

coquitlamriverwatershed.ca



Governance for a healthy Coquitlam River watershed (CRW): Getting started on terms of reference for a new CRW team

Tuesday, February 2, 2010, Coquitlam City Hall (Lobby) 3000 Guildford Way, Coquitlam

Table of Contents

Opening Remarks	1
Review of latest steps, Introduction to tonight’s tasks.....	2
Draft Outline for Terms of Reference.....	3
Draft Mission.....	4
Draft Guiding Principles.....	5
Draft Goals	6
Draft Structures.....	9
Closing comments	9
Appendix 1: Guiding Principles: Themes, key words and related statements	10
Appendix 2: Pros/ cons of Governance structures.....	16

Opening Remarks

Mayor Stewart, City of Coquitlam

Mayor Stewart welcomed participants and thanked all the organizations that had teamed up to support development of the Coquitlam River Watershed Strategy, including the Kwikwetlem First Nations, the Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, the City of Port Coquitlam, the Coquitlam River Watershed Society and City of Coquitlam staff who have dedicated countless hours to this project. He also commended the commitment and energy of the co-leader for this project, Glen Joe of the Kwikwetlem First Nation, and recognized the other elected officials present for their ongoing commitment.

Stressing the value and importance of the Coquitlam River to the community and to future harmony between endangered fish stocks, water quality and gravel production, he noted the

strategy under development would form the foundation for responsible watershed governance and stewardship planning.

“We need to restore and improve the health of the Coquitlam River watershed by creating and supporting a community that recognizes and promotes the importance of a watershed strategy,” he said.

Mayor Stewart expressed the hope for good discussion among the many dedicated workshop participants about watershed governance, based on the common vision and values already developed, and closed by thanking everyone for their contribution, involvement and passion.

Review of latest steps, Introduction to tonight’s tasks

Margaret Birch, Environmental Services Coordinator, City of Coquitlam

This is the third phase of the ongoing project, with the aim of the current phase being to get agreement on terms of reference for a watershed planning team or coalition. After inviting the project team members present to identify themselves, Birch noted that Phase III began in October with a workshop that provided presentations on governance, governance models and shared experiences. Participants engaged via breakout groups to provide input on a governance model for the Coquitlam watershed. Detailed notes on the proceedings were prepared and posted on the project Website. The current stage involves engaging the community with two workshops to develop draft terms of reference for a new body. A draft will be completed later in spring, based on community input, at which time the project team will communicate the proposal to key stakeholders (Federal and municipal governments, First Nations and key utilities) to get their support.

Julie Gardner, Dovetail Consulting (facilitator)

Gardner began by inviting participants to identify the interests that they represented. Responses indicated participation by most key interest groups, including stewardship groups, federal government, utilities, industry, municipal government, the private sector, watershed residents, citizens and taxpayers. Margaret Birch explained that Glen Joe of the Kwikwetlem First Nation had been planning to attend but was unable to.

Gardner pointed out that the project team would use the input from this meeting to develop a draft of parts of the new body’s terms of reference for further discussion and refinement at a second meeting in March. The focus of this meeting would be on selected key “ingredients” for the terms of reference, including the overall direction and draft goals or areas of emphasis for the new body, along with the possible forms that the new body might take.

Gardner proposed starting with a brief review of the vision and values already agreed upon, before starting to work on draft guiding principles and a proposed structure for the new watershed governance body.

- Participant: One of the concerns from Day 1 has been that industry wants a clear definition of the watershed.

Gardner noted that some work had recently been done on this by Project Tem members and invited Margaret Birch to read out the draft description:

“Coquitlam River Watershed is...

“... one of a number watersheds on the north shore of the Fraser River’s lower reach in British Columbia’s Lower Mainland region. This mountain and valley region is characterized by a varied natural, rural-agricultural, urban and industrial landscape, with cultural, recreational and natural resources values, including habitat for Pacific salmonids. The Coquitlam watershed includes a vast headwater wilderness including Coquitlam Lake above the Coquitlam Lake Dam. From this catchment area, at least thirty watercourses flow into a developed lower watershed that drains into the Fraser River, just above its estuary on Georgia Strait. The two largest tributaries of the Coquitlam River are Or Creek and Hoy/Scott/Pinnacle Creek. The Coquitlam River watershed is part of the traditional territory of the Kwikwetlem First Nation.

“In its lower reaches, during modern times, the Coquitlam River has been the site for industrial, agricultural and land use activities that are associated with urban development. From the 1880s, Coquitlam Lake served to provide drinking water to New Westminster and the surrounding area. Through the early 1900s the River was dammed for water supply and power generation to support growing communities in the Lower Mainland. Gravel operations began in and along the Coquitlam River in the 1950s, and commercial logging in the watershed developed in the 1960s and 1970s. Over time, land use and urban development has evolved to meet the needs of residents, businesses and others in the community, which continues to thrive today. The accumulation of these activities, combined with a history of major flooding events, has caused the once plentiful salmon populations of the watershed to dwindle significantly over the last century.

“The Coquitlam River watershed remains about ‘people and fish.’ Through the formation a Coquitlam River Watershed governance body, it is envisioned that a healthy watershed is possible.”

A round of applause followed the presentation of the draft. Participants were invited to provide comments via the website to guide further edits so that a revised draft could be presented to the next meeting.

Draft Outline for Terms of Reference

Copies of a draft framework for the terms of reference were distributed to participants, who were invited to comment on the basic outline. Was this an appropriate framework to give guidance to a new body? It was not expected that everything would be resolved in Phase III, Gardner explained. The new body will have to flesh out details of its own mandate once it is formed. There has to be just enough detail so that the first members of the new body will know what they are signing on to, and so that the community (including participants in the strategy to date) have enough confidence that the new body will meet expectations.

Discussion

- Participant: It would be helpful to have descriptions of various structures such as roundtables.
 - Gardner: Brief descriptions will be provided on a handout/poster.
- Participant: It would be helpful to provide a purpose statement that captures why we are trying to create a watershed governance body.
- Participant: Such a statement should indicate what the powers of this body will be and over whom.
 - Gardner: This is part of what the terms of reference have to address. The existing legal powers and rights of governments, landowners, etc., won't change. It is extremely unlikely that a new watershed body would have legislated powers to start with – although that may come in the future. But that's not to say that such a body can't be influential.
- Participant: The driver for starting the process was the urgency for dealing with the stresses on the river and that urgency is not reflected in this document.
- Participant: It was the sense of urgency that brought people together to start this. But as we're bringing people together, the urgency has been dropping.
- Participant: Regarding the terms of reference, form should follow function. The Vision that drives it also needs to be clearer.
 - Gardner reviewed the outline of the terms of reference in more detail, acknowledging that the structure chosen for the new body should follow its function and noting that the vision and values driving it would be those already agreed upon. Along with the vision and values, agreed-on goal categories and guiding principles should be enough to indicate the body's function, and then a structure to match this can be selected.
- Q/A: Water quality is addressed under ecosystem integrity.

Draft Mission

Participants were presented with the draft Mission statement that was almost finalized in Phase 2:

"Our Mission is

"To restore and improve the health of the Coquitlam River Watershed by creating and supporting a community that recognizes and promotes [the watershed] through:

- *Communication,*
- *Coordination,*
- *Collaboration, and,*
- *Education."*

Gardner invited comments, recommending that the mission might have to be spelled out by the new governance body due to the lack of time for more discussion during Phase III.

Discussion

- Participant: Agreement on defining the mission broke down during Phase II over the question of whether to include “...to conserve and protect.”
- Participant: Some of the language is a bit difficult. I’m not sure it fully represents the needs of a mission statement.
 - Gardner: Should this be left for the body to define, based on the comments provided during the development process? The vision, values and guiding principles will also provide direction. Are there any problems with letting the body work out the mission?
- Participant: They can fine-tune it.
- Participant: The language is too ambiguous. It provides no clear direction, so they could go anywhere. For example, what does “restore” mean? We should provide clear direction and then the body should work towards those goals.
- Participant: I don’t think we can leave out words like “conservation” from the bullets before handing this off to the group. We need to add back the words that were removed.
 - Gardner: We will take this back to the project team to consider. Do the vision, values and principles provide enough guidance or not?
- Participant: You can spend forever on the words, but at the end of the day, it’s about the actions.

Draft Guiding Principles

Posters were distributed to each table listing a series of proposed themes, key words and phrases outlining draft guiding principles. Gardner explained that guiding principles are intended to provide proactive statements about the way in which the organization will operate to achieve its mission. Sources for the suggested themes, keywords and phrases in the draft included literature on good governance, suggestions from all phases of this CRW Strategy process and lessons learned from other governance models.

Participants were invited to break up into seven groups to discuss the draft and offer feedback, with alternate groups working on principles 1-6 and 7-12. They were asked to highlight or endorse themes, key words and phrases they support, to suggest edits or to strike out those they rejected. (See Appendix 1 for a compilation of the suggested principles and participant feedback.) Following the exercise, and a break during which participants were able to view each other’s results, participants reconvened for a plenary discussion.

Discussion

- Participant: Principle #9 is redundant.
- Participant: Regarding Principle #1, direction was seen by our group as something that should be in the mission statement, not governing principles.

- Participant: The coordinating role is more a function than a principle.

Gardner thanked participants, noting the feedback would be captured in a succinct draft of guiding principles to be brought to the next meeting in March.

Draft Goals

Gardner introduced a list of six goal categories that she generated from earlier feedback, as well as from the vision, values and draft mission. Participants were invited to offer feedback on the proposed six goal categories: How close are we to having the right categories? Are there too few, too many, are they the right themes? Should the goals be defined, or should the new group do that? The proposed goal categories were:

2.1 Coordination for responsible decision- making (includes information sharing/knowledge management)

2.2 Education

2.3 Stewardship

2.4 Monitoring

2.5 Conservation and Green economics

2.6 Developing a Coquitlam River Watershed Plan

Discussion

- Participant: This provides direction. I'm not sure we need to do more than that, though perhaps some need to be defined a bit more.
- Participant: I agree – with some potential fine-tuning of 2.5. Conservation is good but the concept of “green economics” is a bit nebulous.
- Participant: It was supposed to be about moving from standard accounting to Green accounting, where you also count the effects of what happens to the environment. We used the term “ecosystem economics.”
- Participant: My take was that there needs to be recognition that people do business so that you encourage responsible business practices.
- Participant: If we're going to have viable industry in the watershed, we want to work towards that. I understand education, stewardship and monitoring. Those come clear in a watershed plan. It gets harder if the body is going to start diving into areas like conservation and green economics and I'd like more clarity. Is this body going to deal with things like energy and waste and transportation systems and housing? Will it comment on residential and industrial development and infrastructure planning for things like waste systems? It's important to be clear about how far the body will go.
 - Gardner: Should it go that far?
- Participant: Big issues like climate change are ultimately driven by such practices in the watershed.

- Participant: When we talk about conservation and green economics as goals, are we looking at thriving local economies as the goal or are we talking about ecosystem health or about sustainable economies?
- Participant: In other watersheds that have watershed bodies up and running efficiently, they have an annual work plan and when they decide on a project, they plan it, carry it out and then monitor the results.
 - Gardner: Monitoring and evaluation will involve key indicators of success and measuring progress towards the goals (e.g. monitoring the health of the river).
 - Gardner: There is no need to flesh out the goals. The body could do projects under all these categories, though it may not do all these things every year. That will be guided by the work plan.
- Participant: All these things are already being done. We already have a body capable of doing all that in the Coquitlam River Watershed Society. I thought the idea was to go beyond that instead of competing with what the existing stewardship groups can do. The City, the Region and the groups that are already actively engaged can do all this. So this list is missing something.
 - Gardner: Coordination between existing groups and bodies is seen as the main role by the planning committee.
- Participant: What's missing is that it doesn't reflect the message that there is an urgent need to do something different. What will be different in 5 years if we do all this?
- Participant: Maybe there are some things that aren't being done that should be added?
- Participant: Monitoring is indeed being done all over the watershed by many groups but the information is not being shared and that's very important. The Coquitlam River Watershed Society exists but it doesn't have the funding and capacity to do all this. The governance body needs to have the stewards, plus all the other key players, involved in order to be successful. The CRWS doesn't have what's needed to succeed.
- Participant: I agree. It's about raising the level of effectiveness. Synergy is the key word, so that one plus one becomes equal to three. When you start assimilating all the knowledge and energy available, suddenly a lot more is possible.
- Participant: What's missing from the goals is a focus on doing more than just stopping the damage. There is not much about moving beyond and restoring and going back in time to what it used to be. It's just about maintaining the status quo to avoid it getting worse vs. about restoring.
- Participant: When are we going to develop a watershed plan? Is it a static plan (when it's done, it's done) or an ongoing thing that the team will continually work on?
 - Gardner: I don't think anyone wants a static thing. The watershed plan is the way you look ahead to do the things you want to do, whether it's education or other goals.
- Participant: The work plan for this group will come from the watershed plan.

- Participant: Before we get a formal group, we need the municipal governments and agencies and stakeholders to come up with the terms of reference for a watershed plan, then get the funding and then look at implementation. And the implementation plan may call for a governance body. A lot of discussion has to revolve around the plan: will it monitor water quality levels, what are the goals for conservation? I don't see any of that, so we're leaving a lot up to the body. It should be a living plan. Key agencies involved in land use decisions should come up with the plan. It should spell out urban growth, protected areas, transportation, what existing agencies have mandates, gaps in the mandates, etc. What is the plan for the watershed? We don't have one.
 - Gardner: The intent is that this group will be the one to advise existing bodies on such an integrated plan.
- Participant: It doesn't seem to have ownership. Who wants improved monitoring? Presumably the citizens do. Hydro has a plan, Fisheries has a plan, and the City has aspirations to please its citizens and address things like flood protection. No one organization wants it and needs to make it all happen. Is that a community organization? The elements exist already so we need a council that includes those elements with a mandate to develop a plan. Maybe this is it but I don't get a sense of ownership.
- Participant: A plan that drives the governance structure is something to explore. A solid plan could also simplify structure questions. Look back to where it started in the Coquitlam watershed. They wanted to see a plan that had the health of the river at its centre. We have to get back to a healthy river and the definition of a healthy river. We have a river that's battered and bruised. It's not clear that in bringing together government agencies with very restrictive mandates that they will do anything different. This is the reason we're trying to do something different. The fact is we do have a river that we're trying to restore via a water use plan, with the stewardship groups saying that we can have a river and also have a city. Urban planning is not going to get there unless this is front and centre. It won't work if it just brings agencies together to plan a plan.
 - Gardner: It becomes a chicken and egg question about whether you need to have the body first to generate the plan or the plan first to guide the body. The new governance body could work on a plan.
- Participant: Instead of moving words around from different sources like the vision, maybe there should just be one goal, which is the development of the plan.
 - Gardner: The goal could just be to develop a plan if that is what people want.
- Participant: The other direction is to be a coordinating body. When we first looked at it, the choices were between having it being government-driven, community-driven or a hybrid. If it was to be government-driven, there was cynicism about the status quo and limited resources, and what would change. If it was community-driven, there would be more focus on advocacy. But with no power or money, how much could it accomplish? So we ended up with a hybrid, and the first product was the watershed atlas. The next step was a watershed plan, but it ran out of money and political will. The next step is the structure because you need to consider who is putting the money in to make it happen.

- Gardner: Take role of goal 2.1. The new body can start by playing a coordinating role to promote any of the other five goals and meanwhile it gets proactive about developing a watershed plan. As noted, the other points are already in the vision and values.
- Participant: There is a caveat regarding that suggestion from many of us who have been involved since the 1990s. Most people who have been involved from the beginning are very tired and many groups have stumbled. So leaping into developing a plan with stakeholders who are already tired may not be realistic at the outset. We need to re-energize and re-engage stakeholders so they see that we can potentially achieve something.

Draft Structures

A table listing a series of possible structures for a new watershed body was provided to all participants, who were invited to break up into seven groups again to offer feedback on the pros and cons they saw in the proposed models. Participants were also provided with an array of resource materials, including summaries of the experience from other watersheds.

The feedback on governance structures from all groups is compiled in the table provided in Appendix 2.

Closing comments

Gardner thanked participants, noting that all the feedback would be collated and taken to the project team to see if it pointed to one or a few specific options. The results would be brought back for further discussion at the March meeting. The themes presented at the next workshop would be similar, but with a lot more specific ideas. Input may also be sought on other ingredients of the terms of reference, such as who should be part of the new body. Gardner invited participants to share any questions or concerns about next steps, noting that the Website was also available for sharing further thoughts.

Birch closed the meeting by thanking everyone for coming and encouraging participants to check the new Website frequently for updates. Notes from this meeting, plus the work of the project team, will be provided there.

The next meeting will be held March 18 in Port Coquitlam.

Adjourned: 9:30 pm

Appendix 1: Guiding Principles: Themes, key words and related statements

- Seven table groups were invited to rate the proposed themes, key words and related phrases based on the following key.
- Alternating groups were asked to focus just on Themes 1 – 6 or Themes 7 -12.
- Following the exercise, each group’s results were posted for others to view during the break.
- Feedback from six of the groups is compiled in the table below.
- One group proposed a complete reorganization of the ideas under just three key guiding principles – their proposal is shown separately below.

Key:

- H: Highlighted
 ✓: Endorse/keep
 E: Edit or re-wording proposed
 0: No comment, or question mark as indicated
 -: Struck out, rejected

NOTE : Some groups did not distinguish between statements endorsed or highlighted as important. In such cases, the selection was categorised in the table below as Endorsed

Theme	H	✓	E	0	-	Key words from various sources	H	✓	E	0	-	Related statements from various sources	H	✓	E	0	-
1. Direction		1			1	vision						Strategic vision that accounts for historical, cultural and social complexities					
						watershed perspective						Maintain and pursue a collective vision (no side tracking by special interests) Edit: Maintain and pursue a collective vision (period).	1		1		
						ecosystem approach						A commitment to decision making at a local, watershed or “sub-region” level					
						positive, proactive		1				Incorporating watershed management strategies and an ecosystem approach	1				

Coquitlam River Watershed Strategy: February 2, 2010 Workshop – notes

Theme	H	✓	E	0	-	Key words from various sources	H	✓	E	0	-	Related statements from various sources	H	✓	E	0	-
2. Coordinating		11				partnerships						Being a catalyst for partnership building and cooperation <i>Edit: Move this under the relationship building theme</i>			1		
						improves cooperation						Working to reduce competition between existing groups					
						reduces conflict						Facilitating communication and information exchange					1
						communicative											
3. Relationship-building	1					amicable relationship				1		Continuity in membership/representatives		1			
						trust		1				Follow a positive approach to problem solving (No finger pointing or criticism of past practices)		1			
						Balanced <i>Edit: define "balanced"</i>			1			Don't take positions – instead look for common concerns <i>Edit: Don't take positions – instead look for common goals</i>		1	1		
						collaborative		1				Lead by example and allow people time to change their mind		1			
						respect for all concerns	1	11				Understanding that cultural differences do exist <i>Edit: Understanding that differences do exist – cultural, philosophical, technical</i>			1		1
						<i>Edit: Add "representative"</i>			1								
4. Open/ Inclusive	1	1				approachable						Right people at the table					1
						accessible/ public accessibility						Ability to actively participate (feeling of involvement)					
						transparent		1				Openness in decision-making and actions	1				
						communicative		1				Being inclusive and open in all processes	1				

Coquitlam River Watershed Strategy: February 2, 2010 Workshop – notes

Theme	H	✓	E	0	-	Key words from various sources	H	✓	E	0	-	Related statements from various sources	H	✓	E	0	-
						all stakeholders involved Edit: All stakeholders/interests involved Edit: Broad interests involved	1	1	11			Edit: Add Task forces/delegates (as members?)			1		
						Edit: Add First Nations			1			Edit: Recognition – Aboriginal rights & title			1		
5. Accountable/ Responsive	1	1				community mandate						Accountable for implementing strategy	1				
						accountable to public Edit: Accountable (period)			1		Governance serves participants and objectives						
						elected				?	Accountability for stewardship and performance	1					
						Democratic Edit: Appointed? Application process?				?	Responsible to the watershed community					1	
6. Fair, equitable	1	11				Integrity						Not weight the group with agencies					
						Ethical					Maintaining respect for all participants in the process, by all participants in the process						
						non partisan	1				Integrity based on honesty and objectivity						
						shared decision-making	1										
Other?			1			Collaborative Consensus			1		Task forces. Delegates			1			
7. Effective/ Credible Edit: Add "timely"		1	1			mutually beneficial	1	1				A credible community source that helps and speeds up decision making					
						not overly compromising Edit: Adhere to principles			1	1	Measure and report to public and government and make recommendations to continually move the citizens by the watershed towards the vision						

Coquitlam River Watershed Strategy: February 2, 2010 Workshop – notes

Theme	H	✓	E	0	-	Key words from various sources	H	✓	E	0	-	Related statements from various sources	H	✓	E	0	-
						currency for those who need to be at the table <i>Edit: worthwhile</i>			1	?	1	Facilitate implementation of a CRW Strategic plan		1			
						Vetted <i>Edit: Check credentials & qualifications</i>			1			Clear understanding of roles and responsibilities		1			
						a good decision-making process	1	11				Effective practices in place					
						responsive	1					Ensure that a Watershed Plan is useful to landowners, agencies, First Nations, businesses and citizens <i>Edit: a Watershed Plan is relevant to landowners, agencies, First Nations, businesses and citizens</i>		1	1		
						proactive	1	1				Thinking strategically, in terms of the watershed, at all levels, including individual project design and implementation.		11			
						performance	1					Making projects happen (taking action), while considering the other guiding principles <i>Edit: Making projects happen (taking action).</i>		1	1		
						respectable	1					<i>Edit: add scientific foundation for decision making</i>				1	
						modern					1						
						experienced leadership	1	1									
						well coordinated	1										
						<i>Edit: Add respectful</i>			1								
8. Influential/ Self-determining/ Responsible [note contradictory ideas here]			1			ability to make decisions	1	1				People who can make decisions					
						voice	1	1				Reasonable control by the senior stakeholders					
						distributed authority	1	1				Influence decisions – advise decision makers					
						citizen led, government supported	1					Measure and report to government to make recommendations					
						a support group	1					Ability to make decisions					

Coquitlam River Watershed Strategy: February 2, 2010 Workshop – notes

Theme	H	✓	E	0	-	Key words from various sources	H	✓	E	0	-	Related statements from various sources	H	✓	E	0	-
Edit: Responsible						not a lobby					1	Responsibility - authority to make change		1			
						a new level of authority Edit: Authority			1			Independent of other agencies that support it		1			
						control over the land and water		1			1						
9. Clear niche		1			?	not redundant					1	Recognizes, respects and incorporates the various processes on the watershed (i.e. hydro, metro, parks, local government planning)					?
						avoid duplication						Respect for the rule of law					
												Doesn't replicate or overlap too much with other governance arrangements Edit: Doesn't replicate or overlap with other governance arrangements		1	1		
10. Adequate capacity		1				access to funding/ resources	1	1				Ability to maximize funding opportunities		1			
						access to staff/ employee(s)	1	1				Capacity to govern assured					
						Sustainable	1	1				Edit: Add maximize use of resources				1	
11. Efficient		1				Frugal		1				Easy on everyone's time		1			
						Simple		1				Working towards streamlining and simplifying processes Edit: Streamlined and simple processes that value people's time				1	
12. Adaptive		1				Learning, evolving	1	11				Improving based on experience Edit: Improving based on experience, needs & requirements Edit: evolve with reality/adapting to changing demand				11	
Other?																	

Group 7's proposed revised framework for Guiding Principles

(Rationale: The group saw the proposed framework as having too many principles)

1. Ecosystem approach	Vision ratified by public Watershed perspective Ecosystem approach
2. Accountable	Inclusive Respect for all concerns Public involved Balanced Trust Collaborative Partnering Accessible Transparent Communicative
3. Shared decision making	Integrity Fair & ethical Ownership

Appendix 2: Pros/ cons of Governance structures

Since “form follows function” the following table invites people to estimate which structures are most likely to support the vision, values, etc. of the new governance body. The “typical characteristics” are listed to provide broad distinctions between the different types of structures. The sequence of governance structure types is roughly in increasing order of formality.

Feedback from the seven groups of participants is included in the table below, with each group’s feedback uniquely colour-coded.

Type of structure	Typical characteristics	“Pros”: CRW vision, values, etc. supported by the structure	“Cons”: CRW vision, values, etc. not well supported
Umbrella	Helps coordinate groups with related goals.	Unites/coordinates We like this: Overarching interests Leave society under umbrella to raise funds for key projects Groundwork has already been done by individual stakeholders	Does not meet mission or goals Too far to the community side Opposition from member groups to direction from umbrella body Can it be decision making/firm direction to move process any quicker than we’ve experienced over the last 10-14 years
Coalitions	Like-minded groups build an alliance around a specific purpose. Often temporary.	Alliance to get something done Reject Very focused on goals Possibility of quick results	Excludes non-like-minded stakeholders, government Not so different voices Temporary Narrow scope
Partnership	Limited number of entities work together towards (a) shared objective(s). Joint investment of resources.	Mixed views: ?, structured, shared resources (See “Council” comments below) Joint venture – a Council of provincial, municipal & utility forming one organized – has to be inclusive but formal And a society of other stakeholders – industry, stream keepers and community – have their own accountabilities , ownership, responsibilities	Limited participants Lack of ability to get things done ? More resources = more power?

<p>Round table</p>	<p>Multi-interest. Oriented around a geographical area/ community.</p>	<p>Collaboration Invites stakeholders to participate Allows for active task groups Brings plans together to see where they overlap & build a new plan Goal-oriented Instills ownership/moving forward Liability is reduced Inclusive Allows for other task group round tables Diversity Consultative committee: i.e. Water Use Plan BC Hydro – historically has been proven type that works – builds trust, partnerships: (add decision framework & transparency to the list of features in the column to the left) * We like this: - * Process – good for all interests Inclusive of all groups including industry, government & utilities. Balanced views? Can this be incorporated in a hybrid organization (see more under “Hybrid”)</p>	<p>Needs coordination & funding Could be quite large May take longer to make decisions Not top (too?) structure to coordinate – maybe Too slow in making decisions. Project driven vs. strategic plan direction Who coordinates?</p>
<p>Society</p>	<p>Constituted under Society Act. Often charitable status. Does not include government or diverse interests.</p>	<p>Anybody other than government can join We like this: - Organizational tool - Access to money through charities, grants etc - Joint resources</p>	<p>Does not include government reps – less effective because of this Burn out experienced among stewardship groups in Coquitlam Excludes government Lots of admin Accountable for raising/managing</p>

			<p>funding</p> <p>Increases` competition for funding</p>
<p>Council</p>	<p>Includes government representatives.</p> <p>May be legislated.</p>	<p>We like this: Ability to be legislated <u>can</u> help to get things done</p> <p>? Can be powerful – joint resources</p> <p>- stewards +</p> <p>Assembly of learned elected and appointed to consult, deliberate and advise</p> <p>Needs a partnership (i.e. funding from partners, commitment of staff reps)</p> <p>MOU/agreement committing partners & secured funding</p> <p>Local levy by municipalities - \$1/pp</p> <p>Funding for a plan</p> <p>Who: PoCo, City of Coq, BCH, Kwikwetlem FN, MoE, other prov agencies?, Metro Vancouver, DFO, CRWS, maybe Creek S.K, Hoy/Scott (...illegible), ratepayers?, industry rep.</p> <p>Set budget allocation from government to assure sustainability</p> <p>-Empowerment</p>	<p>Too much government</p> <p>Can be powerful</p> <p>Restrictive influence</p> <p>Too political – have a specific agenda</p>
<p>Other/ Hybrid/ Unique</p>	<p>Unique structure drawing on different above or new characteristics.</p> <p><i>Describe:</i></p>	<p>Includes interests (i.e. stakeholders)</p> <p>Can help get things going</p> <p>(See link from Round table above)</p> <p>Representation from all government bodies</p> <p>-decision making</p> <p>- coordinating</p> <p>- needs funding/fund-raising ability</p>	<p>Tends to be limited by stakeholders' mandate</p> <p>Reject - Complicated</p>

Coquitlam River Watershed Strategy: February 2, 2010 Workshop – notes

Combination	Two or more of the above structures parallel/connected.		Reject - Complicated
Evolution from one to another	Expect transition from a start-up structure to another structure later.	Change is good Adaptability	Reject - Difficult
	Informal round table of interest	Possibly set a task goal to make a plan & parallel the round table Start off with a non-formal round table to establish a task group for a plan	
	Other comments	Advocacy (society) already exists (CWS): need to move towards a management council	