



HABITAT
CONSERVATION TRUST
FOUNDATION

HCTF Project Evaluation Workshop 2010-11

FISHERIES PROJECTS

March 23 - 25, 2010
Kelowna, BC

HCTF Fisheries Project Evaluation Workshop:

March 23 – 25, 2010

Background:

In an ongoing effort to evaluate the outcomes of investments, HCTF uses several vehicles:

- Technical committee review: annual technical evaluation of continuing projects.
- On site visit: HCTF staff and Board of Directors on-the-ground evaluations of individual projects.
- Detailed project evaluations: evaluations of specific projects including on-the-ground and financial audits.
- Project evaluation workshops: project leaders present their results for peer review.

This report summarizes the first HCTF Fisheries Evaluation Workshop, held in Kelowna, March 23-25, 2010.

Workshop Objectives:

The goal of this workshop was to allow project leaders to discuss their projects in a mutually respectful atmosphere, so that HCTF representatives and other project leaders could learn from each other's experiences.

Specific workshop objectives were to:

- 1) Review and evaluate the results of HCTF investments in projects; and
- 2) Provide a forum for organizations, resource managers and scientists to share information and ideas on how to further fish, wildlife and habitat management and activities in BC

Project Selection:

A blend of the following criteria was used to select projects to be presented:

- Multi-year projects that are at or near the end of their project life;
- High dollar projects;
- Mix of small, site-specific and larger, wider ranging projects;
- Mix of 1-year and multi-year projects;
- Geographic spread throughout BC;
- Blend of proponent types by organization.

Based on the above criteria, 32 fisheries projects were selected and invitation letters sent out. 22 presenters accepted the invitation: 14 from the provincial government and 8 from non-government organizations (Table 1).

Table 1. Fisheries Presentations at March 23-25, 2010 HCTF Workshop.

| Organization | Presenter | Project | Years Funded | HCTF Amount |
|------------------------------------|------------------|---|---------------------|--------------------|
| Ministry of Environment | Andrew Klassen | Gardom Lake invasive management (3-193) | 2006-07 to 2009-10 | \$1,218,069 |
| Ministry of Environment | Tom Wilkinson | Beaver Creek invasive management (5-211) | 2007-08 to 2009-10 | \$109,000 |
| Ministry of Environment | Paul Askey | Kettle River Large Woody Debris (8-302) | 2007-08 to 2009-10 | \$152,625 |
| BC Conservation Foundation (BCCF) | Kevin Pellet | East Coast Vancouver Island project effectiveness (1-429) | 2007-08 to 2009-10 | \$67,144 |
| Instream Fisheries Research Inc. | Don McCubbing | Fitzsimmons Creek bull trout (2-414) | 2009-10 | \$27,900 |
| Redfish Consulting Ltd. | Greg Andrusak | Kaslo Creek bull trout (4-408) | 2006-07 to 2009-10 | \$38,925 |
| Family Fishing Society of BC | Bill Ottway | Family Fishing Weekend (0-229) | 2001-02 to 2009-10 | \$295,000 |
| Freshwater Fisheries Society of BC | Don Peterson | Angling Market Development Plan (0-353) | 2006-07 to 2009-10 | \$335,000 |
| Ministry of Environment | Michelle Kehler | Chemainus River LWD habitat complexing (1-427) | 2007-08 | \$23,824 |
| Ministry of Environment | Shannon Harris | Alouette Dam fishway feasibility study (2-415) | 2008-09 to 2009-10 | \$29,375 |
| Ministry of Environment | Greg Wilson | Ashlu Creek floodplain restoration (2-379) | 2007-08 | \$17,000 |

| Organization | Presenter | Project | Years Funded | HCTF Amount |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|--|---------------------|--------------------|
| Ministry of Environment | Rob Bison | Thompson River Juvenile Steelhead Stock Assessment (3-112) | 2001-02 to 2008-09 | \$265,050 |
| Ministry of Environment | Joe DeGisi | Status Indicators for Lake Trout Conservation & Management (0-321) | 2007-08 to 2008-09 | \$84,010 |
| BC Conservation Foundation | James Craig | East Coast Vancouver Island water storage (1-430) | 2007-08 to 2008-09 | \$67,015 |
| Ministry of Environment | Steve Maricle | Thompson Nicola water conservation (3-192) | 2006-07 to 2009-10 | \$347,376 |
| Ministry of Environment | Andy Morris | Shuswap Lake char (3-252) | 2003-04 to 2009-10 | \$564,937 |
| Poisson Consulting Ltd. | Joe Thorley | Gerrard modeling/life history (4-413) | 2007-08 to 2009-10 | \$125,832 |
| Ministry of Environment | Tara White | Construction of Turbid Water Bypass at Mission Creek (8-301) | 2007-08 to 2008-09 | \$58,150 |
| N Salt Spring Waterworks District | Trevor Hutton | St. Mary Lake aeration (1-426) | 2007-08 | \$86,000 |
| Ministry of Environment | Steve Matthews | Okanagan River Restoration (8-319) | 2008-09 | \$75,000 |
| Ministry of Environment | Lee Williston | Mid Fraser River sturgeon telemetry (5-196) | 2009-10 | \$7,500 |

Additional participants included one HCTF Board member and two HCTF staff.

On the second day of the workshop, guest speaker Dr. Tom Pedersen, Director Pacific Institute for Climate Solutions at the University of Victoria, gave a lecture on climate change.

Participant Requirements:

Participants were required to:

1. Make a presentation with the following mandatory elements:
 - Project summary
 - Project objectives
 - Methodologies / Activities
 - Outcomes achieved to date and linkage to HCTF Strategic Objectives
 - Budget summary
 - Communications/ outreach activities
 - Lessons learned.
2. Complete a project feedback sheet (anonymously, if desired) for each project presentation.

Participants were also asked to rate the workshop itself and provide any comments on the workshop and on HCTF projects and/or process. The HCTF board member who attended the workshop also participated in the review and evaluation of each project.

Methods:

Workshop participants were asked to fill out a project feedback form after each presentation, evaluating the project itself rather than the presentation. They were asked to give a score out of 10 for each section of the project and also provide written comments in response to questions that were included on the form.

Not all participants circled a score for each section, but for those that did, a range of scores and the mean score for each section was calculated. Comments from all the forms submitted were also recorded.

Participants were also asked to fill out a General Feedback Form for HCTF by scoring the evaluation workshop (out of 10), and providing any comments on the workshop and on HCTF projects and/or process. A range of scores and a mean score for the workshop were calculated and all the comments recorded.

Results:

1) Feedback on Individual Fisheries Projects

Details of scores and specific comments for each project were supplied to the proponent of that project.

Generally, the scores and comments on each of the projects were very positive. The total scores for each project ranged from 28 to 35 out of a possible 40. Most comments were about:

- The applicability of a project to other regions;
- The potential of province-wide implications of the results of projects;
- The importance of partnerships;
- The importance of communications to ensure that results become widely known.

2) General Feedback – Common themes regarding the fisheries workshop and HCTF

a) Participant comments on fisheries projects in general:

- Keep funding science-based projects.
- Very good to see HCTF recognizing the value of water management and stream flow protection for conservation of fisheries resources, particularly in the face of drought and climate change.
- Once projects are approved, details of the project should be available for information sharing to help biologists around the province know what is already happening and learn from others.
- HCTF should do a comparison of “project types”, e.g., installation of LWD or tagging – how do they measure up?
- HCTF should consider an evaluation of techniques used in projects funded by HCTF across the province to ensure the most up-to-date and effective standards are being applied consistently.

b) Participant comments about the workshop:

An open discussion provided strong support for continuing these evaluation workshops. Participants listed that the following components had made the workshop a valuable experience:

Networking

- Provides an opportunity for MoE fisheries biologists to connect with non-government fisheries biologists.

Knowledge/ skills

- Good summary and overview of the science behind these projects: great opportunity to share knowledge, technical information and techniques.

Accountability

- Good opportunity for peer review and accountability of project leaders.

Morale

- Tremendously uplifting to see all the good things that HCTF is doing with surcharge funding

c) Participant comments about HCTF projects and process in general:

Other comments from the discussion focussed on HCTF's submission/approval process.

Some participants commented that:

- They liked the new, simplified proposal process.
- Proposal turn-around time is currently too long: Funding notification is too late for many spring projects.
- It would be helpful to have greater transparency into the funding decision making process
- 9/10 HCTF Board members represent wildlife interests – yet 60% of HCTF funding comes from fisheries. This needs to be addressed. (Note: in 2010-11 an additional Board member with fisheries background was appointed to the Board)

Conclusions:

Overall, participants felt that this workshop designed to provide feedback to project leaders was a good idea, and they had benefitted from the 2 ½ days of meetings. Many learned about new and innovative techniques across the province and made valuable connections for ongoing and future projects.

HCTF intends to hold evaluation workshops on an annual basis.