Report, which was presented by the Honourable Gail Shea, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, in the House of Commons, had been provided to Members for their review, in advance of the PRHAAC meeting.
- She advised Members that the Response highlighted the extra funding invested in the Program since the study was initiated and the need to revisit Program needs post-EAP. She also highlighted that the Response recognized and referenced the important role that HAs play in the Program. S. Murdoch then reviewed the 22 specific recommendations made by SCOFO, and the Government's Response to each.
- Significant discussion on the following specific recommendations and Responses took place:
 - **Recommendation 4:** *That Fisheries and Oceans Canada ensure that there are adequate funds in both its operations and maintenance, and its capital budgets for recurrent dredging and related activities. The amount of this funding should take into consideration the increasingly stringent environmental standards and regulations that apply to these activities, especially with respect to the protection of the fish habitat.* This recommendation was only partially supported by the Government, as full-time access for all classes of vessels is not in the best interest of taxpayers nor is it realistic given often unpredictable weather conditions. Members discussed the need to determine what an acceptable service standard is and set a base standard that should be met. Good discussion also took place on the need to determine what is reasonable, in terms of longevity and return on investment.
 - **Recommendation 5:** *That Fisheries and Oceans Canada adopt a longer-term approach to solving dredging problems that could be addressed by permanent structures such as breakwaters.* This recommendation was only partially supported by the Government. S. Murdoch highlighted that while the focus is on breakwaters in this recommendation, the idea of a more strategic approach to solving dredging problems and long-term investments/plans for harbours is positive.
 - **Recommendation 6:** *That, where there is a need to dredge beyond the harbour basin and the entrance channel for which the Small Craft Harbours Program is responsible, Fisheries and Oceans Canada coordinate with the authorities responsible for dredging these waterways to ensure safe access to the harbour at all times.* This recommendation was only partially supported by the Government, with the Response highlighting that DFO is prepared to work and meet with other government departments, organizations and individuals to explore options and facilitate means to address needs. However, any dredging not strictly required for access by small commercial fishing vessels to SCH sites would be outside the Program's mandate.
 - **Recommendation 12:** *That the limit on contract signing authority for Harbour Authorities managers be increased from \$40,000 to \$200,000 for minor capital and repair projects, and that, where possible, priority be given to hiring local enterprises to do the approved work.* This recommendation was partially supported

by the Government. As S. Murdoch highlighted, the recommendation itself is slightly confusing, as 40K signing authority relates to SCH sole source authority to contract with HAs, and not for HA Managers themselves to have government signing authority. Intention, however, is good and supports SCH Pacific's program approach. She confirmed that SCH Pacific was working internally to review authorities and contracting mechanisms, but also recognized the value of the approach being supported by others, such as SCOFO.

- After completing review and discussion of the Government Response to the 22 SCOFO Report Recommendations, it was agreed that a link to the electronic version of the Response should be provided to the PRHAAC and to HA Chairs in BC.

Action Item 9: SCH Pacific (S. Martin) to provide PRHAAC Members and HA Board Chairs in BC with an electronic link to the Government Response to the SCOFO Report on SCH.

PREPARATION FOR UPCOMING NHAAC MEETING

- S. Murdoch reviewed the draft NHAAC meeting agenda with Members, who requested that a copy of the final agenda be provided to them as soon as it was available.
- Discussion then focused on *The Way Forward* agenda item, which S. Murdoch advised was intended as an interactive session aimed at identifying post-EAP priorities and areas of focus for SCH nationally.
- During the discussion, S. Murdoch asked Members what SCH could do to be more effective and efficient and how SCH could further assist HAs? B. Mabblerley indicated that HAs also need to know from Regional Directors what SCH requires. S. Murdoch responded that she was impressed with the business-like approach HAs in BC were taking with managing their harbours and recognized that they were operating quite efficiently and effectively, usually with the support of paid staff. She acknowledged, however, that since HAs don't own assets they cannot fully operate under the business-model.
- In terms of possible areas for SCH improvement, S. Murdoch raised the issue of long-term integrated planning with HAs. A second potential area for improvement was in the area of governance. She highlighted that the Program could perhaps do a better job of engaging and challenging HA Boards, even though they are volunteers, rather than exclusively liaising with paid Harbour Managers. L. McLeod agreed and expressed concern that the HA model could be vulnerable if SCH doesn't do a better job of engaging HA Boards and getting them performing the roles they should be, such as harbour planning, etc. S. Murdoch acknowledged that sometimes when the Board is less engaged individual Harbour Managers are filling the vacuum and SCH has worked with this model and not put the expectations on Boards that they should.
- Members then devoted some time to brainstorming a number of proposed post-EAP

SCH priorities, in preparation for *The Way Forward* session. Members made a number of initial suggestions for areas of focus, as follows:

- Post-EAP infrastructure re-evaluation (measure and evaluation of effects/impacts of EAP on harbours, in order to better understand changes to infrastructure value and repair cost requirements post-EAP)
 - Better understanding of the future of the fishing industry
 - Use of SCOF0 Report recommendations as guide to priorities/areas of Program focus
 - Review and study of dredging plans and broader approaches to managing sediment
 - Planning regarding impact of changing First Nations fisheries
 - Planning regarding sustainability of Program based only on A-Base funding
 - Need for better integrated project planning with HAs
 - HA board engagement vs. harbour manager engagement
 - Climate change impacts on harbour infrastructure
 - Revenue recovery/debt collection/lost revenues and impact on HA viability
 - Review of the Acts and Regulations, especially regarding need to acknowledge the role of HAs
- The discussion concluded for the day, with the understanding that the upcoming NHAAC meeting agenda would be further discussed on Day Two, in light of the fact that B. Maberley would be participating in a NHAAC Contact Group call prior to the start of Friday's session and may have some additional information to share with the group regarding the upcoming national session.

Action Item 10: SCH Pacific (S. Martin) to provide PRHAAC Members with a copy of the final agenda for the upcoming May NHAAC meeting when available.

DAY ONE WRAP-UP & DAY TWO PREVIEW

- S. Murdoch thanked Members for their participation on Day One and for their flexibility and understanding regarding the numerous changes to the agenda. She reminded participants that a group dinner had been booked for 5:00pm at Shabusen Yakiniku House and confirmed that K. Smith would also be attending.

DAY TWO: FRIDAY, APRIL 23, 2010

WELCOME/INTRODUCTION

- S. Murdoch welcomed PRHAAC members to Day Two of the PRHAAC session and reminded them of the changes to the agenda for the day.

PRESENTATION & DISCUSSION ON ELECTRONIC POLLING SESSION

- S. Martin presented some selected results from the Electronic Polling Session that was conducted at the HAABC Conference in January. She highlighted that the results being shared were from an SCH perspective and indicated that they would also be shared with SCH staff and HAs, at a later date.
- S. Martin reminded Members that HA conference attendees were polled on a series of topics, including general demographics, planning & long-term viability, communications & relationships and HA support & capacity. She advised that the response to the session overall had been very positive and the results had provided some useful information for both SCH and the HAABC
- The PRHAAC discussion of the presented polling results focused largely on the planning results. Members suggested that business planning and strategic planning be presented separately and indicated that many HAs undertake various forms of informal planning, which could explain the 14% of respondents who indicated that their HA had a long-term plan that had not been shared with SCH. While all agreed to the importance of planning, some Members highlighted the challenges that exist when planning in isolation and questioned if planning documents were actually used by SCH once they were received from HAs. Members also questioned SCH about the distribution of inspection reports, as many had found that inspections were taking place at their harbours, but the results were not being shared. All agreed that the information contained in inspection reports could be crucial to planning and requested that the reports be shared with HAs in a timely manner.
- The HAABC's question regarding the importance of transient recreational vessels was also discussed, with Members suggesting that the same question be asked in regards to the importance of the commercial sector and/or homeport vessels.
- The need for appropriate communication with HA Boards was also discussed, in response to the series of questions ranking the level of communication between various groups. While not surprising, the results, which indicated communication between SCH and HA Boards was generally seen as weak, further highlighted the need for SCH to better engage HA Boards and to ensure appropriate communication. Members indicated some confusion regarding SCH staff roles and suggested that at the next HAABC Conference, staff roles and responsibilities also be highlighted when staff members are introduced.
- Finally, SCH's HA support tools were discussed, with Members agreeing that the HAABC's zone meetings could provide an important forum at which to share and refine HA tools. For example, the importance of the Emergency Response Guide was highlighted in the polling session results and it was suggested that this document could be discussed at zone meetings, with additional sections, such as crowd control, added to the guide.

- The discussion concluded with Members agreeing that the polling session was a good exercise and that HAs should be polled again at next year's conference.

Action Item 11: SCH Pacific (S. Murdoch) to follow-up with Engineering and Program Operations staff regarding the current process for sharing harbour inspection reports with HAs and advise PRHAAC members on protocol regarding their timely distribution.

Action Item 12: SCH Pacific (S. Martin) to ensure that SCH Pacific Managers not only introduce their staff, but also highlight their roles and responsibilities, at the next HAABC Conference scheduled for January 2011.

Action Item 13: SCH Pacific (S. Martin) to develop a plan to share electronic polling results with SCH staff and HAs in Pacific Region.

CANADA CORPORATIONS ACT PRESENTATION & DISCUSSION

- S. Martin confirmed that the Canada Corporations Act presentation deck prepared by NHQ had been provided to PRHAAC Members for their information.
- B. Maberley highlighted that the deck was purely informational, as the consultation phase is already complete. He further indicated that the new regulations were not yet in effect and that it may be difficult for NHQ to answer HA questions until the legislation is finalized.
- Members generally agreed that the biggest change is in access to financials and in bylaw filing. L. McLeod felt that the changes overall were positive, as they made the Board more accountable to its members, instead of to Industry Canada.
- S. Murdoch indicated that NHQ already had a long list of questions from the last NHAAC meeting and acknowledged that she didn't want to solicit more questions until answers had been provided to those already identified. However, she advised that if HAs did have any questions, they should forward them to R. Richardson.

PREPARATION FOR UPCOMING NHAAC MEETING (Continued from Day One)

- In order to ensure Pacific Region NHAAC representatives had sufficient regional input to inform their participation, it was agreed to continue with the NHAAC preparation agenda item.
- As debrief of his early morning NHAAC Contact Group teleconference, B. Maberley advised that on Day One, national and regional presentations would be made, primarily as relates to EAP. He indicated that M. Leduc had not intended to speak to the SCOFO response however, since it was now a public document, she would touch on it briefly in her update. On Day Two, Guy Beaupré, the new Associate Assistant Deputy Minister of the Ecosystems and Fisheries Management sector, would provide an update on the DFO

- re-alignment, followed by a RHAAC roundtable at which advisors would give updates on regional initiatives.
- Regarding the RHAAC roundtable agenda item B. Maberley confirmed that NHAAC advisors were expected to give a brief presentation on initiatives in their Regions. Discussion followed, highlighting many Members' opinion that the Regional Directors should be responsible for advising the NHAAC of initiatives taking place within their Regions. L. McLeod further suggested that NHAAC agendas should be coming from the Regional Directors. B. Baziuk agreed that the process seemed too advisor driven and that Regional Directors must be more involved in bringing issues to the table. S. Murdoch acknowledged that Regional Director input and participation in NHAAC may have been somewhat limited to-date, however, she highlighted that the increased Regional Director engagement in planning for the upcoming meeting may signal a change.
 - S. Murdoch reiterated that many initiatives had been put on hold during EAP, so the NHAAC discussion should concern priorities for the Program post-EAP, as had been discussed on Day One of the PRHAAC meeting. She confirmed that Regional Directors want to discuss Program direction and *The Way Forward* interactive session planned for the NHAAC meeting was a result of that interest. She conceded that this was just a first step in the process and indicated that she hoped that the upcoming NHAAC meeting would identify issues that would be tackled at future NHAAC sessions.
 - To conclude the discussion, S. Murdoch suggested that the group review the items identified for *The Way Forward* NHAAC agenda item in order to ensure that Members' ideas had been fully captured. The list developed on Day One was reviewed, with Members agreeing that a summary should be provided to all PRHAAC reps prior to the NHAAC meeting, in order to provide one final opportunity for input prior to the Pacific Region NHAAC representatives attending the national meeting.

Action Item 14: SCH Pacific (S. Martin) to provide Pacific Region NHAAC representatives with a summary of HAABC and PRHAAC initiatives to help inform the Regional HAAC Roundtable NHAAC meeting agenda item.

Action Item 15: SCH Pacific (S. Martin) to provide a summary of the potential post-EAP SCH priorities identified in advance of the NHAAC meeting in order to allow PRHAAC members a final opportunity to provide input to NHAAC representatives.

DISCUSSION ON SCH PACIFIC'S HA REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

- R. Richardson advised Members that, as mentioned previously, efforts are being made to better integrate and undertake planning, which requires the collection of current, comparable information and the development of appropriate indicators and measures.
- L. O'Grady, A/Manager of Budget & Strategic Planning, added that SCH had contracted with G. Gislason to develop some economic performance indicators for the regional

- Program, in line with the new economic prosperity function. She advised that while it was still in the early stages, she did want to share some of proposed draft indicators that G. Gislason had developed with PRHAAC Members and to solicit their input and feedback. She advised Members that after the indicators had been established, SCH Pacific would then need to determine how best to measure them.
- S. Murdoch emphasized that SCH had shifted from an infrastructure program to an economic development program within the Department. Unfortunately, however, the Program only has anecdotal information to support this shift. Questions SCH Pacific is now asking include: How can the economic development component be captured and monitored? How does SCH tell the economic development story regarding HA-managed harbours? She also identified additional questions that it would be good to answer, such as: Is infrastructure meeting current and future user needs? Are harbours at capacity? Are vessels too big for the existing infrastructure? She advised that SCH needs to be proactive in collecting the relevant information necessary to answer some of these questions, in order to paint the picture and successfully plan for the network of harbours now, and in the future.
 - R. Richardson advised that SCH also wants to be able to present a realistic and accurate picture of HAs in BC and reflect the extra dollars HAs are bringing in and spending at the SCH sites, as well as the volunteer time that is devoted to managing the harbours. He reminded Members that financial reporting is required by the lease, but highlighted that there is an opportunity to collect additional information in order to help tell the complete story.
 - Good discussion on information requirements followed, with Members suggesting a focus on vessel length, vessel licenses, revenue-in versus revenue-out, etc. Members agreed that reporting must be straight forward and standardized and L. McLeod suggested that SCH may want to hire someone to develop a program for harbours that is tied to billing programs/processes and that would allow for the efficient collection of standardized information.
 - The importance of capturing the difference between homeport and transient vessels in adequately portraying the economic impacts of harbour users was identified, as was the fact that those benefits may be completely different depending on the harbour being discussed. Members questioned how the Program could accurately communicate the interconnectedness of the harbours in terms of the transient fleet and the network component of the harbour system in BC.
 - The need for the collection of different information at different times of year and with varying degrees of frequency was also highlighted for consideration and S. Murdoch agreed that some information is important on a monthly basis, some quarterly and some annually and that requirements for information should be taken into account with any reporting requests.

- Members highlighted that resources were extremely limited and capacity to provide information to SCH that is not also already required/collected by HAs may be an issue. Members indicated that SCH required a good, simple reporting form, which could be supplemented, as necessary, by additional information collected directly from Harbour Managers one-on-one. S. Murdoch indicated that, ideally, the information that SCH would want would be the same information HA Boards would want to know. From her perspective, SCH and HAs should be asking the same types of questions.
- S. Murdoch then questioned Members as to what information HAs currently collect or know about their harbour that would be useful but that SCH does not currently ask for? Members' responses included: licensing, vessel length, homeport vs transient, sector, membership, and revenue-in versus revenue-out. It was generally agreed that this information should be considered when developing measures and making data requests.
- L. O'Grady highlighted that SCH has historically collected information from HAs, but hasn't necessarily used that information. She acknowledged that if the Program identifies the need for certain data, they must also be prepared to use it for the benefit of HAs and the Program. Members added that SCH must know why they need certain data and be able to communicate that need to HAs, in order to get their buy-in for providing.
- The discussion concluded with R. Richardson requesting that Members provide proposed changes to the Monthly Harbour Report and L. O'Grady advising that she would be following-up with some of the representatives directly over the next few months in an effort to better understand what information HAs currently have available.

Action Item 16: PRHAAC Members to provide R. Richardson with any proposed changes to the Monthly Harbour Report.

Action Item 17: SCH Pacific (L. O'Grady) to follow-up with individual PRHAAC Members to see what information they currently have available that may be of use to SCH.

CLOSING REMARKS AND MEETING ADJOURNMENT

- S. Murdoch thanked Members for their active participation in the session and expressed her appreciation for their feedback and input. Members all agreed that the two-day meeting was constructive and allowed good opportunities to discuss the direction of the regional program and potential areas of focus at the national level.
- The meeting was adjourned at 3:15pm.