

August 1999

John MacFarlane
H.T. Consulting
Qualicum Beach B.C.

By

Canadian Wildlife Service
Qualicum Beach, B.C.

Prepared for the

**An Evaluation of the
Sensitive Ecosystems Inventory (SEI)
of East Vancouver Island and the
Gulf Islands
Project
1993-1999**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

5	1.0 INTRODUCTION
6	1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE ASSESSMENT
6	1.2 GENERAL OBSERVATIONS
7	2.0 SEI TECHNICAL ISSUES
7	2.1 DATA ACCURACY
7	2.2 SCALE
8	2.3 AIRPHOTO INTERPRETATION
9	2.4 METADATA
9	2.5 DATA MAINTENANCE & UPDATING
11	2.6 TECHNICAL CAPABILITY OF USERS
13	3.0 SEI SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION
13	3.1 CLASSIFICATION SCHEME OBSERVATIONS
14	4.0 SEI ACCESS & DISTRIBUTION
14	4.1 INSTITUTIONAL GIS (MUNICIPALITIES & REGIONS)
14	4.2 INSTITUTIONAL GIS (GOVERNMENT AGENCIES)
15	4.3 INSTITUTIONAL GIS (NGOS & INDIVIDUALS)
15	4.4 INSTITUTIONAL GIS (INDUSTRY CONSULTANTS)
17	4.5 INSTITUTIONAL GIS (FIRST NATIONS)
17	4.6 INSTITUTIONAL GIS (OTHER)
18	5.0 SEI SERVICES & PRODUCTS
18	5.1 FAMILIARITY WITH THE SEI PROGRAM
18	5.2 FAMILIARITY WITH SEI PRODUCTS & SERVICES
20	5.3 USEFULNESS OF SEI PRODUCTS & SERVICES
20	5.4 FAMILIARITY WITH SEI PROJECT SPONSORS
21	5.5 POSSIBLE SEI WEBSITE
22	6.0 SEI TRAINING
22	6.1 MEETING NEEDS
22	6.2 COST OF TRAINING
23	6.3 TRAINING TRACKS
24	7.0 LAND USE PLANNING & SEI
24	7.1 INSTITUTIONAL GIS (MUNICIPALITIES & REGIONS)
25	7.2 INSTITUTIONAL GIS (GOVERNMENT AGENCIES)
25	7.3 INSTITUTIONAL GIS (NGOS & INDIVIDUALS)
26	7.4 INSTITUTIONAL GIS (INDUSTRY CONSULTANTS)
26	7.5 INSTITUTIONAL GIS (FIRST NATIONS)
27	7.6 SEI USE IN LAND-USE DECISIONS
27	7.7 PERCEIVED NEEDS & USEFULNESS
28	7.8 PLAN STATUS
30	7.9 NEW PLANNING INITIATIVES
31	8.0 CONSERVATION DATA CENTRE SERVICES
31	8.1 FAMILIARITY WITH THE SERVICE
31	8.2 USE OF & USEFULNESS OF THE SERVICE

32 9.0 USER & TARGET GROUPS

32 9.1 MUNICIPALITIES

32 9.2 REGIONAL DISTRICTS

32 9.3 NGOS & INDIVIDUALS

32 9.4 FIRST NATIONS

32 9.5 INDUSTRY CONSULTANTS

33 9.6 FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

33 9.7 PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

34 10.0 WILDLIFE VALUES RESEARCH

35 11.0 CONCLUSION & SUMMARY

35 11.1 PERCEPTION OF OVERALL SATISFACTION

36 12.0 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

39 APPENDIX ONE: MASTER ADDRESS LIST

39 FEDERAL

39 CANADIAN WILDLIFE SERVICE (QB)

39 CANADIAN WILDLIFE SERVICE (DELTA)

39 PARKS CANADA

39 FISHERIES & OCEANS

39 PACIFIC FORESTRY CENTRE

40 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENCE

40 PROVINCIAL

40 MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT LANDS & PARKS (NANAIMO)

40 MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT LANDS & PARKS (NANAIMO)

40 CONSERVATION DATA CENTRE (MOE)

40 MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION & HIGHWAYS

41 MINISTRY OF ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

41 PROVINCIAL CAPITAL COMMISSION

41 REGIONAL DISTRICT

41 ISLANDS TRUST

41 CAPITAL REGIONAL DISTRICT (PARKS)

42 COMOX STRATHCONA REGIONAL DISTRICT

42 NANAIMO REGIONAL DISTRICT

42 COWICHAN VALLEY REGIONAL DISTRICT

42 MUNICIPAL

42 COLWOOD (Municipality)

42 METCHOSIN (District Municipality)

43 LANGFORD (Municipality)

43 HIGHLANDS DISTRICT

43 VIEW ROYAL (Municipality)

43 ESQUIMALT (Municipality)

44 VICTORIA (Municipality)

44 OAK BAY (Municipality)

44 SAANICH (Municipality)

44 CENTRAL SAANICH (Municipality)

44 NORTH SAANICH (Municipality)

45	SIDNEY (MUNICIPALITY).....
45	DUNCAN (MUNICIPALITY).....
45	NORTH COWICHAN (MUNICIPALITY).....
45	LADYSMITH (MUNICIPALITY).....
45	NANAIMO (MUNICIPALITY).....
46	PARKSVILLE (MUNICIPALITY).....
46	QUALICUM BEACH (MUNICIPALITY).....
46	COURTENAY (MUNICIPALITY).....
46	COMOX (MUNICIPALITY).....
46	CUMBERLAND (VILLAGE OF).....
47	CAMPBELL RIVER (MUNICIPALITY).....
47	OTHER USERS
47	LANARC CONSULTANTS.....
47	MADRONE CONSULTANTS LTD.....
47	WESTLAND RESOURCES.....
47	ECOTRUST CANADA (MAPPING OFFICE).....
48	HULLQUMINUM TREATY GROUP.....
48	COMOX VALLEY PROJECT WATERSHED SOCIETY.....
48	SNUNEYMUXXW FIRST NATION.....
48	TR-NEXW TREATY.....
49	COWICHAN VALLEY LAND TRUST.....
49	DUCKS UNLIMITED.....
50	BC WILD.....
50	QUALICUM BEACH STRAEMKBEPPER SOCIETY.....
50	UBC (GEOGRAPHY).....
50	CAMOSUN COLLEGE (GEOGRAPHY).....
51	ENKON ENVIRONMENTAL LTD.....
51	AQUAMETRIX RESEARCH.....
51	THURBER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS LTD.....
51	BIOLINX ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH LTD.....
51	SEACOR ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING INC.....
51	KATY HOLM.....
52	J.C. LEE & ASSOCIATES LTD.....
52	NINA RAGINSKY (WATERBIRD WATCH COLLECTIVE).....
52	ANTHONY LEE.....
53	APPENDIX TWO: INDIVIDUAL SUMMARIES.....
115	APPENDIX THREE: QUESTIONNAIRE.....

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In late 1992, Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks (MELP) and Canadian Wildlife Service (CWS) met to discuss working together to produce systematic, scientific information on remnant ecosystems in the study area. Initially, wetlands were the focus for CWS and MELP but this quickly expanded to include other wildlife habitats and rare and endangered species. The project evolved over its eight year life span by adapting to meet the needs of the main client groups. What began as a wetlands inventory for use by senior government agencies evolved into an inventory of all remaining sensitive ecosystems for use by all levels of government, consultants, non-government organizations, landowners and other citizens. It also expanded to include a substantial outreach program, to assist stakeholders in the interpretation and use of the data for conservation purposes.

By 1992, little mapping had been done showing environmentally sensitive areas (ESA's) on the increasingly developed and ecologically valuable Vancouver Islands' eastern coastal lowland and adjacent Gull Islands. In other areas of the province it had been found that this type of information was valuable for various local land use planning processes such as Official Community Plans and Parks Plans. Thus, although the initial intention of this inventory was to satisfy senior government information needs, it soon became apparent that in order to influence land use decision-making, it would be necessary to include local government as a prime user of this information.

For this reason, the SEI project team approached local governments to inform them of the project goals and ask them for contributions towards the project. Several governments responded favourably, although several also felt that this was a 'downloading' exercise. Final figures show that the federal and provincial governments contributed about 90% of the total cost of the project with the remainder provided by local governments.

Once the inventory maps and database were published in September 1997, it became evident that an outreach program was necessary to help users interpret the data and use it effectively. Orientation sessions, workshops and two lengthy reports were produced describing the inventory, its ecosystems and how to manage and protect them. Training programs are being developed, a web site with an educational component is being created and other documents are being produced.

The following evaluation of the SEI project shows that, based on a sample of 59 interviewees representing a cross-section of users, the majority (66%) felt that the SEI generally met their expectations and needs; 19% felt that it did not and a further 15% gave no response.

1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE EVALUATION

This report outlines the results of interviews which were undertaken in-person and by telephone of users of SEI data in both digital and hard formats.

The goal of the study was to:

- establish up-to-date contacts with the data users;
- determine how the data is being used and received;
- how it is being disseminated;
- how it related to CDC services;
- how well support materials have been received and used.

Additionally, the interviews were meant to determine:

- how well a website might be received;
- whether or not training was needed for users;
- overall satisfaction levels;
- the status of present and anticipated plans in local and regional governments.

Any additional pieces of information which were mentioned in the interview process were also captured along with specific quotations to capture the spirit of the input as well as its content. Also, lastly, a question relating to research on the willingness of municipalities to participate in discussions on incorporating wildlife values into official community plans was raised.

Note: The Islands Trust was treated as a Regional District for purposes of compiling statistics based on the type of agency responding to the interview questions. This was done because of the unique nature of their activities and authority.

1.2 GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Many of the contacts interviewed professed to being unaware of the original intent of the SEI project, or to having no background to it. Many of the observations made by them relate directly to this lack of awareness. Some of this can be attributed to:

- changes in personnel in user organizations during the life of the project;
- long intervals between contact with users by project organizers;
- failure of printed materials to gain the attention of users.

It was a surprise to find that so few planners and their municipalities have yet embraced the new technologies of GIS and associated tools and databases. If there were deficiencies noted by respondents then they were often related to a lack of detailed working experience in spatial data analysis and management as planning and management tools.

2.0 SEI TECHNICAL ISSUES

2.1 DATA ACCURACY

Notification of the users about the anticipated levels of accuracy and the reliability of the data do not seem to be widely understood. What appears to have happened is that during the life of the project user expectations have risen to a new plateau which exceeds the intended (or budgeted) quality and accuracy of the SEI project.

Were you satisfied with the accuracy of the data in the SEI?

	Positive	Negative	No Response	Total
	#	%	#	%
Municipal	8	36.4%	7	31.8%
Reg Districts	2	40.0%	3	60.0%
Provincial	4	50.0%	2	25.0%
Federal	3	75.0%	0	0.0%
NGO & Ind.	3	42.8%	2	28.6%
1 st Nations	0	0.00%	1	25%
Consultants	4	44.4%	5	55.6%
Total	24	40.7%	20	33.9%
			15	25.4%
			0	0.00%
			4	75.0%
			7	28.6%
			4	25.0%
			8	25.0%
			5	0.00%
			22	31.8%
			59	25.4%

The accuracy of spatial databases is often misunderstood in both in terms of reasonable expectations and in terms of what accuracy is needed at specific scales for specific tasks. Difficulties can occur when data mapped at one scale is blown up and used for a different function in often requiring a different more precise degree of accuracy.

2.1.1 It is recommended that: more specific advice on the reasonable expectations of accuracy be addressed to existing and new users of the data to ensure that the data is being used for the purpose for which it was intended.

2.2 SCALE

While the 1:20,000 scale of the data analysis and mapping may have been entirely satisfactory for planning purposes and it may have been the only achievable result with the budget available it now no longer meets the needs or expectations of the majority of users.

Most planners and consultants are looking for data which they can use in making strong management decisions. It usually requires 1:5,000 or better scale data to meet other operational requirements. If the mapped data was at 1:5,000 it would probably be more widely accepted and used by municipal and regional planners.

Were you satisfied with the scale of the mapped data in the SEI?

	Positive		Negative		No Response		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Municipal	6	27.3%	11	50.0%	5	22.7%	22
Reg Districts	3	60.0%	1	20.0%	1	20.0%	5
Provincial	2	25.0%	4	50.0%	2	25.0%	8
Federal	0	0.0%	3	75.0%	1	25.0%	4
NGO & Ind.	6	85.7%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	7
1 st Nations	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	3	75.0%	4
Consultants	5	55.5%	4	44.5%	0	0.00%	9
Total	22	37.3%	24	40.7%	13	22%	59

2.2.1 It is recommended that: greater explanation of the mapping scale, the rationale for its choice and more explicit warnings about its limitations be included on map sheets and in the metadata to avoid disappointment and errors.

2.2.2 It is recommended that: consideration be given to future projects being funded to map data at 1:5,000 to meet operational requirements of users.

2.3 AIRPHOTO INTERPRETATION

The vintage of aerial photography runs used in the analysis stages may have been such, in some cases, that the results did not match areas which have been subsequently developed or harvested. Naturally this has created a database of polygons which may not match the real world and some of these may have missed the limited ground-truthing exercise which was undertaken after the analysis stage.

2.3.1 It is recommended that: greater emphasis be made to data users of information on the vintage of airphoto coverage in individual map sheets. The issue should also be addressed, for users, in the metadata given to each user.

2.4 METADATA

Many of the respondents were unfamiliar with metadata and so were unable to make a meaningful comment on its quality. For example when asked several replied 'What is metadata?' signalling an issue related to whether or not the use of the database is being undertaken with a root understanding of the capabilities and limitations of the data in mind.

Of those who did, the following points were raised:

- the SEI metadata does not conform to national standards in that it does not answer all the technical questions which a true GIS professional may require;
- many of the respondents were unfamiliar with the concept of metadata and were unaccustomed to using it;
- metadata is of interest to non-digital versions and would answer a variety of questions which are not dealt with in the map-version of the metadata on the individual sheets.

2.4.1 It is recommended that: a higher profile be given to the existence of metadata for the SEI through more comprehensive information and that it be provided through a variety of channels of communication to reach users of hard-copy data as well as digital data;

2.4.2 It is recommended that: more detailed technical metadata be created to provide assistance to those working through technical challenges;

2.4.3 It is recommended that: detailed indexes of map sheets, polygons, airphoto data, lists of field-checked polygons be included in metadata to ensure that users who are reluctant (or unable) to query the CDC or the digital data have access to the information.

2.5 DATA MAINTENANCE & UPDATING

A number of respondents raised the issue of updating of the information in the database. Some are concerned about what will happen to it after the conclusion of the project in March 2000 including the CDC scientific support service.

Do you collect and maintain data related to sensitive ecosystems for your own purposes?

	Positive		Negative		No Response		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Municipal	8	36.4%	9	40.9%	5	22.7%	22
Reg Districts	2	40.0%	3	60.0%	0	0.00%	5
Provincial	5	62.5%	2	25.0%	1	12.5%	8
Federal	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.00%	4
NGO & Ind.	5	71.4%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	7
1 st Nations	0	0.00%	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	4
Consultants	2	22.2%	7	77.8%	0	0.00%	9
Total	24	40.7%	26	44.0%	9	15.3%	59

2.5.1 It is recommended that: a process for updating of the SEI data be identified and that it be communicated to all project stakeholders;

2.5.2 It is recommended that: that an initiative to develop active participation by SEI stakeholders and users in the updating process be developed;

2.5.3 It is recommended that: the issue of data ownership and data control be addressed in advance of it being raised by possible data sharing partners.

If yes, would you be willing to share your data with the SEI project originators?

	Positive		Negative		No Response		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Municipal	6	27.2%	1	4.5%	15	68.8%	22
Reg Districts	1	20.0%	1	20.0%	3	60.0%	5
Provincial	3	37.5%	1	12.5%	4	50.0%	8
Federal	1	25.0%	1	25.0%	2	50.0%	4
NGO & Ind.	4	57.1%	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	7
1 st Nations	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4	100%	4
Consultants	1	11.1%	2	22.2%	6	66.7%	9
Total	16	27.1%	7	11.9%	36	61.0%	59

Many of the respondents in this study have already made the determination that the project originators should be responsible for maintaining and updating the data. Some of the municipalities feel that as a fallback, their regional districts will look after all environmental concerns on their behalf and they in turn expect the project originators to carry on.

Consultants work for their clients and would be unlikely to provide extensive *pro bono* services to support the SEI program.

First Nations are currently using their GIS primarily in support of treaty negotiations and in negotiating co-management agreements so would be an unlikely source of support at this time. Support levels in the federal and provincial government agencies for such an undertaking appears to be low or even non-existent.

NGOs are the most supportive and enthusiastic about participation in updating and maintenance programs and might provide a rich source of expertise, energy, diligence and support in that existing groups could be convinced to coordinate some of their effort in a pool toward this end. The issue of technical competence of these groups is always close in the background and there is a real uneven level of capability in the GIS aspect (spatial data) as well as in the biological capability. An assessment of this issue needs to be undertaken.

It would be most undesirable to have the data become dormant, or outdated due to lack of maintenance and update input. This was recently identified as a major issue in Canada where cost recovery programs to support database creation and maintenance have been unsuccessful. It is estimated that data that can't be supported through cost recovery have been abandoned, leaving to ruin tens of millions of dollars worth of data.¹

There is a perception in other agencies that the function of updating and maintenance may be unfairly ideloaded to them without the necessary resources to make it possible.

2.5.4 It is recommended that: the issue of keeping the data up-to-date be directly addressed;

2.5.5 It is recommended that: the issue of the identification of a long-term custodian for the data be identified.

2.6 TECHNICAL CAPABILITY OF USERS

Many times during the interviews the respondents made casual comments which indicated a limited technical capability for dealing with cartographic issues, spatial data issues, application of data in planning and assessment exercises etc.

Municipalities on Vancouver Island generally do not have the staff and resources to undertake much field (if any) environmental field work. They tend to rely on any data source regardless of the caveats stated in the metadata and to try to fit it into their

¹ Levinshon, Allan *Canadian Geospatial Data Policy Stifles Productivity* In GeoWorld 12: 6 June 1999.

own requirements. This is creating technical issues related to accuracy which in turn are affecting the credibility of the SEI.

Reliance on the users having advanced skills in these areas, or in their ability to read and digest detailed metadata from a technical report will, in the short run, have limited success. Until GIS and the use of spatial data becomes widely accepted and used in planning and assessment by the professionals themselves these difficulties will persist. The question is what role, if any, do the partners in the SEI wish to take on to expedite and direct the proper use of their data by users with limited or non-existent technical skills and understanding? While it is clear that the training of users in GIS technical skills is not the mandate of any of the SEI sponsors, the lack of these skills in their target audiences is currently a problem.

Here is some anecdotal evidence. One NGO stated that their GIS was operated by a secondary school student after only two weeks of training. Another government respondent was unable to create a view with the SEI data so that he could actually use it.

2.6.1 It is recommended that: consideration to addressing the issue of whether or not amateur participation in data collection is currently at the level needed and to see whether initiatives to raise their technical qualifications would be appropriate.

3.0 SEI SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION

3.1 CLASSIFICATION SCHEME OBSERVATIONS

For the most-part SEI clients have accepted the eco-system classification scheme at face value and have used it in their own work. A smaller number expressed specific concerns which may (or may not) be significant in the long run.

There was some concern that the system of indicating secondary communities was awkward to use, difficult to understand or frustrating to access in the digital format. There difficulties may be contributing to the secondary communities not being identified by clients in their database queries.

Several respondents questioned the completeness of the coverage of significant communities and ecosystems when the SEI is so terrestrially oriented. Those respondents with interests in coastlines, saltwater areas, aquatic environments etc. tended to express these concerns.

Some respondents observed that, in their opinion, tall riparian zone vegetation is sensitive/ felt that more or all of it should have been indicated in polygons.

The designation of older second growth forest was specifically identified as a source of concern by several respondents. One planner in particular observed that the differences in inherent values implied by this designation caused him a problem because rather than a signal to preserve, this designation was a signal to harvest it. It was specifically requested by two respondents that the SEI provide information (see also website section) on a bibliography of studies, reports and data related to the SEI with further information on their location and availability.

3.1.1 It is recommended that: consideration for the creation of a bibliography of related studies, papers, reports etc. for SEI users.

4.0 SEI ACCESS & DISTRIBUTION

4.1 INSTITUTIONAL GIS (Municipalities & Regions)

	FORMAT	
Campbell River	Digital, Hard copies	4 hard copies
Capital Regional District (Parks)	Digital, Hard copies	10 hard copies
Central Saanich	Hard copies	3 hard copies
Colwood	Hard copies	2 hard copies
Comox	Hard copies	2 hard copies
Comox Strathcona Regional District	Digital, Hard copies	21 hard copies
Courtenay	Hard copies	3 hard copies
Cowichan Valley Regional District	Hard copies	15 hard copies
Cumberland	Hard copies	2 hard copies
Duncan	Hard copies	1 hard copy
Esquimalt	Hard copies	2 hard copies
Highlands	Digital, Hard copies	2 hard copies
Islands Trust	Digital, Hard copies	25 hard copies
Ladysmith	Hard copies	3 hard copies
Lake Cowichan	Hard copies	1 hard copy
Langford	Digital, Hard copies	2 hard copies
Metchosin	Hard copies	4 hard copies
Nanaimo	Digital, Hard copies	4 hard copies
Nanaimo Regional District	Digital, Hard copies	15 hard copies
North Cowichan	Hard copies	4 hard copies
North Saanich	Hard copies	1 hard copy
Oak Bay	Hard copies	1 hard copy
Parksville	Hard copies	2 hard copies
Qualicum Beach	Hard copies	2 hard copies
Saanich	Hard copies	4 hard copies
Sidney	Hard copies	1 hard copy
Victoria	Hard copies	1 hard copy
View Royal	Hard copies	1 hard copy

4.2 INSTITUTIONAL GIS (Government Agencies)

	FORMAT	
Department of Defence (CFB Esquimalt)	n/k	
Department of Fisheries and Oceans (Vancouver)	Digital	
Pacific Forestry Centre		
Parks Canada (Vancouver)	Digital	

	FORMAT	
	n/k	Biolinx Environmental Research Ltd.
	n/k	Enkon Environmental Ltd.
	n/k	J.C. Lee & Associates Ltd.
	Digital	Lanarc Consulting Inc.
	Digital	Madrone Consultants Ltd.
	n/k	Pottinger Gaherty Environmental Consultants
	n/k	Seacor Environmental Engineering Inc.
	n/k	Thurber Environmental Consultants Ltd.
	Digital	Westland Resources Ltd.

4.4 INSTITUTIONAL GIS (Industry Consultants)

	FORMAT	
	Digital	BC Wild Project
	Digital	Comox Valley Project Watershed Society
	Digital	Cowichan Valley Land Trust
	Digital	Ducks Unlimited
	n/k	EcoTrust Canada
	n/k	Anthony Lee
	Digital	Qualicum Beach Streamkeepers Society
	n/k	Waterbird Watch Collective

4.3 INSTITUTIONAL GIS (NGOs & Individuals)

	Digital	BC Forest Service (Port Alberni)
	Digital	BC Parks (Strathcona District)
	Digital, Hard copies	MELP (CDC Victoria)
56 hard copies	Digital, Hard copies	MELP (Nanaimo)
132 hard copies	Digital, Hard copies	Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs (Victoria)
	Hard copies	Ministry of Transport & Highways (Nanaimo)
66 hard copies	Digital	Provincial Capital Commission (Victoria)

4.5 INSTITUTIONAL GIS (First Nations)

	FORMAT	
	Digital	Homalco Band
	Digital	Hull' Quimil Num Treaty Group
	Digital	Snuneymuxw First Nation
	Digital	Tel Mexw Treaty Association

4.6 INSTITUTIONAL GIS (Other)

	FORMAT	
	Digital	Camosun College (T.J.A. Elkin)
	Digital	UBC Dept of Geography (Brian Klinkenberg)
	Digital	Malsaspina University College (Tim Neagle)
	Digital	Stephen Young (Uvic Graduate Student)
	Digital	Karen Golinski (Uvic Graduate Student)

5.0 SEI SERVICES & PRODUCTS

5.1 FAMILIARITY WITH THE SEI PROGRAM

There appeared to be a distinction between the awareness and familiarity with the SEI program in general, awareness of products and services and the general pattern of use.

Are you familiar with the SEI program?

	Positive		Negative		No Response		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Municipal	17	77.2%	4	18.2%	1	4.6%	22
Region Dist	5	100%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	5
Provincial	7	87.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.00%	8
Federal	4	100%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4
NGO & Ind.	6	85.7%	0	0.00%	1	14.3%	7
1 st Nations	3	75.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.00%	4
Consultants	9	100%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	9
Total	51	86.4%	6	10.2%	2	3.4%	59

5.1.1 It is recommended that: the program for promoting awareness and understanding of the SEI program be reviewed in the light of the actual experience during the life of the project with the goal of increasing use and participation in its maintenance.

5.2 FAMILIARITY WITH SEI PRODUCTS & SERVICES

The familiarity of respondents with the SEI support materials had varying degrees of response.

Are you familiar with the SEI products and services which are offered?

	Positive		Negative		No Response		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Municipal	9	40.9%	9	40.9%	4	18.2%	22
Reg Districts	1	20.0%	4	80.0%	0	0.00%	5
Provincial	2	25.0%	4	50.0%	2	25.0%	8
Federal	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.00%	4
NGO & Ind.	3	42.9%	3	42.9%	1	14.2%	7
1 st Nations	1	25.0%	3	75.0%	0	0.00%	4
Consultants	4	44.4%	5	55.6%	0	0.00%	9

Total	22	37.3%	30	50.8%	7	11.9%	59
-------	----	-------	----	-------	---	-------	----

While there were no questions specifically dealing with the awareness of respondents of the sponsoring agencies it was observed that there was a fairly consistent lack of awareness of the identity of the project originators and sponsors. At least three remarked that they had no idea who the project originators were. Most identified only one of the project sponsors as the sole originator. If the profile of the originating agency is a secondary, but important, objective then some small changes in the profile of the agencies should be adopted.

5.4.1 It is recommended that: the identity of the project sponsors be clearly identified in all communications, publications and distribution of data.

5.4 FAMILIARITY WITH SEI PROJECT SPONSORS

	Positive	Negative	No Response	Total	
	#	%	#	%	
Municipal	8	36.4%	7	31.8%	22
Reg Districts	2	40.0%	0	0.00%	5
Provincial	5	62.5%	1	12.5%	8
Federal	2	40.0%	1	25.0%	4
NGO & Ind.	3	42.8%	0	0.00%	7
1 st Nations	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4
Consultants	5	55.5%	0	0.00%	9
Total	25	42.4%	9	15.2%	59

Do you find the SEI products and services useful?

Rating of the usefulness (vs. awareness) of the SEI support materials had varying degrees of response.

5.3 USEFULNESS OF SEI PRODUCTS & SERVICES

5.5 POSSIBLE SEI WEBSITE

With the potential for the development of a website for serving users of SEI data, and to provide background information about sensitive ecosystems the respondents were asked:

Would a website offered by the SEI program be useful?

	Positive	Negative	No Response	Total
	#	#	#	#
	%	%	%	%
Municipal	14	3	5	22
Reg Districts	3	1	1	5
Provincial	4	2	2	8
Federal	4	0	0	4
NGO & Ind.	4	2	1	7
1 st Nations	3	0	1	4
Consultants	8	1	0	9
Total	40	9	10	59
	67.8%	15.3%	16.9%	

There is still some lingering background doubts about the effectiveness of websites but most of the respondents professed to searching for data on the web themselves. They also felt that this was a good channel of communications for related information.

Several respondents identified specific topics that they would like to see handled on such a website:

- lists of species with related information on each;
- lists of habitats, communities and associations with related information on each;
- protection advice for ecosystems;
- management advice for ecosystems;
- field notes from field checked polygons;
- contents of background studies;
- links to closely related sites;
- text of technical reports;
- text of conservation manual;
- read-only map access for querying polygons.

5.5.1 It is recommended that: if a website is anticipated that it contain detailed reference data and information which would be very useful to the respondents and others;

5.5.2 It is recommended that: a website contain information which would answer the most frequently asked questions about the polygons, their component species, and the SEI coverage area.

6.0 SEI TRAINING

6.1 MEETING NEEDS

Do you think that there is a need for training in the use and understanding of the SEI database?

	Positive		Negative		No Response		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Municipal	15	68.2%	3	13.6%	4	18.2%	22
Reg Districts	5	100%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	5
Provincial	5	62.5%	0	0.00%	3	37.5%	8
Federal	4	100%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4
NGO & Ind.	6	85.7%	0	0.00%	1	14.3%	7
1 st Nations	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.00%	4
Consultants	8	88.9%	1	11.1%	0	0.00%	9
Total	45	76.3%	6	10.2%	8	13.5%	59

There is significant support for training in all aspects of the SEI from most sectors. The weakest support comes from the provincial and 1st Nations sectors.

6.2 COST OF TRAINING

Would you be willing to pay for a training program?

	Positive		Negative		No Response		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Municipal	10	45.5%	0	0.00%	12	54.5%	22
Reg Districts	4	80.0%	0	0.00%	1	20.0%	5
Provincial	1	12.5%	1	12.5%	6	75.0%	8
Federal	2	50.0%	0	0.00%	2	50.0%	4
NGO & Ind.	3	42.8%	3	42.8%	1	14.4%	7
1 st Nations	1	25.0%	1	25.0%	2	50.0%	4
Consultants	8	88.9%	0	0.00%	1	11.1%	9
Total	29	49.1%	5	8.5%	25	42.4%	59

It is noted that training sessions for community groups such as Wetland Keepers routinely charge a fee for attendance at training sessions which equally the participants to participate in the activities of their program. This also creates a loyal following in all of whom have a shared common training base.

Some individual respondents or representatives of NGOs in this study indicated that they would attend a training course if it was free. The questions were not specific enough to determine whether or not this is a market trend or simply a quirk of the population being sampled.

The representatives of agencies and the consultants all indicated that it was normal to pay a fee for training but a large number of all respondents in all categories who indicated a willingness to pay a fee cautioned that it should be reasonable. They did not indicate what the threshold of reason would be for them.

6.2.1 It is recommended that: the cost for participants be designed to generate revenue to defray costs without creating a marketing barrier for participation on the training program.

6.2.2 It is recommended that: investigation of locating a sponsor which would defray some of the costs for the development of curriculum and the presentation of the course.

6.2.3 It is recommended that: consideration be given to presenting the course content, afterwards, in the proposed SEI website.

6.3 TRAINING TRACKS!

There could be two different training tracks to meet the diverse needs of the audience. Firstly there could be a track for community and park planners from within municipal and regional district infrastructures.

Secondly there could be a similar course for biologists, planners, developers. This is supported in anecdotal comments from municipal and regional respondents who felt that the training requirements of practitioners were different from their own and that there ought to be specialized content for them.

There also appears to be both a demonstrated need and a market for students, volunteers and laypersons interested in using or participating in gathering SEI information for their own purposes. This could be a slightly different orientation of the practitioner track.

6.3.1 It is recommended that: consideration be given for a training sessions for different market tracks to meet demand and to contribute to improving

7.0 LAND USE PLANNING & SEI

7.1 INSTITUTIONAL GIS (Municipalities & Regions)

It might have been expected that the majority of those communities operating a GIS would own and use ESRI products but there is actually a wide range of software being used by those communities.

Producing datasets which are easily useful for all these software packages will meet their requirements and it will ensure that translation of datasets will be done uniformly and without adding unforeseen distortions in the process if it is done at source.

	GIS	TRIM?
Campbell River	n/k	n/k
Capital Regional District (Parks)	No (only from contractor)	No
Central Saanich	Yes	n/k
Colwood	n/k	n/k
Comox	Database only for AM/FM	No
Comox Strathcona Regional District	ArcINFO	No
Courtenay	AutoCAD	No
Cowichan Valley Regional District	ArcINFO/AutoCAD	No
Cumberland	No	No
Duncan	No	No
Esquimalt	No	No
Highlands	MapINFO	Yes
Islands Trust	ArcVIEW	Yes
LadySmith	n/k	n/k
Langford	CityVIEW	Yes
Metchosin	No	No
Nanaimo	MapINFO	No (Have created their own coverage)
Nanaimo Regional District	ArcINFO/ArcVIEW	Yes
North Cowichan	No	No
North Saanich	No	No
Oak Bay	ArcINFO	n/k
Parksville	AutoCAD	No
Qualicum Beach	No	No
Saanich	ArcVIEW	Yes
Sidney	n/k	n/k
Victoria	n/k	n/k
View Royal	AutoCAD	No

7.2 INSTITUTIONAL GIS (Government Agencies)

	GIS	TRIM?
Department of Defence (CFB Esquimalt)	ArcVIEW	Yes
Department of Fisheries and Oceans (Vancouver)	ArcINFO, ArcVIEW	Yes
Pacific Forestry Centre	ArcINFO, ArcVIEW	Yes
Parks Canada (Vancouver)	ArcINFO, ArcVIEW	Yes
BC Forest Service (Port Alberni)	N/K	N/K
BC Parks (Strathcona District)	ArcVIEW	Yes
MELP (CDC Victoria)	ArcINFO, ArcVIEW	Yes
MELP (Nanaimo)	ArcINFO, ArcVIEW	Yes
Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs (Victoria)	ArcVIEW, GeoMEDIA	Yes
Ministry of Transport & Highways (Nanaimo)	No	No
Provincial Capital Commission (Victoria)	AutoCAD Map	No

7.3 INSTITUTIONAL GIS (NGOs & Individuals)

	GIS	TRIM?
Comox Valley Project Watershed Society	ArcVIEW	No
Cowichan Valley Land Trust	ArcVIEW	No
Ducks Unlimited	ArcVIEW, AutoCAD	No
EcoTrust Canada	N/K	N/K
Anthony Lee	No	No
Qualicum Beach Streamkeepers Society	ArcVIEW	Yes (partial)
Waterbird Watch Collective	No	No

7.4 INSTITUTIONAL GIS (Industry Consultants)

	Biolinx Environmental Research Ltd.	No	No
	Enkon Environmental Ltd.	PC ArcINFO/ArcVIEW	No
	J.C. Lee & Associates Ltd.	No	No
	Lanarc Consulting Inc.	ArcVIEW, AutoCAD Map	No
	Madrone Consultants Ltd.	ArcVIEW	No
	Pottinger Gaherty Environmental Consultants	MicroStation	No
	Seacor Environmental Engineering Inc.	No	No
	Thurber Environmental Consultants Ltd.	No	No
	Westland Resources Ltd.	ArcVIEW, MapINFO	No
TRIM?	GIS		

7.5 INSTITUTIONAL GIS (First Nations)

	Homalco Band	ArcVIEW, MicroStation	Yes
	Hull' Quimil Num Treaty Group	No	No
	Snuenymuxw First Nation	PAMap, ArcVIEW	Not complete
	Tel Mexw Treaty Association	ArcINFO, ArcVIEW, MapINFO	Yes
TRIM?	GIS		

7.5.1 It is recommended that: all future datasets which are distributed to users be provided in all of the most popular software file formats to ensure consistency in datasets and in the ease of use.

7.5.2 It is recommended that: annual contact be made with each GIS coordinator to ensure that there are no technical difficulties and that he data is being used in the framework intended in the original project.

7.6 SEI USE IN LAND-USE DECISIONS

Although SEI data in both digital and hard-copy formats were distributed to municipalities some of the recipients were either unable or unwilling to actually use the data or some of them received it too late for inclusion in the most recent version of their official community plan.

Most respondents indicated an interest in or a willingness to include such data in subsequent plans with the idea of raising the profile of the need to protect these areas or even to develop a bylaw giving them a higher degree of protection.

7.6.1 It is recommended that: a representative of the project partner consortium accept the responsibility to contact the planners in all the affected communities, once a year, to encourage the use of SEI data in planning projects and to update the plan status summary.

7.7 PERCEIVED NEEDS & USEFULNESS

There are a number of observations of spontaneous comments from respondents which may be useful in the amendment of the SEI program to improve it. These observations are all anecdotal and usually do not represent the responses of more than 1 to 3 respondents.

- Legislative status for the data is lacking. The respondent felt that it solved nothing to identify and designate polygons as sensitive, vulnerable or endangered without any legislated teeth for zoning or protection. This was a source of management problems for the respondent. Another respondent felt that there appeared to be a pattern of destruction of sensitive sites on private property by developers based on heightened awareness of the sites possibly as a result of awareness through the SEI and the Watershed Atlas of DFO.

- Management and protection guidelines for red and blue designated communities and species were not readily available to some respondents who would like greater assistance in these areas.

- There is need to fill in the gaps in the data and the polygon coverage or explain why those gaps exist. This would make the SEI more credible and more useful to several officials.

7.8 PLAN STATUS

One of the objectives of this study was to determine what opportunities might exist for participation in new or on-going planning initiatives in the communities which have interests in sensitive ecosystem sites.

PLAN STATUS	PLAN	
		Campbell River n/k
		Capital Regional District n/k
		(Parks) n/k
		Central Saanich - OCP - completed 1999 - included in OCP
		Colwood n/k
		Comox - OCP - approved 10/1997 - participate in regional strategy
		Comox Strathcona Regional District - Rural Use Bylaw - Cortes Island OCP - Rural Comox Valley Plan
		Courtenay - OCP - to be reviewed in 2000 - at least one is under review at any given time
		Cowichan Valley Regional District - 8 OCPs
		Cumberland - OCP - updated in 1997
		Duncan - OCP - completed 07/1995 - Participate in regional strategy
		Esquimalt - OCP - approved 1996 - participate in the regional strategy
		Highlands - OCP - approved 07/1997 - participate in regional strategy
		Islands Trust - Each island has its own OCP - At least one under review at any given time - Participate in regional strategy
		Ladysmith n/k
		Langford - OCP - approved 1996 - participate in the regional strategy
		Metchosin - OCP - adopted in 1995 - currently in force

7.9 NEW PLANNING INITIATIVES

In addition to the status of existing or on-going planning initiatives, the communities and regions indicate the following new initiatives to which input from the SEI may be possible:

PLAN STATUS	PLAN	
	n/k	Campbell River
	n/k	Capital Regional District (Parks)
- being developed	- 3 park management plans	
- anticipated in 2000	- review of systems plan	
- require management plans	- 15 other parks	
	- Brentwood Bay residential plan	Central Saanich
- to be updated	- Saanichton residential plan	
- to be updated	- Greenways Plan	Colwood
- in 1999	- None	Comox
	- 3 new OCPs	Comox Strathcona Regional District
- coming up	- local area plans	
- anticipated	- None	Courtenay
	- Watershed Management Plan	Cowichan Valley Regional District
- coming up soon	- None	Cumberland
	- None	Duncan
	- None	Esquimalt
- in 2000	- parks plan	Highlands
- being developed	- Land Use Bylaws	Islands Trust
n/k	n/k	Ladysmith
- anticipated	- neighbourhood plans	Langford
	- None	Metchosin
	- plan updates	Nanaimo
- being developed in 2000	- 2 new OCPs	Nanaimo Regional District
- village and Local Area plans anticipated in 2000	- village plans and Local area plans	
	- None	North Cowichan
	- None	North Saanich
	n/k	Oak Bay
	- local area plans	Parksville
- anticipated	- zoning bylaw	Qualicum Beach
- amendments	- local area plans	Saanich
	- None	Sidney
- constantly coming on stream	- neighbourhood plans	Victoria
- anticipated	- local area plans	View Royal
- anticipated	- detailed environmental review guidelines	

8.0 CONSERVATION DATA CENTRE SERVICES

8.1 FAMILIARITY WITH THE SERVICE

This section was intended to measure the amount of the general awareness of the scientific support service offered by the CDC in support of the SEI.

Did you know that the CDC offers a scientific support service to the SEI?

	Positive		Negative		No Response		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Municipal	5	22.7%	12	54.6%	5	22.7%	22
Reg Districts	4	80.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.00%	5
Provincial	5	62.5%	2	25.0%	1	12.5%	8
Federal	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.00%	4
NGO & Ind.	4	57.1%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	7
1 st Nations	1	25.0%	3	75.0%	0	0.00%	4
Consultants	7	77.8%	2	22.2%	0	0.00%	9
Total	28	47.4%	24	40.7%	7	11.9%	59

8.2 USE OF & USEFULNESS OF THE SERVICE

What is apparent is that those agencies which are aware of the CDC scientific support service to the SEI make use of it.

Have you made use of the CDC to obtain information about sensitive ecosystems or sensitive areas?

	Positive		Negative		No Response		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Municipal	5	22.7%	12	54.6%	5	22.7%	22
Reg Districts	4	80.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.00%	5
Provincial	5	62.5%	2	25.0%	1	12.5%	8
Federal	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.00%	4
NGO & Ind.	4	57.1%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	7
1 st Nations	1	25.0%	3	75.0%	0	0.00%	4
Consultants	7	77.8%	2	22.2%	0	0.00%	9
Total	28	47.4%	24	40.7%	7	11.9%	59

9.0 USER & TARGET GROUPS

Some general observations can be made on the various groupings of users and target audiences for SEI data:

9.1 MUNICIPALITIES

There appears to be some resistance by some communities to the integration of SEI data into their planning process and to incorporate sensitive area inventory and monitoring in their municipal planning. This may be related to what appears to be a lag in the development of spatial databases and geographical information systems for their communities.

9.2 REGIONAL DISTRICTS

These agencies tend to be among the more technically sophisticated agencies with a high level of awareness and a high level of capability. They also tend to cover large areas of territory often with the result that they have some sort of jurisdiction over large numbers of SEI polygons with the result that they are important to their protection and management.

9.3 NGOS & INDIVIDUALS

Representatives of NGOs and some individual activists appear to be the most enthusiastic users and supporters of the SEI initiative. There is a lag between the mastery of the GIS software and a comprehensive understanding of the basic concepts which it embodies in currently resulting in questionable quality output. This may resolve itself over time as participants gain a greater conceptual understanding of the principals and concepts.

9.4 FIRST NATIONS

The four First Nations interviewed in this study appear to be currently more focused on treaty negotiations than on land-use planning. There is also much variability in the use of GIS and development of databases in different groups. Some work will have to be done to encourage use of the SEI on their areas of interest for management and protection functions.

9.5 INDUSTRY CONSULTANTS

They see the SEI, as one of them stated in the realm, providing tremendous easy access to good data in a form that allows them to execute contract content quickly and easily. They are enthusiastic users and also see themselves as potential providers of program expansion.

9.6 FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The respondents of these agencies often did not have the authority to commit to new activity, implementation or new initiatives. Consideration might be given to expanding the range of contacts to include planners, policy analysts and field managers. These agencies could do more to integrate initiatives such as SEI into their own inventory, planning and management initiatives. There is a need to invite and request more participation and cooperation.

9.7 PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

These respondents appear to indicate that there is a lack of integration and cooperation in the identification, designation, protection and management of sensitive ecosystems and sensitive areas within their jurisdictions. This is probably rooted in current organizational, jurisdictional and legal structures but signals a need to identify the issue to senior management for need for positive change.

10.0 WILDLIFE VALUES RESEARCH

At the request of the agency an additional question was asked on behalf of other staff interested in researching the inclusion of migratory bird values in Official Community Plans. A 'Yes' in the response column indicates that they would be willing, at a later date, to discuss this topic with a CWS researcher.

RESPONSE	NOTES
n/k	
Yes	They can speak for Regional (Parks)
Yes	Central Saanich
n/k	
Yes	Colwood
Yes	Comox
Yes	Comox Strathcona Regional District They are very interested in this topic, and volunteer to pilot test new initiatives.
Yes	Courtenay
Yes	Cowichan Valley Regional District
Yes	Cumberland
No	Duncan
Yes	Esquimalt
Yes	Highlands
Yes	Islands Trust
n/k	Ladysmith
Yes	Langford
Yes	Metchosin
Yes	Nanaimo
Yes	Nanaimo Regional District Very interested in including them in their OCPs.
Yes	North Cowichan
Yes	North Saanich
n/k	Oak Bay
Yes	Parksville This is highly relevant to some planning issues they have.
Yes	Qualicum Beach
Yes	Saanich Very important in local area plans.
Yes	Sidney
Yes	Victoria
Yes	View Royal

11.0 CONCLUSION & SUMMARY

Any assessment of a project tends to focus on and highlight short-comings in the final products. This report highlights its share of deficiencies, but it should be noted that in spite of critical review the overall impression individually and collectively is positive to very positive.

11.1 PERCEPTION OF OVERALL SATISFACTION

When asked about overall satisfaction with the SEI data

Did the SEI generally meet your expectations and needs?

	Positive		Negative		No Response		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Municipal	11	50.0%	5	22.7%	6	27.3%	22
Reg Districts	5	100%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	5
Provincial	6	75.0%	1	12.5%	1	12.5%	8
Federal	3	75.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.00%	4
NGO & Ind.	5	71.4%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	7
1 st Nations	1	25.0%	2	50.0%	1	25.0%	4
Consultants	8	88.9%	1	11.1%	0	0.00%	9
Total	39	66.1%	11	18.6%	9	15.3%	59

Many of the respondents had no expectations because they did not know about the project well enough in advance to develop any but the project certainly met existing needs. Its quantity and quality has now raised the bar in the general expectations which users may have for future projects.

12.0 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

CHAPTER 2:

2.1.1 It is recommended that: more specific advice on the reasonable expectations of accuracy be addressed to existing and new users of the data to ensure that the data is being used for the purpose for which it was intended.

2.2.1 It is recommended that: greater explanation of the mapping scale, the rationale for its choice and more explicit warnings about its limitations be included on map sheets and in the metadata to avoid disappointment and errors.

2.2.2 It is recommended that: consideration be given to future projects being funded to map data at 1:5,000 to meet operational requirements of users.

2.3.1 It is recommended that: greater emphasis be made to data users of information on the vintage of airphoto coverage in individual map sheets. The issue should also be addressed, for users, in the metadata given to each user.

2.4.1 It is recommended that: a higher profile be given to the existence of metadata for the SEI through more comprehensive information and that it be provided through a variety of channels of communication to reach users of hard-copy data as well as digital data;

2.4.2 It is recommended that: more detailed technical metadata be created to provide assistance to those working through technical challenges;

2.4.3 It is recommended that: detailed indexes of map sheets, polygons, airphoto data, lists of field-checked polygons be included in metadata to ensure that users who are reluctant (or unable) to query the CDC or the digital data have access to the information.

2.5.1 It is recommended that: a process for updating of the SEI data be identified and that it be communicated to all project stakeholders;

2.5.2 It is recommended that: that an initiative to develop active participation by SEI stakeholders and users in the updating process be developed;

2.5.3 It is recommended that: the issue of data ownership and data control be addressed in advance of it being raised by possible data sharing partners.

2.5.4 It is recommended that: the issue of keeping the data up-to-date be directly addressed;

2.5.5 It is recommended that: the issue of the identification of a long-term custodian for the data be identified.

2.6.1 It is recommended that: consideration to addressing the issue of whether or not amateur participation in data collection is currently at the level needed and to see whether initiatives to raise their technical qualifications would be appropriate.

CHAPTER 3:

3.1.1 It is recommended that: consideration for the creation of a bibliography of related studies, papers, reports etc. for SEI users.

CHAPTER 5:

5.1.1 It is recommended that: the program for promoting awareness and understanding of the SEI program be reviewed in the light of the actual experience during the life of the project with the goal of increasing use and participation in its maintenance.

5.4.1 It is recommended that: the identity of the project sponsors be clearly identified in all communications, publications and distribution of data.

5.5.1 It is recommended that: if a website is anticipated that it contain detailed reference data and information which would be very useful to the respondents and others;

5.5.2 It is recommended that: a website contain information which would answer the most frequently asked questions about the polygons, their component species, and the SEI coverage area.

CHAPTER 6:

6.2.1 It is recommended that: the cost for participants be designed to generate revenue to defray costs without creating a marketing barrier for participation on the training program.

6.2.2 It is recommended that: investigation of locating a sponsor which would defray some of the costs for the development of curriculum and the presentation of the course.

6.3.1 It is recommended that: consideration be given for a training sessions for different market tracks to meet demand and to contribute to improving

CHAPTER 7:

7.5.1 It is recommended that: all future datasets which are distributed to users be provided in all of the most popular software file formats to ensure consistency in datasets and in the ease of use.

7.5.2 It is recommended that: annual contact be made with each GIS coordinator to ensure that there are no technical difficulties and that he data is being used in the framework intended in the original project.

7.6.1 It is recommended that: a representative of the project partner consortium accept the responsibility to contact the planners in all the affected communities, once a year, to encourage the use of SEI data in planning projects and to update the plan status summary.

APPENDIX ONE: Master Address List

FEDERAL

CANADIAN WILDLIFE SERVICE (QB)

Contact: **Peggy Ward**
Mailing Address: 3567 Island Highway West, Qualicum Beach, B.C. V9K 2B7
Phone: 250-752-9611
Fax: 250-752-9611
Notes: SEI Project Manager

CANADIAN WILDLIFE SERVICE (DELTA)

Contact: **Trish Hayes**
Mailing Address: RR#1 5421 Robertson Rd., Delta BC, V4K 3N2
Phone: 604-940-4658
Fax: 604-946-7022
Notes: For information only.
Distribution: Digital format and hard copy.

PARKS CANADA

Contact: **Greg MacMillan**
Title: Data Manager
Mailing Address: 300-300 West Georgia St., Vancouver BC V6B 6B4
Phone: 604-666-3431
Fax: 604-666-7957
Notes: Pacific Marine Legacy Program dataset
Distribution: Digital format.

FISHERIES & OCEANS

Contact: **Brad Mason**
Title: Habitat Inventory Coordinator
Mailing Address: 360 n 555 West Hastings St., Vancouver BC, V6B 5G3
Phone: 604-666-7015
Fax: 604-666-7907
Notes:
Distribution: Digital format.

PACIFIC FORESTRY CENTRE

Contact: **Art Robinson**
Mailing Address: 506 West Burnside Rd., Victoria, BC V8Z 1M5
Phone: 250-363-0729
Fax: 250-363-0775
Notes: Forest Ecosystem mapping on DND lands.
Distribution: Digital format.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENCE

Title: **Jody Watson**

Mailing Address: Environmental Risk Management Office, Bldg 29, CFB Esquimalt, PO Box 1700 Stn Forces, Victoria BC V9A 7N2

Phone: 250-363-5063

Fax: 250-363-2567

Notes: A frequent user of SEI data through the Conservation Data Centre. They use Pacific Forestry Centre for professional services.

PROVINCIAL

MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT LANDS & PARKS (NANAIMO)

Contact: **Marlene Caskey**

Title: District Habitat Protection Officer

Mailing Address: 2080-A Labieux Road, Nanaimo BC V9T 6E9

Phone: 250-751-3220 (1-800-663-7867)

Fax: 250-751-3103

Notes: Debbie Narver is the GIS Coordinator (751-3117). Maggie Henigman is the District Habitat Protection Officer for Nanaimo, RDN and Comox-Strathcona Regional District.

Distribution: Digital format.

MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT LANDS & PARKS (NANAIMO)

Contact: **Mary-Jo Hamey**

Title: District Habitat Protection Officer

Mailing Address: 2080-A Labieux Road, Nanaimo BC V9T 6E9

Phone: 250-751-3226 (1-800-663-7867)

Fax: 250-751-3103

Notes: A frequent user of SEI data through the Conservation Data Centre.

CONSERVATION DATA CENTRE (MOE)

Contact: **Jan Kirkby/Andrew Harcombe**

Title: Conservation Science Ecologist

Mailing Address: PO Box 9344 Stn Prov Gov, Victoria BC V8W 9M1 (2975 Jutland)

Phone: 250-387-0732

Fax: 250-387-2733

Notes: Harcombe is the Director

Distribution: Digital format.

MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION & HIGHWAYS

Contact: **Rob Howatt**

Title: Subdivisions Approval Officer

Mailing Address: Nanaimo BC

Phone: 250-390-6180 (1-800-663-7867)

Fax: 250-390-6296

Distribution: n/k

MINISTRY OF ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Contact: **Peter Naken**

Title: GIS Coordinator

Mailing Address: PO Box 9100, Stn Prov Gov, Victoria BC V8W 9B1

Phone: 250-387-0600 (1-800-663-7867)

Fax: 250-356-0783

Notes: Treaty negotiations

Distribution: Digital format.

MINISTRY OF FORESTS (PORT ALBERNI)

Contact: **Sean Herbert**

Title: Planner

Mailing Address: 4227 h 6th Ave, Port Alberni BC V9Y 4N1

Phone: 250-724-9215 (1-800-663-7867)

Fax: 250-724-9261

Notes: Land use planning.

Distribution: Digital format.

BC PROVINCIAL PARKS (STRATHCONA DISTRICT)

Contact: **Bill Zinovich**

Title: Resource Assistant

Mailing Address: PO Box 1479, Parksville BC V9P 2H4

Phone: 250-954-4612 (1-800-663-7867)

Fax: 250-248-8584 (Local call)

Notes: Park management, conservation

Distribution: Digital format.

PROVINCIAL CAPITAL COMMISSION

Contact: **Dave Morris**

Title: Planner

Mailing Address: 613 Pandora St, Victoria BC, V8W 1N8

Phone: 250-953-8806

Fax: 250-386-1303

Notes: SEI contributor

Distribution: Digital format.

REGIONAL DISTRICT

ISLANDS TRUST

Contact: **Tyrone Guthrie**

Title: GIS Coordinator

Mailing Address: 200-1627 Fort Street, Victoria BC V8R 1H8

Phone: 250-405-5151 (1-800-663-7867)

Fax: 250-405-5155

Notes:

Distribution: Digital format and hard copy.

CAPITAL REGIONAL DISTRICT (Parks)

Contact: **Joel Ussery**

Title: Park Planner
Mailing Address: 510 Yates St., Victoria, BC
Phone: 250-478-3344
Fax: 250-478-5416
Notes:
Distribution: Digital format.

COMOX STRATHCONA REGIONAL DISTRICT

Contact: Harry Harker/Gord Hodge (GIS Tech)
Title: Head Planner

Mailing Address: 1001 Vanier St., Courtenay BC
Phone: 1-800-331-6007
Fax: 250-334-4358

Notes:
Distribution: Digital format and hard copy.

NANAIMO REGIONAL DISTRICT

Contact: Bob Lapham

Title: General Manager

Mailing Address: PO Box 40, Lantzville BC, V0R 2H0 (6300 Hammond Bay Rd.)

Phone: 250-390-6510

Fax: 250-390-6511

Notes:

Distribution: Digital format and hard copy.

COMICHAN VALLEY REGIONAL DISTRICT

Contact: Tom Anderson

Title: Development Services

Mailing Address: 137 Evans St., Duncan BC, V9L 1R1

Phone: 250-746-2620

Fax: 250-746-4136

Notes:

Distribution:

MUNICIPAL

COLWOOD (Municipality)

Contact: Simon Lawrence

Title: City Planner

Mailing Address: 3300 Wishart Rd., Victoria BC, V9C 1R1

Phone: 250-478-5590

Fax: 250-478-7516

Notes:

Distribution: Hard copy.

METCHOSIN (District Municipality)

Contact: Jill Parsons

Title: City Planner

Mailing Address: 4450 Happy Valley Road, Victoria BC, V9C 3Z3

Phone: 250-474-3167
Fax: 250-474-6298
Notes:
Distribution: Hard copy.

LANGFORD (Municipality)

Contact: **Robert Buchan**
Title: City Planner
Mailing Address: 2805 Carlow, Victoria BC, V9B 5V9
Phone: 250-474-6919
Fax: 250-478-7864
Notes:
Distribution: Digital format and hard copy.

HIGHLANDS DISTRICT

Contact: **Kevin Key**
Title: Planning Technician
Mailing Address: 1564 Millstream, Victoria BC V9E 1G6
Phone: 250-474-1773
Fax: 250-474-3677
Notes:
Distribution: Digital format and hard copy.

VIEW ROYAL (Municipality)

Contact: **Alan Haldenby**
Title: City Planner
Mailing Address: 45 View Royal, Victoria BC, V9B 1A6
Phone: 250-479-6800
Fax: 250-727-9551
Notes:
Distribution: Hard copy.

ESQUIMALT (Municipality)

Contact: **Russ Fuoco**
Title: City Planner
Mailing Address: 1229 Esquimalt Road, Esquimalt BC, V9A 3P1
Phone: 250-414-7108
Fax: 250-414-7111
Notes:
Distribution: Hard copy.

VICTORIA (Municipality)

Contact: **Doug Koch**

Title: City Planner

Mailing Address: 1 Centennial Square, Victoria BC V8W 1P6

Phone: 250-361-0382

Fax: 250-361-0386

Notes: Dennis Carlson is the Victoria Harbour Planner.

Distribution: Hard copy.

OAK BAY (Municipality)

Contact: **Stuart Pitt**

Title: Director of Engineering Services

Mailing Address: 2167 Oak Bay Ave., Victoria BC, V8R 1G2

Phone: 250-598-3311

Fax: 250-598-9108

Notes:

Distribution: Hard copy.

SAANICH (Municipality)

Contact: **Alan Hopper**

Title: City Planner

Mailing Address: 770 Vernon, Victoria BC, V8X 2W7

Phone: 250-475-1775

Fax: 250-475-5450

Notes: Karen Hurley is the Environmental Planner. (250-475-1775)

Distribution: Hard copy.

CENTRAL SAANICH (Municipality)

Contact: **John Windsor**

Title: City Planner

Mailing Address: 1903 Mt. Newton X-Rd, Victoria BC, V8M 2A9

Phone: 250-544-4209

Fax: 250-652-4737

Notes:

Distribution: Hard copy.

NORTH SAANICH (Municipality)

Contact: **Jack Parry**

Title: City Planner

Mailing Address: PO Box 2639 Sidney BC V8L 4C1 (1620 Mills Rd, Sidney BC)

Phone: 250-656-0781

Fax: 250-656-3155

Notes:

Distribution: Hard copy.

SIDNEY (Municipality)

Contact: **Randy Humble**
Title: City Planner
Mailing Address: 2440 Sidney Ave, Sidney BC, V8L 1Y7
Phone: 250-656-1725
Fax: 250-655-4508
Notes:
Distribution: Hard copy.

DUNCAN (Municipality)

Contact: **Paul Douville**
Title: City Planner
Mailing Address: (200 Craig), PO Box 820, Duncan BC, V9L 3Y2
Phone: 250-746-6126
Fax: 250-746-6129
Notes:
Distribution: Hard copy.

NORTH COWICHAN (Municipality)

Contact: **Chris Hall**
Title: City Planner
Mailing Address: PO Box 278, Duncan BC V9L 3X4 (7030 Trans Canada Hwy)
Phone: 250-746-3105
Fax: 250-746-3133
Notes: Gayle Jackson used to work there (now in Parksville)
Distribution: Hard copy.

LADYSMITH (Municipality)

Contact: **Patrick Durban**
Title: City Planner
Mailing Address: 410 Esplanade, Ladysmith BC, V9R 4Y7
Phone: 250-245-6400
Fax: 250-245-6411
Notes:
Distribution: Hard copy.

NANAIMO (Municipality)

Contact: **Harriet Rugeberg**
Title: Environmental Planner
Mailing Address: 455 Wallace St. Nanaimo BC V9R 5J6
Phone: 250-754-4251
Fax: 250-755-4403
Notes:
Distribution: Digital format and hard copy.

PARKSVILLE (Municipality)

Contact: **Gayle Jackson,**

Title: City Planner

Mailing Address: (194 Memorial Ave) PO Box 1390, Parksville BC, V9P 2H3

Phone: 250-248-6144

Fax: 250-248-6650

Notes: She is newly appointed (1999).

Distribution: Hard copy.

QUALICUM BEACH (Municipality)

Contact: **Paul Butler**

Title: Planner

Mailing Address: PO Box 130, Qualicum Beach BC, V9K 1S7

Phone: 250-752-6921

Fax: 250-752-1243

Notes:

Distribution: Hard copy.

COURTENAY (Municipality)

Contact: **Peter Crawford**

Title:

Mailing Address: 750 Cliffe Ave, Courtenay BC, V9N 2J7

Phone: 250-334-4061

Fax: 250-334-9676

Notes:

Distribution: Hard copy.

COMOX (Municipality)

Contact: **Tim Hall**

Title: City Planner

Mailing Address: 1809 Beaufort, Comox BC, V9M 1R9

Phone: 250-339-1118

Fax: 250-339-7110

Notes:

Distribution: Hard copy.

CUMBERLAND (VILLAGE OF)

Contact: (Mr.) **Terry Kelly**

Title: City Administrator

Mailing Address: (2673 Dunsmuir) PO Box 340, Cumberland BC V0R 1S0

Phone: 250-336-2291

Fax: 250-336-2321

Notes: Planning done on contract by Comox-Strathcona Regional District. (They are a 4

person operation)

Distribution: Hard copy.

CAMPBELL RIVER (Municipality)

Contact: **Jag Dhillon**
Title: City Planner
Mailing Address: 301 St. Anne's, Campbell River BC V9W 4C7
Phone: 250-286-5700
Fax: 250-286-5761
Notes: Ron Neufeld is the main GIS contact.
Distribution: Digital format and hard copy.

OTHER USERS

LANARC CONSULTANTS

Contact: **Doug Backhouse/Jessica Gemella**
Title: Principal
Mailing Address:
Phone: 250-754-5651
Fax: 250-754-1990
Notes: OCP for North Cowichan
Distribution: Digital format.

MADRONE CONSULTANTS LTD.

Contact: **Gillian Radcliffe**
Title: Principal
Mailing Address: 1877 Herd, Duncan BC, V9L 1M3
Phone: 250-746-5545
Fax: 250-746-5850
Notes: They undertake Environmental Impact Assessments for various clients. They created the SEI Technical report and did the air photo interpretation for the SEI.
Distribution: Digital format.

WESTLAND RESOURCES

Contact: **David Harper**
Title: Consultant
Mailing Address: 1863 Oak Bay Ave, Victoria BC, V8R 1C6
Phone: 250-592-8500
Fax: 250-592-1633
Notes: Traverse Creek, CRD Roundtable, VEHEAP
Distribution: Digital format.

ECOTRUST CANADA (MAPPING OFFICE)

Contact: **David A. Carruthers**
Title: Director, Info Systems
Mailing Address: 1216 Broad St., Victoria, BC V8W 2A5
Phone: 250-480-1854
Fax: 250-480-1375
Notes:
Distribution: Digital format.

HULIQUMINUM TREATY GROUP

Contact: **Craig Harder**
Title: Executive Director
Mailing Address: 12611B Trans Canada Highway, Ladysmith BC V0R 2E0
Phone: 250-245-4660
Fax: 250-245-4668
Notes: Landuse planning (Consultant is John Munro 537-4891). George Harris no longer with them.
Distribution: Digital format.

COMOX VALLEY PROJECT WATERSHED SOCIETY

Contact: Jamie Woodland
Title: GIS Specialist
Mailing Address: PO Box 3007, Courtenay BC V9N 5N3
Phone: 250-339-1619
Fax: 250-339-9619
Notes: Comox Valley stream stewardship and land conservation initiatives.
Distribution: Digital format.

HOMALCO BAND, (CAMPBELL RIVER)

Contact: **Doug MacGillivray**
Title: GIS Specialist
Mailing Address: 1218 Bute Cres, Campbell River, BC, V9H 1G5
Phone: 250-923-4979
Fax: 250-923-4987
Notes: General mapping
Distribution: Digital format.

SNUNEYMUXW FIRST NATION

Contact: **Kelly Poulin**
Title: GIS Coordinator
Mailing Address: Treaty Negotiations, 668 Centre, Nanaimo BC, V9R 4Z4
Phone: 250-753-6768
Fax: 250-
Notes: Treaty negotiations, management plan. Kathleen Johnny is their Planner (main user).
Distribution: Digital format.

TR-NEXW TREATY

Contact: **(Ms) Jamie Disbrow**
Title: Consultant
Mailing Address: 202-45 Bastion Square, Victoria Bc V8W 1J1
Phone: 250-383-8688
Fax: 250-383-8974
Notes: Van den Berg & Associates
Distribution: Digital format. They have referred the inquiry to LGL Ltd. (Peter Wainwright 250-656-0127) who handles their GIS work.

KAREN GOLINSKI (UVIC PHD BOG RESEARCHER)

Contact: **Karen Golinski**

Title: Researcher
Mailing Address: n/k
Phone: 250-472-4694
Fax: 250-
E-mail: golinsky@uvic.ca (No longer valid)
Notes: Graduate research. (This phone number does not appear to be correct)
Distribution: Digital format.

STEPHEN YOUNG (UVIC MARBLED MURRELET RESEARCH)

Contact: **Stephen Young**
Title: Researcher
Mailing Address:
Phone: 250-383-2070
Fax: n/k
Notes: Graduate research.
Distribution: Digital format.

COWICHAN VALLEY LAND TRUST

Contact: **Valery Harrison**
Title: Coordinator
Mailing Address: 6-55 Station St., Duncan BC V9L1M2
Phone: 250-746-0227
Fax: 250-746-9608
Notes: Tzouhalem protection project; landowner contact. Serge Bourque (1-250-746-8633) used to work for them, but not at the time of the call.
Distribution: Digital format.

DUCKS UNLIMITED

Contact: **Kathleen Fry**
Title: N/k
Mailing Address: 1-3033 King George Highway, Surrey, BC
Phone: 604-531-5933
Fax: 604-531-4389
Notes: DU presentations
Distribution: Digital format.

BC WILD

Contact: **Tim Wilson**

Title: Coordinator

Mailing Address: n/k

Phone: n/k

Fax: n/k

Notes: Leadership initiative for earth. They appear to have been an initiative of the Sierra Club, and worked with Wild BC (part of the BC government) but the project seems to have wrapped up and disappeared (1999)

Distribution: Digital format.

QUALICUM BEACH STREAMKEEPER SOCIETY

Contact: John MacFarlane

Title: Mapping & GIS Coordinator

Mailing Address: 217 Saturna Dr., Qualicum Beach BC V9K 2P5

Phone: 250-752-8288

Fax: 250-752-8288

Notes: Beach Creek, Grandon Creek, Little Qualicum River.

Distribution: Digital format.

UBC (GEOGRAPHY)

Contact: **Dr. Brian Klinkenberg**

Title: Instructor

Mailing Address: Vancouver, BC

Phone: 604-822-3534

Fax: n/k

Notes: Teaching GIS. Data is being used in classroom exercises.

Distribution: Digital format.

CAMOSUN COLLEGE (GEOGRAPHY)

Contact: **Dr. T J A Eikin**

Title: Instructor

Mailing Address: Victoria, BC

Phone: n/k

Fax: n/k

Notes: Teaching GIS. Data is being used in classroom exercises.

Distribution: Digital format.

MALASPINA UNIVERSITY COLLEGE (GEOGRAPHY)

Contact: **Tim Neagle**

Title: Instructor

Mailing Address: Nanaimo BC

Phone: 250-753-3245

Fax: n/k

Notes: Teaching GIS. Data is being used in classroom exercises.

Distribution: Digital format.

POTTINGER GAHERTY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS

Contact: Ainslie Ogden
Title: Consultant
Mailing Address: 1200 n 1185 West Georgia St., Vancouver BC V6E 4E6
Phone: 604-895-7627
Fax: 604-682-3497
Notes: A frequent user of SEI data through the Conservation Data Centre.

ENKON ENVIRONMENTAL LTD.

Contact: Susan Blundell
Title: Consultant
Mailing Address: 525-1207 Douglas Rd., Victoria BC,
Phone: 250-480-7103
Fax: 250-380-2668
Notes: A frequent user of SEI data through the Conservation Data Centre.

AQUAMETRIX RESEARCH

Contact: Nancy Prockiw/Steve Gormican
Title: Consultant
Mailing Address: 204-2527 Beacon Ave., Sidney, BC, V8L 1Y1
Phone: 250-655-3255
Fax: 250-655-3265
Notes: A frequent user of SEI data through the Conservation Data Centre.

THURBER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS LTD.

Contact: Ray Halladay
Title: Consultant
Mailing Address: 210 n 4475 Viewmont, Victoria BC, V8Z 6L8
Phone: 250-727-7332
Fax: 250-727-3710
Notes: A frequent user of SEI data through the Conservation Data Centre.

BIOLINX ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH LTD.

Contact: Lennart Sopuck
Title: Consultant
Mailing Address: 1759 Colburne Place, Sidney BC V8L 5A2
Phone: 250-656-8981
Fax: 250-655-4602
Notes: A frequent user of SEI data through the Conservation Data Centre.

SEACOR ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING INC.

Contact: Sandra Nelson-Baker
Title: Consultant
Mailing Address: 406-13251 Delf Place, Richmond BC
Phone: 604-244-2266
Fax: 604-244-2246
Notes: A frequent user of SEI data through the Conservation Data Centre.

KATY HOLM

Title: Student, University of Victoria

Mailing Address: c/o 1991 Casa Marcia Cres., Victoria BC V8N 2X5
Phone: 250-477-8596
Fax: n/k
Notes: A frequent user of SEI data through the Conservation Data Centre.

J.C. LEE & ASSOCIATES LTD.

Contact: Charlene Lee
Title: Consultant
Mailing Address: 5331 Hammond Bay Rd., Nanaimo BC
Phone: 250-758-2922
Fax: 250-758-2922
Notes: A frequent user of SEI data through the Conservation Data Centre.

NINA RAGINSKY (Waterbird Watch Collective)

Title: Volunteer
Mailing Address: 272 Beddis Rd., Salt Spring Island, BC, V8K 2J1
Phone: 250-537-4515
Fax: n/a
Notes: A frequent user of SEI data through the Conservation Data Centre.

ANTHONY LEE

Title: Student/Volunteer
Mailing Address: 5180 Riverbottom Road, RR#2 Duncan BC V9L 6J6
Phone: 250-746-7945
Fax: 250-748-0006
Notes: A user of SEI data through the Conservation Data Centre. E-mail: Ajlee@cow-net.com

APPENDIX TWO: Individual Summaries

AQUAMETRIX RESEARCH

Contact: Nancy Prockiw, Consultant
Date: 14/07/1999

Mailing Address: 204-2527 Beacon Ave., Sidney, BC, V8L 1Y1
Phone: 250-655-3255
Fax: 250-655-3265

Notes: Nancy Prockiw has left the firm and the remaining staff were not familiar enough with the data to make any contact on it. This contact was not included in the analysis.

BC FOREST SERVICE (Port Alberni)

Contact: Sean Herbert

Date: 08/06/1999

Mailing Address: 4227 h 6th Ave, Port Alberni BC V9Y 4N1
Phone: 250-724-9215 (1-800-663-7867)
Fax: 250-724-9261

Notes: When contacted Mr. Herbert explained that he did not recognize the project, have any familiarity with the data, nor did he or anyone else in his office have any knowledge of the whereabouts of the data or any materials relating to it. Consequently the have not used it and were unable to comment on it at all.

BC PARKS (Strathcona District)

Contact: **Bill Zinovitch**, Resource Assistant

Date: 10/06/1999

Mailing Address: PO Box 1479, Parksville BC V9P 2H4
Phone: 250-954-4612 (1-800-663-7867)
Fax: 250-248-8584 (Local call)

Use of SEI Data: He did not get a hard of the data and was unaware of how to get it. He received a diskette but was unable to get the data to display on the screen with his TRIM data. He seems to be having technical problems with his software.
Use Frequency: 0

Data Usefulness: He felt that it would probably be useful once he figured out how to make it appear on the screen.
Data Accuracy: N/A

Access & Distribution: The data was easy to get but he could not use it at all. The metadata was too general for his needs, he had other questions but had not expressed them to project contacts.
Data Maintenance: N/A.

OCP Status: N/A

Growth Management Strategy: N/A

Other Plan Development: Miracle Beach PP and Rathrevor PP development plans.

GIS: ArcVIEW

Topographic Base: They have TRIM for all of Vancouver Island.

Support Materials: The support services and products looked useful. He was unsure if he was on a mailing list.

Scientific Support: He was unaware of the CDC services. They use an in-house specialist at their corporate HQ in Victoria BC.

Web Site: A web site would be very useful especially for updating coverages and updates to polygons.

Training Programs: They would staff to a training session within reasonable cost restrictions.

Overall Assessment: For technical reasons it did not meet his needs or expectations. He felt that he would have more useful feedback if he used the data more often. The BC Parks landbase is limited in the area of interest. He would like to see the geographic area of coverage expanded.

Migratory Bird Values: N/A

BIOLINX ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH LTD.

Contact: **Lennart Sopuck**, Principal Consultant

Date: 30/06/1999

Mailing Address: 1759 Colburne Place, Sidney BC V8L 5A2

Phone: 250-656-8981

Fax: 250-655-4602

Use of SEI Data: Yes, he uses the data for client projects.

Use Frequency: He used it once.

Data Usefulness: It was not very useful because it was not detailed enough.

Data Accuracy: It contained some inaccuracies. A scale of 1:5,000 would have been better.

Access & Distribution: He thought that the data was too scattered to be easily obtainable.

Data Maintenance: No.

GIS: He does not use a GIS.

Topographic Base: No.

Support Materials: He was unfamiliar with the SEI support materials.

Scientific Support: He had used the CDC services once. They were useful but there was nowhere to spread out a map in their office which was frustrating.

Web Site: He thought that a web site would be very useful. He wanted an interactive query feature with linkages to all species found in the polygon.

Training Programs: He would consider attending a course but it would depend on location, timing and a cost of less than \$50.

Overall Assessment: It was very helpful in his work.

CAMPBELL RIVER (Municipality)

Contact: **Jag Dhillon**, Planner

Mailing Address: 301 St. Anne's, Campbell River BC V9W 4C7

Phone: 250-286-5700

Fax: 250-286-5761

Use of SEI Data: They have used SEI information.

Notes: Although they were contacted several times by fax and telephone, and the planner was reached twice in person by telephone they appear to be either unable or unwilling to provide input to the survey.

CAPITAL REGIONAL DISTRICT PARKS

Contact: **Joel Ussery**, Park Planner
Date: 17/06/1999

Mailing Address: 510 Yates St., Victoria, BC
Phone: 250-478-3344
Fax: 250-478-5416

Use of SEI Data: He has used the SEI extensively, perhaps more than most users. It provided input to the Regional Parks Plan, The Green and Blue Spaces Strategy, the Urban Containment Boundary, State of the Parks Report.
Use Frequency: He conservatively reckons to have used it 26 times Pa.

Data Usefulness: It has been very useful, but he has several reservations at the same time.

Data Accuracy: He would have preferred better scale of mapping (say 1:5,000 for use in management plans. He would like to see terrestrial ecosystem mapping rather than just sensitive area mapping. He'd also like to have more ground-truthing.

Access & Distribution: He shares hard copy maps with local government as well as reports on significance in response to queries.
Data Maintenance: He is already making extensive field checks, and collecting new data to create new polygons or correct old ones over a wide geographical area. He will share this information but needs a formal process for doing so.

OCP Status: N/A

Growth Management Strategy: N/A

Other Plan Development: Three management plans, review of systems plan and 15 other parks which still need a management plan.

GIS: They use ArcView/ArcInfo but have no in-house capability. The GIS is run by an outside contractor.
Topographic Base: N/A

Scientific Support: He uses the CDC service. He feels that they need more resources and staff to be effective (what happens after March 2000? Will service disappear? Web Site: He is not convinced about the usefulness of websites. It should include fact sheets, conservation manual, etc.
Training Programs: He would not attend a training session or send staff. He felt that a separate track for practitioners or community groups would be useful.

Overall Assessment: SEI is at best a snapshot and must be updated every 5 years (at least). Each municipality should add to it, but some agency still needs to input the bits together.

Migratory Bird Values: He will speak with a researcher with the understanding that he speaks for Parks only. Need it for parks too!

CENTRAL SAANICH (Municipality)

Contact: **John Windsor**, Planner

Date: 21/06/99

Mailing Address: 1903 Mt. Newton X-Rd, Victoria BC, V8M 2A9

Phone: 250-544-4209

Fax: 250-652-4737

Use of SEI Data: He uses it indirectly through other plans and products. Used directly once every 3 months. Used indirectly in other products and plans once per week.

Data Usefulness: It was very useful, especially for its intended use in policy overview function.

Data Accuracy: Yes.

Access & Distribution: It was easy to get.
Data Maintenance: They are developing a Resource Atlas on a volunteer basis through Andrew Harcombe (Councillor) and Bob Maxwell (Environmental Advisory Committee member).

OCF Status: Complete in 1999. (Used the SEI data in the environmental section).

Growth Management Strategy: (Included in OCP)
Other Plan Development: They have two area plans to update: the residential plans for Saanichton and Brentwood Bay.

GIS: Yes, they operate one but he was unfamiliar with the software package. It is operated by the Engineering Department.
Topographic Base: N/A

Support Materials: They don't use the SEI materials (could not recall them). Was familiar with the Stewardship Series of publications though.
Scientific Support: They rely on direct contact with CDC employees in the political scene of the community for information.
Web Site: Would be useful. Should tie into existing websites and similar services.
Useful for reinforcing knowledge about the SEI and updates. Very useful for new employees.
Training Programs: Would attend a training session and would pay a reasonable fee to attend.

Overall Assessment: He was impressed, excited by it, happy to get it. He had no expectations beforehand because he had no knowledge of it.

Migratory Bird Values: He would be willing to discuss with a researcher.

COLWOOD (Municipality)

Contact: **Simon Lawrence**, Planner

Date: 23/06/99 (Response by FAX)

Mailing Address: 3300 Wishart Rd., Victoria BC, V9C 1R1

Phone: 250-478-5590

Fax: 250-478-7516

Use of SEI Data: They used the data in their OCP and in support of their Environmental Protection Development Permit Areas.

Use Frequency: n/k

Data Usefulness: Yes, it was useful because they don't have the resources to obtain the data themselves.

Data Accuracy: Wished the scale was better to highlight smaller polygons, and to better locate their boundaries.

Access & Distribution: n/k

Data Maintenance: They use the services of local citizens and community-based groups to ground-truth and check the data.

OCF Status: In implementation since 1997.

Growth Management Strategy: n/k

Other Plan Development: They are developing a Greenways Plan in 1999.

GIS: n/k

Topographic Base: n/k

Support Materials: n/k

Scientific Support: n/k

Web Site: n/k

Training Programs: n/k

Overall Assessment:

Migratory Bird Values: n/k

COMOX n STRATHCONA REGIONAL DISTRICT

Contact: **Harry Harker**, Director of Development
Date: 14/06/1999

Mailing Address: 1001 Vanier St., Courtenay BC
Phone: 1-800-331-6007
Fax: 250-334-4358

Use of SEI Data: It was used in the OCP, their parks plan and for specific site assessments. It was also incorporated into the DFO watershed atlas.
Use Frequency: They is it continuously probably 10 times per day since they received it in both a regulatory and advisory function.

Data Usefulness: It has been very useful but has limitations.
Data Accuracy: Smaller polygons were not ground-truthed. They got into a public difficulty recently over the accuracy of the data n involving wetland classifications. They would like to see an on-going vetting process to check the data.

Access & Distribution:
Data Maintenance: They will not update the data but would assist the CWS in updating it.

OCP Status: Rural Land Use Bylaw, Cortes Island OCP, Rural Comox Valley Plan.
Growth Management Strategy:
Other Plan Development: Three new area OCPs update coming up. Local area plans anticipated.

GIS: They operate an ArcINFO GIS.
Topographic Base: They do not use TRIM.

Support Materials: They may have used the SEI materials in the past but cannot say for sure. They are very interested in having an ongoing human contact with a technical report and the conservation manual.
Scientific Support: They did not know about the CDC services but would like to learn more about it.

Web Site: He also felt that a website would be useful, as they are about to give all staff web access at their desks.
Training Programs: They were very enthusiastic about a training session and would send 6 staff members. They were prepared to pay a reasonable amount.

Overall Assessment: It was ivery helpful and ivery beneficial.

Migratory Bird Values: They are VERY interested in talking with a researcher. They would volunteer to partner on policy development and to provide a test of any new policies.

COMOX (Municipality)

Contact: **Tim Hall**, Planner
Date: 14/06/99

Mailing Address: 1809 Beaufort, Comox BC, V9M 1R9
Phone: 250-339-1118
Fax: 250-339-7110

Use of SEI Data: They have used it in the preparation of their OCP, an Estuary Management Plan and in several Development Proposals.
Use Frequency: They use it once every two months (6 pa.)

Data Usefulness: The scale should be 1:5,000 to be more useful. The hard copy was the best and most useful.

Data Accuracy: There were minor discrepancies in the accuracy of the polygons (mainly wetlands).

Access & Distribution: It was easy to use, easy to obtain.
Data Maintenance: They will not update the data themselves.

OCP Status: It was approved in October 1997.

Growth Management Strategy: They participate in a regional strategy.
Other Plan Development: No other plans anticipated.

GIS: They run a GIS but mainly/mostly for facilities management (AM/FM).
Topographic Base: They do not have a TRIM coverage for their area.

Support Materials: The SEI backup materials were useful in a minor way. They are looking forward to receiving the technical manual and the conservation manual.
Scientific Support: They knew about the CDC service but it was, in their opinion, useful although they only used it once.
Web Site: Although they would not find a website of value, they saw a lot of value for others.
Training Programs: They would attend a training session if the cost was modest.

Overall Assessment: They had no expectations but it met their needs, and they felt that it would assist in the conservation of sensitive areas.

Migratory Bird Values: They would talk with a researcher.

COMOX VALLEY PROJECT WATERSHED SOCIETY

Contact: **Jamie Woodland**, GIS Coordinator

Date: 14/06/99

Mailing Address: PO Box 3007, Courtenay BC V9N 5N3

Phone: 250-339-1619

Fax: 250-339-9619

Use of SEI Data: They use SEI data on a moderate basis.
Use Frequency: Less than 10 times.

Data Usefulness: It is useful for reconnaissance purposes.

Data Accuracy: The data appears to be incomplete, there are gaps in the site identification.

Access & Distribution: They had technical problems using the data in ArcVIEW. They only distribute hard copy maps.

Data Maintenance: They are gathering more data and will share the data with the SEI project when it is considered accurate enough.

OCF Status: N/A

Growth Management Strategy: N/A

Other Plan Development: They are updating the Habitat Atlas for the Regional District.

GIS: ArcVIEW with a Trimble GPS

Topographic Base: N/A

Support Materials: They were unaware of the support materials, services etc. of the SEI program. They were expecting, though, the Conservation Manual.

Scientific Support: They knew about the support services of the CDC and have used it 3 or 4 times. It was very useful to them but they felt that it was distant from the community level users.

Web Site: They were interested in seeing a website established especially with details of wetland ecology and a list or rare or endangered species.
Training Programs: They would attend a training course but were constrained by their funding and budget.

Overall Assessment: They felt the SEI was a good start, but that the data was too general. They felt the classification system of the polygons was hard to use and difficult to understand. They would like more information on how to contribute data to the project.

Migratory Bird Values: N/A

CONSERVATION DATA CENTRE (MELP)

Contact: **Jan Kirkby**, Conservation Science Ecologist
Date: 18/06/1999

Mailing Address: PO Box 9344 Stn Prov Gov, Victoria BC V8W 9M1 (2975 Jutland)
Phone: 250-387-0732
Fax: 250-387-2733

Use of SEI Data: They are both a supplier and consumer of SEI information.
Use Frequency: They handled about 84 requests for information based on SEI polygons.

Data Usefulness: It is a good basic flagging tool. It has been useful to a wide range of special interest groups and consultants, developers and universities.
Data Accuracy: It is as accurate as the date of the air photos, which in some cases may be quite dated now.

Access & Distribution:
Data Maintenance:

OCP Status: N/A

Growth Management Strategy: N/A
Other Plan Development: N/A

GIS: ArcINFO and ArcVIEW
Topographic Base: Yes.

Support Materials: N/A
Scientific Support: N/A

Web Site: The CDC operates its own website.
Training Programs: Training sessions tend to reach the committed. There are large groups of untrained people and groups who need it.

Overall Assessment: They were pleased with the quality of field-checked polygons. Marine component needs to be integrated (LUCC efforts.) They have a large constituency of SEI users who need to have their reactions to SEI assessed.

Migratory Bird Values: N/A

COURTENAY (Municipality)

Contact: Peter Crawford, Planner

Date: 14/06/1999

Mailing Address: 750 Cliffe Ave, Courtenay BC, V9N 2J7

Phone: 250-334-4061

Fax: 250-334-9676

Use of SEI Data: They do not use the SEI data.

Use Frequency: N/A

Data Usefulness: It was not detailed enough and the scale should have been 1:5,000

so it was not used at all.

Data Accuracy:

Access & Distribution: N/A

Data Maintenance: They do not plan to update or collect data for sensitive sites but will rely on others to do so.

OCP Status: To be reviewed in 2000.

Growth Management Strategy: No.

Other Plan Development: No.

GIS: They AutoCAD but do not have the GIS capability built in, and do not plan to obtain it in the short term.

Topographic Base:

Support Materials: SEI support publications were useful when they were site specific. They look forward to the technical manual, the conservation manual as anything which gives direction is useful.

Scientific Support: They did not know about the CDC services but showed little

enthusiasm for learning about them.

Web Site: They would use a web site if it was created. On it they would like to see all the mandates of environmental authorities. They would also like to see the

authority of the data.

Training Programs: They are concerned that attendees at a training session will become instant experts! who may cause controversy later-on based on a poor scientific grounding.

Overall Assessment: They wanted more detail and more precise locations before they would use it. They like a human contact with the people creating and maintaining the data. This was very important to them and they want personal contacts with the provincial and federal contacts for SEI before they can rely on it.

Migratory Bird Values: They would talk with a researcher.

COMICHAN VALLEY LAND TRUST

Contact: **Valery Harrison**, Coordinator
Date: 09/06/1999

Mailing Address: 6-55 Station St., Duncan BC V9L1M2
Phone: 250-746-0227
Fax: 250-746-9608

Use of SEI Data: The maps are used in a Land-owner Contact Program, in a pilot for the Land Trust. They have a high school student that they employ as their GIS Technician who does GIS queries for land owners.
Use Frequency: n/k

Data Usefulness: It was useful.
Data Accuracy: Did not know. Respondent a non-technical staff member.

Access & Distribution: The give information to landowners and to the public through displays and newsletters.
Data Maintenance: They intend to update the data when they receive funding for the resources to do the work. They will share the results.

OCP Status: N/A

Growth Management Strategy: N/A
Other Plan Development: N/A

GIS: They use ArcVIEW.
Topographic Base: They have just ordered TRIM data for their area of interest.

Support Materials: They were unaware of the SEI publications. The technical manual, the conservation manual and fact sheets etc. were considered too technical for them to use.

Scientific Support: They have used the CDC to provide training workshops. They have used the referral service 6 times.
Web Site: They did not think a web site would be useful in any format.
Training Programs: They were interested in a training session but only if it was free.

Overall Assessment: The large-format maps were a great tool for use in public meetings.

Migratory Bird Values: N/A

COWICHAN VALLEY REGIONAL DISTRICT

Contact: **Tom Anderson**, Director of Planning
Date: 21/06/1999

Mailing Address: 137 Evans St., Duncan BC, V9L 1R1
Phone: 250-746-2620
Fax: 250-746-4136

Use of SEI Data: They use the SEI in the creation of the OCP and in specific site assessments.

Use Frequency: They use it about once a month (12 times pa.)

Data Usefulness: It was easy to use and to obtain. They only have a draft copy of the metadata, need a better copy.

Data Accuracy: It was not accurate enough for their use. There were problems with wetland designation and classification.

Access & Distribution: It has been distributed to their planning committees.
Data Maintenance: They expect the CDC to keep the data updated.

OCP Status: There are 8 OCPs in his region, all at different stages. Usually at least one is in the formulation stage.

Growth Management Strategy: N/A
Other Plan Development: Watershed management Plan

GIS: They operate a GIS: ArcINFO and AutoCAD.
Topographic Base: They do not own TRIM.

Support Materials: He has used field data reports but was unaware of the SEI publications. He is anxious to obtain a technical report and the conservation manual. He thought the fact sheets and ongoing gone! would be useful.

Scientific Support: They are aware of the CDC programs and estimate that they have used them 12 times. The service is useful and available when requested but in his opinion it hasn't really been tested.

Web Site: He thought a web site would be useful, and uses the web personally to track down information.
Training Programs: He would send one staff member to a training session and would pay a nominal fee. He felt that a parallel track for practitioners and others was important.

Overall Assessment: A good start but there are gaps in the coverage and data. They are just starting to make good use of it and expect to use it more in the future.

Migratory Bird Values: He would be willing to discuss with a researcher.

CUMBERLAND (Village of)

Contact: (Mr.) Terry Kelly, Village Administrator
Date: 15/06/1999

Mailing Address: (2673 Dunsmuir) PO Box 340, Cumberland BC V0R 1S0
Phone: 250-336-2291
Fax: 250-336-2321

Use of SEI Data: They do not recall receiving the data or any information about the SEI.

OCP Status: Just updated in 1997.

Growth Management Strategy: No.

Other Plan Development: No.

GIS: They do not have a GIS and do not anticipate getting one.

Topographic Base: N/A

Support Materials: They do not recall receiving the data or any information about the SEI.

Scientific Support: They did not know about the CDC service, and showed no enthusiasm for learning about it.

Web Site: They thought that a website might be useful to them in the future.

Training Programs: They would not send someone to a training session.

Overall Assessment: Not useful to them.

Migratory Bird Values: They would speak with a researcher.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENCE (CFB Esquimalt)

Contact: **Jody Watson**, Acting Environmental Risk Management Officer
Date: 12/07/1999

Mailing Address: Environmental Risk Management Office, Bldg 29, CFB Esquimalt, PO
Box 1700 Stn Forces, Victoria BC V9A 7N2
Phone: 250-363-5063
Fax: 250-363-2567

Use of SEI Data: They use it in their Forest Management Program through the Pacific
Forest Centre (see that entry). It is especially useful in Garry Oak Management.
Use Frequency: See *Pacific Forestry Centre*.

Data Usefulness: She was fairly unfamiliar with the detailed information since it is
primarily used by Forestry Canada on their behalf.
Data Accuracy: Not enough data was included.

Access & Distribution: n/k
Data Maintenance: They have incorporated it into their Sustainable Development
strategy to protect rare and endangered ecosystems.

GIS: They use ArcView
Topographic Base: Yes, they have a complete TRIM coverage.

Support Materials: She was unfamiliar with the SEI support materials, and had just
received the technical report in the first hard copy information she could recall
seeing. It would definitely be useful.
Scientific Support: She was unfamiliar with the CDC services and did not use them.
Web Site: She would like to see mapped data available, and to include sensitive wildlife
data, red & blue listed species in a spatial format.
Training Programs: She would send 2-3 staff to a training session and pay a
reasonable amount.

Overall Assessment: She would like to see more than just vegetation data in with
linkages to fauna as well.

DEPARTMENT of FISHERIES & OCEANS (Vancouver)

Contact: **Brad Mason**, Habitat Inventory Coordinator

Date: 14/06/1999

Mailing Address: 360 n 555 West Hastings St., Vancouver BC, V6B 5G3

Phone: 604-666-7015

Fax: 604-666-7907

Use of SEI Data: Yes. Doesn't use it directly though n just in re-packaging and creation

of new products.

Use Frequency: n/k

Data Usefulness: !A good start!

Data Accuracy: The scale needs to be moved up to 1:5,000 to make it really useful,

and much more detailed (perhaps down to +/- 2 metres.

Access & Distribution: It was easy to use and easy to obtain. They have been re-packaging the data in new forms with DFO as atlases of the Regional Districts.

(Haven't done the Islands Trust area yet. The Cowichan Valley is planned)

Data Maintenance: He will not maintain the data.

OCP Status: N/A

Growth Management Strategy: N/A

Other Plan Development: N/A

GIS: They run ArcINFO and ArcView.

Topographic Base: They have a complete TRIM coverage of their area of interest.

Support Materials: He felt that the SEI materials were not useful to him, but would be of

interest to his clients. He wanted more information so that he could defend specific

polygons on behalf of CWS to other agencies and interests that he comes in

contact with!

Scientific Support: He was aware of the CDC services but did not use them.

Web Site: He thinks this is a great idea n he offered to create the website for free. He'd

like to see orthophotos on the website. He'd like to see more information about

sensitive things!

Training Programs: He supports the idea but it is not his decision to make.

Overall Assessment: !A good start! He feels that the SEI doesn't cover all the

important or sensitive ecosystems n only vegetation-based ones. He suggests that

a better classification system for classifying polygons be developed and one which

takes into account sensitive areas vs. sensitive ecosystems or habitats. He'd like to

see all riparian areas indicated as they are all important to his sensitive habitats.

Migratory Bird Values: N/A

DUCKS UNLIMITED (Vancouver)

Contact: **Kathleen Fry**, Senior Project Officer
Date: 22/06/1999

Mailing Address: 1-3033 King George Highway, Surrey, BC
Phone: 604-531-5933
Fax: 604-531-4389

Use of SEI Data: It was used in the Black Creek watershed management planning, for creating visual support materials for meetings, for calculating acreages and measuring wetlands.
Use Frequency: 6 pa.

Data Usefulness: It was useful.
Data Accuracy: It appears to be accurate but they often cross check it with airphotos.
Access & Distribution: It was easy to use and easy to access.
Data Maintenance: The data will not be maintained.

OCP Status: N/A

Growth Management Strategy: N/A

Other Plan Development:

GIS: Their Engineer uses ArcVIEW and AutoCAD. She uses neither.
Topographic Base: Do not own TRIM.

Support Materials: She was aware of the support materials and found them useful especially the technical report. She is looking forward to the publication of the conservation manual.

Scientific Support: She was aware of the CDC services and has used them about 6 times in the last year. It was useful and available when needed. She felt that there were data gaps in that data she needed was not available.

Web Site: She felt that a website created good public awareness. She obtains data herself from the web. She would like to see descriptions of why the ecosystems are sensitive and "how they work." She would like to see what their values are and to see linkages with other websites of importance.

Training Programs: She would attend a training session if it was at no cost to her.

Overall Assessment: They provide a good big-picture view for planning. Its not perfect but quite valuable.

Migratory Bird Values: N/A

DUNCAN (Municipality)

Contact: **Paul Douville**, Planner

Date: 22/06/1999

Mailing Address: (200 Craig), PO Box 820, Duncan BC, V9L 3Y2
Phone: 250-746-6126
Fax: 250-746-6129

Use of SEI Data: They do not use SEI information at all because there are no sites of ecological sensitivity or importance within the city limits. They rely on the regional district for all environmental vetting.

OCP Status: Completed in July 1995.

Growth Management Strategy: Participate in the regional strategy.
Other Plan Development: None.

GIS: They do not run a GIS in they rely on the regional district.
Topographic Base: N/A

Support Materials: N/A

Scientific Support: Did not know about it - do not use.
Web Site: Of no value.

Training Programs: Would not attend or send staff.

Migratory Bird Values: He would not be willing to discuss with a researcher.

ECOTRUST CANADA (Victoria Office)

Contact: **David Carruthers**, Director of Mapping

Mailing Address: 1216 Broad St., Victoria, BC V8W 2A5

Phone: 250-480-1854

Fax: 250-480-1375

Note: They were contacted several times by e-mail and eventually set a time for a personal visit. After driving to Victoria the meeting was cancelled. They are either unable or unwilling to participate in the study.

ENKON ENVIRONMENTAL LTD.

Contact: Susan Blundell, Consultant
Date: 14/07/1999

Mailing Address: 525-1207 Douglas Rd., Victoria BC,
Phone: 250-480-7103
Fax: 250-380-2668

Use of SEI Data: They use it for client projects: Centra gas pipeline, housing development in Victoria, Matsou Lake, Glen Lake, Oakcrest Estates and others. They have only recently found out about the service and found out about it from the CDC.

Use Frequency: They have done six projects involving SEI data.

Data Usefulness: The map scale was pretty good, and the accuracy was great for their purposes. The data they get from SEI can make or break a project. They like it so much that they would pay for the services received.

Data Accuracy: The hard copy maps were very useful. Some of polygon boundaries were not accurate and needed adjustment in their own ground truth.

Access & Distribution: It was easy to obtain and easy to use.
Data Maintenance: They currently collect new data and do a data exchange with the CDC.

GIS: ArcView/PC ArcInfo
Topographic Base: (From clients)

Support Materials: They do not know about SEI support materials and would like to receive all of them and go on a mailing list especially a technical report. They do access and use field data reports frequently.

Scientific Support: They have used the service 6 times (at least) and find it very useful. Good turnaround time. They are really pleased with the service.

Web Site: A web site would be absolutely useful. They use the web once a day to obtain information. They would like to see a lot of faunal data to complement the vegetation including faunal habitat and requirements.

Training Programs: They are very interested in training programs. They would pay a reasonable amount.

Overall Assessment: The SEI is great! They only just found out about it in its needs more profile.

ESQUIMALT (Municipality)

Contact: **Russ Fuoco**, Director of Planning
Date: 24/06/99

Mailing Address: 1229 Esquimalt Road, Esquimalt BC, V9A 3P1
Phone: 250-414-7108
Fax: 250-414-7111

Use of SEI Data: The information was used once in two years ago.
Use Frequency: N/A

Data Usefulness: N/A
Data Accuracy: Would have preferred information at a better scale in 1:5,000.

Access & Distribution: It was easy to use and easy to obtain.
Data Maintenance: They will not maintain data for their own purposes.

OCP Status: Their OCP was passed in 1996 so it is in midlife at the moment.
Growth Management Strategy: Participate in the Regional District program.
Other Plan Development: No.

GIS: They do not run a GIS.
Topographic Base: N/A

Support Materials: The support materials were unfamiliar to them and they could not see any use for any existing or proposed service or product which might be offered. Scientific Support: They were unaware of the CDC programs and services. They would like to learn more about them.
Web Site: A web site was seen as being valuable in they obtain information from the web.
Training Programs: They might send one staff member on a training course in as long as it only lasted one day (they have a small staff).

Overall Assessment: All of their development proposals are referred to DFO and the Ministry of Environment for vetting. They expect that any sensitive sites or concerns will be highlighted by this process. They feel that the municipality is very developed and that there are few natural sites of interest.
Migratory Bird Values: Yes, they will discuss with a researcher.

HIGHLANDS DISTRICT (Municipality)

Contact: **Kevin Key**, Planning Technician
Date: 15/06/1999

Mailing Address: 1564 Millstream, Victoria BC V9E 1G6
Phone: 250-474-1773
Fax: 250-474-3677

Use of SEI Data: They have used SEI data in the development of their OCP, in the subdivision approval process and the Greenways Plan. They have embraced it. Use Frequency: They use the data several times per week.

Data Usefulness: It is very important to them.
Data Accuracy: The Second Growth classification caused them some difficulties. They used a better system for designation of riparian areas with greater accuracy and greater detail. Not enough riparian zone was shown in the SEI.

Access & Distribution: Hard copy data has been passed on to developers and property owners.
Data Maintenance: They will add to and maintain the data for their area. They are prepared to share this with the project originators.

OCP Status: Adopted 07/1997.
Growth Management Strategy: They participate in the regional plan.
Other Plan Development: A parks plan in 2000.

GIS: They use MapINFO.
Topographic Base: They own TRIM for their area of interest.

Support Materials: They are relatively pleased with the SEI support materials. The technical report is very useful (they have a draft) and very useful in answering questions from decision makers. They are anxious to receive the conservation manual.
Scientific Support: They were aware of the CDC services and have used them once. They were fully satisfied with the service they received. They would like assistance in writing up site specific terms of reference for projects.
Web Site: A website would be important. They use the web to find information.
Training Programs: They would consider attendance at a training session. Timing is very important as they are under-staffed. A track for practitioners and interested individuals would also be very useful.

Overall Assessment: They were very pleased with it and hope that it will be expanded.
Migratory Bird Values: Yes, they are prepared to talk to a researcher.

HOMALCO BAND (Campbell River)

Contact: Doug MacGillivray, GIS Coordinator
Date: 15/06/1999

Mailing Address: 1218 Bute Cres, Campbell River, BC, V9H 1G5
Phone: 250-923-4979
Fax: 250-923-4987

Use of SEI Data: No, they don't use it because they haven't had the time, so didn't get around to it yet.

OCP Status: N/A

Growth Management Strategy: N/A

Other Plan Development: Treaty negotiations. They may do some land use planning in the future.

GIS: They operate ArcVIEW, MicroStation

Topographic Base: They have TRIM coverage for their area of interest.

Support Materials: They were unaware of the SEI publications.

Scientific Support: They did not know about the CDC services.

Web Site: They thought that a web site would be useful.

Training Programs: They might send someone to a training session if it was in their area. They would consider paying a reasonable amount.

Overall Assessment: They are solely focussed on treaty negotiations at present.

Migratory Bird Values: They would be prepared to speak with a researcher.

HULIQUMINUM TREATY GROUP

Contact: **Craig Harder**, Executive Director
Date: 24/06/1999

Mailing Address: 12611B Trans Canada Highway, Ladysmith BC V0R 2E0
Phone: 250-245-4660
Fax: 250-245-4668

Use of SEI Data: They may use the data but he was doubtful. He thought that they had purchased a GIS but no one had used it and lost track of it.
Use Frequency: N/A

OCP Status: N/A
Growth Management Strategy: N/A
Other Plan Development: Treaty negotiations. A Traditional Use Study which is ongoing until October 1999.

Support Materials: He was unaware of any materials in their office.
Scientific Support: He was unaware of the CDC services but would like to learn more about them.
Web Site: N/A
Training Programs: He would send staff if there was sufficient interest in the training sessions. He could not tell, today, if there would be any.

Overall Assessment: N/A

Migratory Bird Values: N/A

ISLANDS TRUST

Contact: **Tyrone Guthrie**, GIS Coordinator

Date: 16/06/1999

Mailing Address: 200-1627 Fort Street, Victoria BC V8R 1H8

Phone: 250-405-5151 (1-800-663-7867)

Fax: 250-405-5155

Use of SEI Data: They have used it in their OCP and for identifying conservation lands for acquisition.

Use Frequency: They have used it 12 times pa.

Data Usefulness: It was accurate enough for planning purposes.

Data Accuracy: Local residents said it wasn't accurate (misunderstanding of scale) but 1:5,000 would have been more useful to them. 1:20,000 ok for an OCP but to do

values work it should be better.

Access & Distribution: It took longer than expected to obtain the data but it was easy to use. They have given hard copies to 12 conservancy groups.

Data Maintenance: They will maintain the data in a separate system. They will not share the data unless asked to.

OCP Status: Each island has an OCP and each is in a different status. Usually at least one underway at any given time.

Growth Management Strategy: Participate in regional district plan.

Other Plan Development: Land use bylaws being developed.

GIS: ArcView.

Topographic Base: They have TRIM coverage for their area of interest.

Support Materials: They were unaware of the SEI support publications. They did not think the technical report was valuable but were anxious to obtain the conservation manual, the fact sheets and the Going Gone publication.

Scientific Support: They are aware of the CDC service but don't use it directly. They refer individuals and conservancy groups to it.

Web Site: They would like to be able to see the status of project components and the status of the completion of work by mapsheet.

Training Programs: They would send staff to a training session and pay up to \$200 per person.

Overall Assessment: The quality of the hard copy was excellent. They deal with clients who do not have a good background in mapping or spatial data. While the project was being developed they were frustrated by the lack of information flow and progress updates. The SEI project needs a better communication flow.

Migratory Bird Values: They would speak to a researcher.

J.C. LEE & ASSOCIATES

Contact: **Charlene Lee**, Principal
Date: 14/07/1999

Mailing Address: 5331 Hammond Bay Rd., Nanaimo BC
Phone: 250-758-2922
Fax: 250-758-2922

Use of SEI Data: They use it for client projects.

Use Frequency: They have used SEI data 12-15 times.

Data Usefulness: It is a good starting base. She would like to see a distinction between the private and public land holdings in the SEI data.
Data Accuracy: Yes and no - some of the information was incomplete and she had to field truth the data herself.

Access & Distribution: It was easy to use and easy to get.
Data Maintenance: She will not update data.

GIS: She does not run a GIS.
Topographic Base: n/a

Support Materials: She found the SEI support documents useful. She had just received a copy of the technical report and it looked useful. She has used field reports as well.

Scientific Support: She has used the CDC service 12-15 times.

Web Site: A web site would possibly be useful to others. She is not a web user.
Training Programs: She would not attend a training session.

Overall Assessment: Yes, it met her needs. She sees a pattern in the number of developers and forest companies developing land on which sensitive polygons can be found. She would like to see legislative teeth in the status of the information to aid in the protection of the polygons.

LADYSMITH (Municipality)

Contact: Patrick Durban, Planner

Mailing Address: 410 Esplanade, Ladysmith BC, V9R 4Y7
Phone: 250-245-6400
Fax: 250-245-6411

Notes: Although contact was made with the Planner he was reluctant to discuss the topic, referred me to another person who could only be reached by voicemail and would not return calls.

LANARC CONSULTING LTD.

Contact: Doug Backhouse, Principal
Date: 11/06/1999

Phone: 250-754-5651
Fax: 250-754-1990

Use of SEI Data: They used it in the North Cowichan OCP, Community Futures, City of Nanaimo, BC Land Trust, Nanaimo & Area Land Trust on a project consulting basis. Use Frequency: It is used often. They are currently in the process of making decisions based on SEI.

Data Usefulness: Very useful.
Data Accuracy: They are not aware of any deficiencies but expect those that exist to show up in time.

Access & Distribution: They found it difficult to get the digital data.
Data Maintenance: They will probably maintain their own database of updates which will build-on or augment the SEI data. They will share it only if they are asked to do so.

OCP Status: N/A

Growth Management Strategy: N/A
Other Plan Development: N/A

GIS: ArcVIEW, AutoCAD Map (their main platform), Freehand Map Publisher.
Topographic Base: Clients provide.

Support Materials: They would like to be able to access them on the web. Very anxious to obtain the conservation manual. Would like to see it supported with case examples.

Scientific Support: They were unaware of the CDC service. Scientific rigor is an issue. Their decisions don't require additional scientific support. They use SEI in a general way, details are less of a concern.
Web Site: This is growing in importance, would like to see one which is regularly updated.

Training Programs: They would probably attend a training session. They would pay a reasonable amount. Attendance would be Value-driven, not cost-driven.

Overall Assessment: They want to see the geographical area of interest in the SEI expanded further. They want to receive all the SEI support materials.

Migratory Bird Values: N/A

LANGFORD (Municipality)

Contact: Robert Buchan, City Planner
Date: 28/06/1999

Mailing Address: 2805 Carlow, Victoria BC, V9B 5V9
Phone: 250-474-6919
Fax: 250-478-7864

Use of SEI Data: They have used SEI information on a regular basis.
Use Frequency: They use the information about 1 time per week in 52 times pa.

Data Usefulness: It was a very useful starting point!
Data Accuracy: It was not accurate enough in the boundaries of the polygons in they
don't match real life.

Access & Distribution: It was easy to obtain and easy to use.
Data Maintenance: They operate their own database for Development Permit Areas.
They overlay Potential Biodiversity & Habitat database to the SEI to identify
sensitive areas and to detect errors in the SEI. They would be prepared to share
this information with the SEI project staff.

OCP Status: Approved 1996.
Growth Management Strategy: Participate in the regional district strategy.
Other Plan Development: Neighbourhood plans.

GIS: They use CITYVIEW.
Topographic Base: They have a TRIM set for their area of interest.

Support Materials: He was unfamiliar with the SEI support materials. He thought the
technical report and conservation manual might be helpful!
Scientific Support: He was familiar with the CDC services but has not used them in this
position. (Used them when he was in Comox previously.)
Web Site: He thought a website might be useful in he obtains information from the web
himself.
Training Programs: He was supportive of a training session and would pay a
reasonable amount!

Overall Assessment: The SEI did not meet his needs, because of the lack of precision
of the polygon boundaries.

Migratory Bird Values: He is prepared to discuss with a researcher.

ANTHONY LEE

Contact: **Anthony Lee**, Student/Volunteer
Date: 12/07/1999

Mailing Address: 5180 Riverbottom Road, RR#2 Duncan BC V9L 6J6
Phone: 250-746-7945
Fax: 250-748-0006

Use of SEI Data: He used it in a school project and for volunteer work with NGOs in his area.
Use Frequency: He used it 3 times.

Data Usefulness: It was very useful. He liked the hard copy maps.
Data Accuracy: The accuracy was accurate but he could not comment on the map scale or any deficiencies in the accuracy or usefulness except to say that relative to the scale they seemed accurate.

Access & Distribution: It was used by a number of local groups and students.
Data Maintenance: He would most definitely update it and share it with the project originators.

GIS: He does not operate a GIS.
Topographic Base: No.

Support Materials: He was familiar with the SEI support materials and found them useful. He had just received the technical report in it was truly excellent!
Scientific Support: He had used the CDC service twice. It was more or less available when he needed it in the contact was sick.
Web Site: A web site would be useful.
Training Programs: A very good idea and he would attend if the cost was low in only a partial cost recovery.

Overall Assessment: It met his needs and expectations.

MADRONE CONSULTANTS LTD.

Contact: Gillian Radcliffe, Principal
Date: 15/06/1999

Mailing Address: 1877 Herd, Duncan BC, V9L 1M3
Phone: 250-746-5545
Fax: 250-746-5850

Use of SEI Data: They SEI as a reference source and in the development of plans for local government.
Use Frequency: They have used it 3 times.

Data Usefulness: They have had to fine-tune boundaries of polygons.
Data Accuracy: Not enough polygons have been field checked.

Access & Distribution: Information has been given to clients and often mentioned in conversations. The metadata was not adequate (need more detail).
Data Maintenance: This is dependent on the projects, but probably not.

OCP Status: N/A

Growth Management Strategy: N/A
Other Plan Development: N/A

GIS: ArcVIEW

Topographic Base: They obtain this from clients.

Support Materials: They were familiar with the SEI support materials and found them useful. They want to receive final versions of the technical report and conservation manual.
Scientific Support: They were familiar with the CDC services and used them twice. They were satisfied with its availability and scope.

Web Site: They would like to see the conservation manual and updates on a web site. They use the web to obtain information.

Training Programs: They might attend a training session but do their own in-house training. Payment would depend on course scope and the quality of the teacher.

Overall Assessment: The SEI is very useful but needs more input from a public communications program.

Migratory Bird Values: N/A

METCHOSIN (Municipality)

Contact: **Jill Parsons**, Planner

Date: 15/06/1999

Mailing Address: 4450 Happy Valley Road, Victoria BC, V9C 3Z3

Phone: 250-474-3167

Fax: 250-474-6298

Use of SEI Data: They use the SEI information for their OCP, Growth management Plan, Development Applications and for working with their Environment Advisory Committee.

Use Frequency: They have used it 12 times pa.

Data Usefulness: It was useful. A 1:5,000 accuracy would have allowed them to put the

data on their cadastral map.

Data Accuracy: They are doing their own more detailed inventory to meet their own

requirements.

Access & Distribution: N/A

Data Maintenance: They are doing their own more detailed inventory to meet their own requirements. They would share the data with the project originators after

negotiating a process.

OCP Status: Adopted in 1995. A review will be made soon.

Growth Management Strategy: Their own is currently in force.

Other Plan Development: No.

GIS: They do not operate a GIS but hope to develop one.

Topographic Base: N/A

Support Materials: She has seen the SEI support materials but has been too busy to read them. She is looking forward to receiving the technical report and the

conservation manual.

Scientific Support: They were unaware of the CDC services.

Web Site: A website might be valuable but they do not have access currently.

Training Programs: They would send someone on a training session but it would be

cost dependent. A track for practitioners and others would be very valuable.

Overall Assessment: A good starting point!

Migratory Bird Values: They are prepared to talk to a researcher.

MINISTRY OF ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS (Victoria)

Contact: **Peter Nakken**, Director of GIS Services
Date: 17/06/1999

Mailing Address: PO Box 9100, Stn Prov Gov, Victoria BC V8W 9B1
Phone: 250-387-0600 (1-800-663-7867)
Fax: 250-356-0783

Use of SEI Data: They found the data interesting. They have used it to provide hard copies to First Nations, in treaty negotiations and to in-house negotiators.
Use Frequency: They have used it 12 times.

Data Usefulness: The scale was perfect for their use.
Data Accuracy: It was accurate enough.

Access & Distribution: The act as a brokerage, don't do planning themselves, but assist others in doing so.
Data Maintenance: They will not maintain the data.

OCP Status: N/A

Growth Management Strategy: N/A
Other Plan Development: N/A

GIS: They use ArcView and Geomedia Pro.
Topographic Base: They have a complete BC coverage for TRIM.

Support Materials: They were unaware of the SEI support publications. He thought the fact sheets would be useful to iscope out areas in the treaty process.
Scientific Support: They were aware of the CDC service but do not use it.
Web Site: They feel that a website would be useful. They would like to see wildlife values added to the spatial data, as well as species inventory data.
Training Programs: They would send someone on the training session only if it appeared that they were going to actually use the raw data.

Overall Assessment: They found the SEI acceptable.

Migratory Bird Values: They are prepared to discuss with a researcher. They would need to consult their negotiators on the topic to get some questions to ask.

MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION & HIGHWAYS (Nanaimo)

Contact: **Rob Howatt**, Subdivision Approvals Officer
Date: 21/06/99

Mailing Address: Nanaimo BC
Phone: 250-390-6180 (1-800-663-7867)
Fax: 250-390-6296

Use of SEI Data: He only uses this data when it is referred to him by the Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks when they are assessing an are for a subdivision development proposal.
Use Frequency: N/A

Data Usefulness: He did not feel that the data was very useful.
Data Accuracy: The scale was inappropriate, did not reference well to property lines. He needs accurate data referenced to the cadastral database for his purposes. A larger scale map (1:5000) would have been more useful.

Access & Distribution: The data was brought to him so he didn't have to look for it. It was easy to use.
Data Maintenance: No.

OCP Status: N/A
Growth Management Strategy: N/A
Other Plan Development: They don't do land-use planning per se, but undertake subdivision planning and highway planning with MOTH.

GIS: No.
Topographic Base: N/A

Support Materials: Not of much interest.
Scientific Support: Did not know about the CDC service.
Web Site: A web site would not be very useful. He is not a user of the web, or oriented toward it. Web sites, in his opinion, are often too general to be useful.
Training Programs: He might send staff to a training session but would need more specific information first. It would have to be a free session.

Overall Assessment: SEI is a good start.

Migratory Bird Values: N/A

MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT LANDS & PARKS (Nanaimo)

Contact: **Marlene Caskey**, District Habitat Protection Officer
Date: 22/06/1999

Mailing Address: 2080-A Labieux Road, Nanaimo BC V9T 6E9
Phone: 250-751-3220 (1-800-663-7867)
Fax: 250-751-3103

Use of SEI Data: It is very useful. It is used in reviewing plans, and is used in displaying information in map form.
Use Frequency: They use the data at least once per day, on average.

Data Usefulness: It has been very useful, recognizing the built-in limitations of scale. Data Accuracy: They would have preferred a scale of 1:5000 to make it even more useful. The timing of the airphotos (year, month, weather etc.) make the data vary from region to region.

Access & Distribution: It is used in reports and by many different staff members in-house.
Data Maintenance: They informally maintain data but not in a format which can be exchanged with other agencies.

OCP Status: They provide input to OCPs in preparation of including SEI input.
Growth Management Strategy: N/A
Other Plan Development: She is developing input to the West Coast Coastal Management Plan, a Protected Areas Strategy and the Vancouver Island Use and Resource Use Plan.

GIS: There is an ArcINFO operation in their office but it is in a different section. She gets output produced by that Section.
Topographic Base: Yes.

Support Materials: The materials were very useful. She is looking forward to having the published Conservation Manual. The fact sheets and going gone! is also useful. Scientific Support: She uses the service about once per month. It is always available when needed but the information is often too vague in terms of precise locations of rare or endangered species.
Web Site: A web site would be useful, she obtains information on the web on rare occasions. She would like to see map-based data as well as textual information. Also other environmental locations of significance in the watershed atlas, wildlife trees, nesting sites, colonies etc.)
Training Programs: N/A

Overall Assessment: It met her expectations. In terms of her needs it fits a good start but needs to be more accurate. Needs to include a lot more important sites, and the small polygons and sites.

MINISTRY of ENVIRONMENT LANDS & PARKS (Nanaimo)

Contact: **Mary-Jo Hamey**, District Habitat Protection Officer
Date: 14/07/1999

Mailing Address: 2080-A Labieux Road, Nanaimo BC V9T 6E9
Phone: 250-751-3226 (1-800-663-7867)
Fax: 250-751-3103

Use of SEI Data: It is used as a coarse filter for high value areas in forest development plans.
Use Frequency: It has been used in 6 different projects.

Data Usefulness: It doesn't identify polygons which are less than 100 hectares which is the main deficiency to usefulness. There is no mandate for the information to officially recognize its role and function and to give it official status.
Data Accuracy: It is accurate at the level it is mapped in which is the same scale as they use in forest development maps.

Access & Distribution: It was easy to use but there was a difficulty in the distribution stage.
Data Maintenance: They maintain their own data and will consider making a transfer of information in due course.

GIS: ArcINFO
Topographic Base: Yes

Support Materials: The SEI support materials were useful. She is anxious to receive the Conservation Manual (and to participate in its draft review).
Scientific Support: She has used the CDC service 4 times. It was useful and timely. She specifically needs directives on development in relation to red-listed species in support of protection, not just occurrence data.
Web Site: She would recommend a website if it was user friendly but she has little time to actually use one.
Training Programs: n/a

Overall Assessment: She was positive yes but had several recommendations. Firstly, she would like to see a distinction between publicly-owned and privately-owned lands to distinguish between them. This should be a layer of information in the dataset. Secondly, she would like to see specific directives about development in relation to red-listed species and communities to put some punch into the application of the data.

NANAIMO (Municipality)

Contact: **Harriet Rugeberg**, Environmental Planner
Date: 15/06/1999

Mailing Address: 455 Wallace St. Nanaimo BC V9R 5J6
Phone: 250-754-4251
Fax: 250-755-4403

Use of SEI Data: They use SEI data and have incorporated it into their OCP and site specific assessments.
Use Frequency: They have used it about 52 times pa.

Data Usefulness: It appears to be very good for terrestrial sensitive sites but is deficient in riparian and wetland sites. No marine content either, need foreshore information.
Data Accuracy: The scale is ok for general and planning functions but they really need 1:5,000 scale for site use. They usually work at 1:1,000 for sites and 1:5,000 for mapped info.

Access & Distribution: There were translation problems for use in MapINFO. They share hard data with landowners and in-house users.
Data Maintenance: They update the data but not on a regular basis, based on local knowledge. They will eventually share this information with the SEI project.

OCF Status: Review in 2001, regular amendments every 6 months.
Growth Management Strategy: Participate in the regional strategy.
Other Plan Development: One neighbourhood plan underway and one near completion.
Town Centre Plan. Specific park plans (Neck Point (ESA content)) completed.

GIS: The operate a GIS in MapINFO
Topographic Base: They have created their own contour coverage.
Support Materials: The SEI publications were moderately useful. The technical report is useful for arguing a defense of specific polygons. She is looking forward to receiving a conservation manual.
Scientific Support: They were unaware of the CDC services.
Web Site: A web site would be useful. She uses the web to gather information. Species lists and a photo-inventory of the sites would be useful additions.
Training Programs: A training session for non-environmental people (engineers, developers, non-green staff and the unconverted.)

Overall Assessment: It filled a need at the time. Need more documentation, descriptive materials, checklists, indications of what is valuable (species & sites), and site evaluations in a larger context.

Migratory Bird Values: She is willing to speak to a researcher.

REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NANAIMO

Contact: **Bob Lapham**, General Manager Development Services
Date: 11/06/1999

Mailing Address: PO Box 40, Lantzville BC, V0R 2H0 (6300 Hammond Bay Rd.)
Phone: 250-390-6510
Fax: 250-390-6511

Use of SEI Data: They use SEI data in their OCP, general development reviews, zoning applications and specific development proposals.

Use Frequency: They use it more than 100 times pa. They use it to consider almost every land-use decision.

Data Usefulness: The classification categories appear to be too broad. Planning areas

select classifications for polygons that they are prepared to accept. They have a

problem with the categories which clash with the forest practices code exemptions.

Garry oak seems to have been overlooked. They don't use the Secondary

Community Plan was critical of the data, asking How can you

value this polygon over that one?

Data Accuracy: It was not accurate enough. The community frequently challenges the

data.

Access & Distribution: It has been incorporated in documents.

Data Maintenance: They do not want to assume a role of maintaining SEI data.

OCP Status: * OCPs are staggered on a 5 year rotation. A new 9th OCP (Coomb's) is ongoing in its development and not yet approved.

Growth Management Strategy: Adopted and in first term review now (1999)

Other Plan Development: Two new OCPs next year (2000) and village and local area

plans will be undertaken.

GIS: They use ArcINFO and ArcVIEW.

Topographic Base: They have purchased the TRIM set for their area.

Support Materials: The conservation manual would be very useful, they are waiting for

publication. They would like more support documentation.

Scientific Support: They are aware of it but haven't used the CDC services. They have

taken the responsibility of building on their own self reliance.

Web Site: N/A

Training Programs: Would send staff if it appeared to be useful. They would pay

based on convenience on a regional basis and would pay up to \$150 per person. If

the sessions were really technical they might pay more. A track for practitioners

and others is more important than a planner track.

Overall Assessment: Generally it met needs. The criteria for inclusion seemed to lack

consistency in the beginning of the project. There are rumors of inconsistent

thoroughness. No clear front end categories and priorities. The question is often

asked: Who did this work? Is it credible? There is a need to integrate the protected

area strategy with SEI.

Migratory Bird Values: Yes, they would be willing to discuss with a researcher. Wildlife issues of all sorts are being overlooked in their OCPs.

NORTH COWICHAN (Municipality)

Contact: Mr. Chris Hall, Planner
Date: 22/06/1999

Mailing Address: PO Box 278, Duncan BC V9L 3X4 (7030 Trans Canada Hwy)
Phone: 250-746-3105
Fax: 250-746-3133

Use of SEI Data: They use SEI data in their OCP and the preparation of a policy document on open spaces. They also use it in the preparation of background papers.

Use Frequency: They used it about 12 times in the year.

Data Usefulness: It was useful to them.

Data Accuracy: They could not comment on accuracy, but a better scale (1:5,000) was desirable.

Access & Distribution: It was easy to use.

Data Maintenance: They will not maintain the data for their area.

OCF Status: It will be approved late next year (2000).

Growth Management Strategy: They participate in the regional district planning. Other Plan Development:

GIS: They do not operate a GIS and have no plans to do so in the short term. Topographic Base:

Support Materials: He felt that although they represented more paper to him, that they appeared to be useful. He was anxious to obtain the technical report and the conservation manual.

Scientific Support: They were unaware of the CDC services, but would like to learn more about them. Web Site: They don't have web access and he doesn't obtain information from the web. He would like to see the watershed atlas on the website.

Training Programs: They would send someone to a training session and would pay a reasonable amount to attend. A parallel course for other practitioners would be valuable too.

Overall Assessment: They had no expectations. They would like to have an indication of which polygons are the MOST sensitive.

Migratory Bird Values: They will talk with a researcher.

NORTH SAANICH (Municipality)

Contact: **Jack Parry**, Planner

Date: 14/06/1999

Mailing Address: PO Box 2639 Sidney BC V8L 4C1 (1620 Mills Rd, Sidney BC)
Phone: 250-656-0781
Fax: 250-656-3155

Use of SEI Data:
Use Frequency:

Data Usefulness: He has never used the data.

Data Accuracy: Scale was inappropriate. He learned nothing new from the data.

Access & Distribution: N/A

Data Maintenance: He will update, where feasible, for his own purposes. He will not share the data because he doesn't know who the project originators are.

OCP Status: Currently approved.

Growth Management Strategy: Participate in the regional strategy.

Other Plan Development: No.

GIS: He does not run a GIS.

Topographic Base: N/A

Support Materials: He was unfamiliar with the SEI support materials and wasn't

interested in them.

Scientific Support: He was not aware of the CDC service (Never heard of them) and

wasn't interested in it.

Web Site: A web site would not be useful.

Training Programs: They would not attend a training session.

Overall Assessment: They had no expectations of any kind.

Migratory Bird Values: He will speak with a researcher.

OAK BAY (Municipality)

Contact: **Stuart Pitt**, Director of Engineering Services
Date: 99/06/07

Mailing Address: 2167 Oak Bay Ave., Victoria BC, V8R 1G2
Phone: 250-598-3311
Fax: 250-598-9108

OCP: Completed about 18 months ago (about January 1998)
GIS: Established using ArcINFO

Notes: The contact was completely unfamiliar with the SEI Program and stated that he was unable to locate the data or any reference to it. They do not use TRIM but instead use a surveyed topographic base. The Capital Regional District acts in a consulting role to them on environmental issues and they follow the direction provided. He felt that there were no sensitive ecosystems in his municipality, in any case or if there were they were very small and not of great significance.

Services: A website would be a useful service. They are prepared to send staff to a training session.

Migratory Bird Values: N/A

**PACIFIC FORESTRY CENTRE
(Natural Resources Canada)**

Contact: **Art Robinson**, Research Scientist

Date: 15/06/99

Mailing Address: 506 West Burnside Rd., Victoria, BC V8Z 1M5

Phone: 250-363-0729

Fax: 250-363-0775

Use of SEI Data: He used it in DND property assessments. He collects data on all wetlands he comes across (field checked polygons) and claims to have a more accurate database n at 1:5,000. He also collects broom-gorse records and sometimes Garry oak occurrences.

Use Frequency:

Data Usefulness: He signed the agreement for the digital data but never received it and never got around to getting it. The hard copy data would have been more useful if it had been collected at 1:5,000 scale.
Data Accuracy: There were problems with wetlands n for example a ten polygon in the SEI turned out to be a rock outcrop. He feels that the polygons should have had more ground truthing.

Access & Distribution:

Data Maintenance: He operates his own database. He would share this updated data under some circumstances to be negotiated.

OCP Status: N/A

Growth Management Strategy: N/A

Other Plan Development: N/A

GIS: ArcVIEW and ArcINFO.

Topographic Base: He has TRIM coverage for his area of interest.

Support Materials: He was not familiar with the SEI materials but would like to receive a set and to be placed on the mailing list.
Scientific Support: He is aware of the CDC services but suggests that he has supplied more information than he has received.
Web Site: He would like to be able to go to a website and query a specific polygon.
Training Programs: He is willing to send staff on a training session and to pay a reasonable amount.

Overall Assessment: It did not fulfill his expectations or needs because it lacked enough accuracy and completeness.

Migratory Bird Values: N/A

PARKS CANADA (Vancouver)

Contact: **Greg MacMillan**, Data Manager & GIS Specialist
Date: 14/06/1999

Mailing Address: 300-300 West Georgia St., Vancouver BC V6B 6B4
Phone: 604-666-3431
Fax: 604-666-7957

Use of SEI Data: They use it for mainly for evaluation of property for acquisition in the Gulf Islands area as well as for display of information in map form.
Use Frequency: Others make the decisions (could not estimate).

Data Usefulness: It was useful.
Data Accuracy: They require data mapped in a scale more like 1:5,000.

Access & Distribution: The data was easy to get and easy to use. It has not been communicated to anyone except in-house.
Data Maintenance: They are not doing so at this time. Possibly in the future, and would be willing to share data at that time.

OCP Status: N/A

Growth Management Strategy: N/A
Other Plan Development: N/A

GIS: They operate ArcINFO and ArcVIEW.
Topographic Base: They have a complete set of TRIM.

Support Materials: He thought the list of services and products would be very useful.
Scientific Support: He was unaware of the CDC services.
Web Site: He thought a web site would be useful for research and downloading data. It should include a description of the database, recent changes, field check sites. He would like to see a sample tutorial, case studies (good & bad), contacts and the metadata. He felt it was more efficient than mailing.
Training Programs: He would suggest that the planners on staff should attend.

Overall Assessment: Data met his needs but required more field checking.

Migratory Bird Values: N/A

PARKSVILLE (Municipality)

Contact: **Gayle Jackson**, Town Planner
Date: 11/06/1999

Mailing Address: (194 Memorial Ave) PO Box 1390, Parksville BC, V9P 2H3
Phone: 250-248-6144
Fax: 250-248-6650

Use of SEI Data: It is currently used in site development proposals and will be used more in the future.
Use Frequency: Under 100 uses pa.

Data Usefulness: Her perception is that the SEI tends to be water oriented and not a full range of environments.
Data Accuracy:

Access & Distribution: The map index was not adequate. It is very difficult to find a specific area (polygon) in the atlas.
Data Maintenance: They are not at this level yet.

OCP Status: Currently (1999) under review.
Growth Management Strategy: Participate in the regional district strategy.
Other Plan Development: Local area plans.

GIS: There is a GIS run by the engineering department in AutoCAD.
Topographic Base: n/k

Support Materials: They do not use the SEI support materials. They would like to get a copy of the technical report and the conservation manual.
Scientific Support: They were unaware of the CDC services. They would like to learn more about them.
Web Site: They would like to see really detailed information only.
Training Programs: They would consider sending someone probably her. She has a hard time getting away. Depends on location. Would pay up to \$200.

Overall Assessment: The SEI is very useful to flag issues of concern. They are an urban setting with few environmental issues to deal with.
Migratory Bird Values: They would speak with a researcher. These issues are highly relevant to their planning concerns.

POTTINGER GAHERTY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS

Contact: **Ainslie Ogden**, Consultant

Date: 12/07/1999

Mailing Address: 1200 n 1185 West Georgia St., Vancouver BC V6E 4E6

Phone: 604-895-7627

Fax: 604-682-3497

Use of SEI Data: Yes.

Use Frequency: She has used it once n for a Municipality of Saanich project.

Data Usefulness: It has been useful but would have been more useful at 1:5,000 scale. Data Accuracy: She also questioned the coverage n that it was not complete enough and possibly missed polygons on private property.

Access & Distribution: The data was easy to get and easy to use. Data Maintenance: She had not considered this, but might participate.

GIS: MicroStation

Topographic Base: No.

Support Materials: She was not familiar with the SEI support materials. She had obtained the Technical Report and a draft copy of the Conservation Manual. She was anxious to get the final version. Scientific Support: She was not aware of the CDC services but would like to learn more about them. Web Site: She had a mixed reaction to a website. They can be cumbersome and difficult to use. She would like to be able to refer to mapped data on the website. Training Programs: She would consider attendance if the location, price and timing were suitable. Overall Assessment: It was great for what it was n with the conditions as noted above.

PROVINCIAL CAPITAL COMMISSION

Contact: **Dave Morris**, Planner

Date: 16/06/1999

Mailing Address: 613 Pandora St., Victoria BC, V8W 1N8

Phone: 250-953-8806

Fax: 250-386-1303

Use of SEI Data: They worked in coordination with the CRD to create the Green and

Blue Spaces Strategy all based on SEI data.

Use Frequency: They use SEI at arm's length. They don't use the data directly but

assist others in doing work on sensitive areas in doing landowner contact by other

groups.

Data Usefulness: They wanted to run a landowner contact by overlaying SEI on the

cadastral base. The scale is not accurate enough at 1:20,000 to do that. Planners

need to know the location of a polygon relative to property lines.

Data Accuracy: They would have preferred 1:5,000 scale.

Access & Distribution:

Data Maintenance: They have funded the Victoria Natural History Society to undertake
more complete inventories. This has not been captured digitally though so probably

of small use to SEI.

OCP Status: N/A

Growth Management Strategy: N/A

Other Plan Development: Developing alternatives in the Green and Blue Strategy,

working on aspects of implementation and funding Greenways projects.

GIS: They use AutoCAD Map.

Topographic Base: They do not use TRIM.

Support Materials: He was not familiar with the SEI support materials. He would like to

obtain a technical report and the final draft of the Conservation Manual. He thought

the fact sheet would be interesting.

Scientific Support: They were familiar with the CDC service and thought it was used

occasionally.

Web Site: He did not think a web site would be useful.

Training Programs: He was marginally interested in sending staff to a training session.

Overall Assessment: It was a valuable first step. The scale was disappointing. They

seem not to trust the people they want to use it.

Migratory Bird Values: He would speak to a researcher.

QUALICUM BEACH (Municipality)

Contact: **Paul Butler**, Director of Planning

Date: 14/06/1999

Mailing Address: PO Box 130, Qualicum Beach BC, V9K 1S7

Phone: 250-752-6921

Fax: 250-752-1243

Use of SEI Data: It was used to develop the OCP and the road network.
Use Frequency: It has been used twice.

Data Usefulness: It was initially useful until deficiencies were noted.
Data Accuracy: It was not accurate enough. Some examples of problems include inaccurate location of polygons, the type of site designation given, and whether or not the site even existed. The wetland data was noted as especially inaccurate in its location and classification (e.g. a paddock misinterpreted as a wetland).

Access & Distribution: It was easy to access and easy to use. It has been used by other in-house users.
Data Maintenance: The Town will not update any of the data and hope that SEI will update and refine it.

OCP Status: Approved 1999.

Growth Management Strategy: Participate in the Regional GMS. (Interim update underway currently, two years after adoption.)

Other Plan Development: An Zoning Bylaw update is anticipated.

GIS: No. Not expected in the short-term.

Topographic Base: N/A

Support Materials: Was not familiar with any of the support materials or information pieces. The list of services was seen as being of limited use. Would like more site specific information. Would like to see information on updating of old topographic information, fine-tuning of riparian zones in relation to property lines and more detailed location data.

Scientific Support: Did not know about the CDC service.

Web Site: Would like to see case studies. It isn't very useful idea now but will increase in importance in the future. Would like to see technical and other reports online.
Training Programs: Would attend a one day seminar. Would pay a reasonable amount.
Would like to see it relate strongly to the civic approval and development process.

Overall Assessment: Not enough ground-truthing. The whole project loses credibility when deficiencies are noted.

Migratory Bird Values: Will speak to a researcher.

QUALICUM BEACH STREAMKEEPERS SOCIETY

Contact: John MacFarlane, GIS & Mapping Coordinator
Date: 21/06/1999

Mailing Address: 217 Saturna Drive, Qualicum Beach BC V9K 2P5
Telephone: 250-752-8288
Fax: 250-752-8288

Use of SEI Data: They have used the data in an informational sense
Use Frequency: They use the data once every two weeks at present with indications of
increasing frequency.

Data Usefulness: It was very useful.
Data Accuracy: Some locational inaccuracies were noted which has caused some
members of the public and the Town administration to question the validity of all of
the data.

Access & Distribution: Bits of data have been distributed, always in hard copy format,
to the Town of Qualicum Beach, Wetland Keepers, Arrowsmith Naturalists.
Data Maintenance: The Streamkeepers are initiating their own database and are
starting to work with other groups to support this effort.

OCP Status: n/a

Growth Management Strategy: n/a
Other Plan Development: n/a

GIS: They have access through a volunteer to ArcVIEW (with Spatial Analyst).
Topographic Base: They have one TRIM dataset at present and plan to purchase
others.

Support Materials: They found the support materials to be very useful, especially the
metadata. More information on the projections of the data would have been
appreciated.

Scientific Support: They were unaware of the existence of the CDC services prior to the
study.
Web Site: A website with the documents on-line, the metadata, and more detailed
information on contents of polygons, lists of species and their significance would be
very valuable.

Training Programs: They would send someone on a training session but as a not-for-
profit organization the cost would have to be more symbolic than full cost recovery.

Overall Assessment: They had no expectations so they were very pleasantly surprised
to find so much valuable data already digitized and ready to add-to. It is a terrific
tool and they look forward to working with it, and to getting updates in the future.

Migratory Bird Values: n/a

SAANICH (Municipality)

Contact: **Karen Hurley**, Environmental Planner
Date: 30/06/1999

Mailing Address: 770 Vernon, Victoria BC, V8X 2W7
Phone: 250-475-1775
Fax: 250-475-5450

Notes: **Alan Hopper**, City Planner. **Karen Hurley** is the Environmental Planner. (250-475-1775) although she resigned the day before the interview. The name of her replacement will be needed for future communication.

Use of SEI Data: Yes they use the data for Local Area Plans, the GIS Atlas and the Environmentally Significant Areas Atlas.
Use Frequency: n/k
Data Usefulness: It was useful.

Data Accuracy: She felt that there was considerable data missing for their area, some important areas were not included. She felt that there were inconsistent classification of sites as well. They use a scale of 1:1,000 in their planning (their air photo coverage scale) so that would have been better.
Access & Distribution: It was easy to obtain the data and easy to use it. She noted that they had to be persistent to obtain it in the early days, noting a hesitancy to release it.
Data Maintenance: They rely on MELP to do this but participate in the collection of data.

OCP Status: Will begin to review in 2 years.

Growth Management Strategy: Participate in CRD strategy.
Other Plan Development: Local Area Plans being amended, Prospect Lake in draft form.

GIS: They use ArcView and G-Image.

Topographic Base: They have a TRIM coverage for their area.
Support Materials: She was familiar with the SEI support materials and found them useful. She is looking forward to receiving the technical report and the conservation manual.

Scientific Support: She used the CDC services more than 6 times. It was definitely vital with a good turnaround time especially in crisis situations. Remarkable service. She likes working with a personal contact who has expertise and scientific integrity.

Web Site: If the information was detailed enough it would be useful. She would like to see the conservation manual on the site. Links to information on ecosystem types with descriptions of rarity or significant features would be useful.
Training Programs: She didn't think a training session would be very valuable because of the poor data coverage for the Saanich Region. It would probably be useful for planners and biologists.

Overall Assessment: It did not meet her needs or expectations.

Migratory Bird Values: She committed her successor to a meeting. Very important in Local Area Plans.

SEACOR ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING INC.

Contact: Sandra Nelson-Baker, Consultant

Date: 14/07/1999

Mailing Address: 406-13251 Delf Place, Richmond BC

Phone: 604-244-2266

Fax: 604-244-2246

Use of SEI Data: They use SEI data for client projects.

Use Frequency: They have only used it once.

Data Usefulness: It was inot too bad!

Data Accuracy: It was very accurate for their purposes.

Access & Distribution: Distributed only to clients. It was easy to use and easy to get at.

The metadata was helpful.

Data Maintenance: They will not update data.

GIS: They do not run a GIS.

Topographic Base: No.

Support Materials: They were not familiar with the SEI support materials. They had used a field data report for their only project. Would like to receive the technical report.

Scientific Support: They've used the CDC 10 times. It was very useful in they got more than they asked for.

Web Site: Ifor sure! it would be useful. Include links to other sites. Include sources of sources for reference materials related to the SEI.

Training Programs: She was enthustastic about a training course and might pay a reasonable amount.

Overall Assessment: It was more than they had hoped for! Very worthwhile. Didn't know about it until recently in it needs more profile. Advetise it better!

SIDNEY (Municipality)

Contact: **Randy Humble**, Planner

Date: 21/06/1999

Mailing Address: 2440 Sidney Ave, Sidney BC, V8L 1Y7

Phone: 250-656-1725

Fax: 250-655-4508

Use of SEI Data: They have NOT used the data at all, but plan to when the OCP is done. Peter Wainwright wanted a better scale (1:5,000) which was more useful in planning exercises. He indicates that more ground-truthing would be useful, to pick up missed polygons and correct other errors.

OCP Status: In near future.

Growth Management Strategy: No.

Other Plan Development: No.

GIS: n/k

Topographic Base: n/k

Support Materials: He was unaware of the SEI support materials.

Scientific Support: He was unaware of the CDC services.

Web Site: n/k

Training Programs: They would consider sending someone on a training session but it would depend on the cost and whether or not their budget could provide payment.

Overall Assessment: They use a professional (Peter Wainwright) who sits on their Council to provide guidance, as well as other professional volunteer community resources.

Migratory Bird Values: He would talk to a researcher.

SNUNEYMUXW FIRST NATION

Contact: Mr. Kelly Poulin, GIS Coordinator (See notes)

Date: 23/06/1999

Mailing Address: Treaty Negotiations, 668 Centre, Nanaimo BC, V9R 4Z4

Phone: 250-753-6768

Fax: 250-

Use of SEI Data: It was used in land use planning.

Use Frequency: It hasn't been used up to now, but they expect it to be used a lot more in the future.

Data Usefulness: They will use the data in a study to identify ecosystems and non-

timber forest products.

Data Accuracy: No opinion.

Access & Distribution: N/A

Data Maintenance: Not in the short term but they may develop this capability sometime

in the future.

OCP Status: N/A

Growth Management Strategy: N/A

Other Plan Development: N/A

GIS: They operate a GIS using PAMAP and ArcView.

Topographic Base: They have some TRIM but not a complete set for their area of

interest.

Support Materials: He was aware of having seen some of the support materials. He

wants a copy of the Technical Report and the Conservation Manual.

Scientific Support: He did not know about the CDC services and would like to know

more.

Web Site: He thinks a web site would be very useful and uses the web to gather

information himself.

Training Programs: He would like to come to a training session but would not like to pay

for it.

Overall Assessment: It was suggested that in future a better contact for us would be

Kathleen Johnny n the Landuse Planner. He would like to see all ecosystems to be

shown, not just sensitive ones. He'd also like an indication of WHY the polygons are

individually sensitive.

Migratory Bird Values: He would speak with a researcher.

TEI MEXW TREATY ASSOCIATION (TTA) (Victoria)

Contact: Peter Wainwright, Consultant, LGL Ltd. Sidney BC (656-0127)

Date: 21/06/1999

Mailing Address: c/o Ms. Jamie Disbrow, 202-45 Bastion Square, Victoria BC V8W 1J1

Phone: 250-383-8688

Fax: 250-383-8974

Use of SEI Data: It is used in treaty negotiations and specific claims.

Use Frequency: n/k

Data Usefulness: Not really relevant to their function of treaty negotiations. Will be more useful in the future as they negotiate fish and wildlife co-management agreements.

Data Accuracy: Scale would have been more useful at 1:5,000. Needs more ground

truthing to pick up missed or erroneous information.

Access & Distribution: It was easy to use and easy to obtain.

Data Maintenance: They may maintain the data in the future.

OCP Status: N/A

Growth Management Strategy: N/A

Other Plan Development: N/A

GIS: They operate ArcINFO, ArcVIEW and MapINFO.

Topographic Base: They have a complete TRIM coverage for their area of interest.

Support Materials: They were unaware of the SEI support materials.

Scientific Support: They are aware of the CDC service but have no need to use it.

Web Site: They thought that a web site would be useful and should contain the

metadata, details of the vintage of the air photo coverage and an indication of which polygons were ground-truthed.

Training Programs: They would NOT attend a training session.

Overall Assessment: A good first start but falls short in many areas, especially in the completeness and accuracy. They would like to see more complete coverage of sensitive areas of more than just vegetation.

Migratory Bird Values: They would speak to a researcher.

THURBER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS LTD.

Contact: **Ray Halladay**, Consultant

Date: 12/07/1999

Mailing Address: 210 N 4475 Viewmont, Victoria BC, V8Z 6L8

Phone: 250-727-7332

Fax: 250-727-3710

Use of SEI Data: Yes, he frequently uses SEI data.

Use Frequency: He has used it from 6-12 times on projects for clients.

Data Usefulness: The maps are iconic of the realm in the site evaluation business. Data Accuracy: The data was accurate enough, considering the original aim of the project. It would have been much more useful to him if they were developed at 1:5,000 scale.

Access & Distribution: It was easy to get in especially as they have an office in Victoria.

Data Maintenance: He will not add to the data on an ongoing basis but often finds additional information in the course of developing specific projects.

GIS: Their company does not run a GIS. They use other compatible software. Topographic Base: They do not own TRIM.

Support Materials: He was completely unfamiliar with the support materials and only once used a field data report.

Scientific Support: He was very familiar with the CDC services and used it 6-12 times. It was exceedingly useful. He felt that the excellent response was a model of what the rest of the government should be! He noted no deficiencies in the service.

Web Site: He thought that a web site would be very useful, and he was an active user of the web himself. He would like to see more data and more detailed technical information which would have strong reference usefulness. Field reports and notes would be useful.

Training Programs: He would attend a training course and would pay a reasonable amount. He compared it Ministry of forests courses which he felt were too overpriced.

Overall Assessment: He thought that the map legends should contain stronger wording about the function of the SEI and the implications to users to work vigorously to preserve and protect the SEI areas. He also asked for more information on second growth polygons including some which were very important to the environment but which may not qualify as SEI polygons. He felt that the isocline aspect of the SEI was good.

VICTORIA (Municipality)

Contact: **Doug Koch**, Director of Planning
Date: 24/06/1999

Mailing Address: 1 Centennial Square, Victoria BC V8W 1P6
Phone: 250-361-0382
Fax: 250-361-0386

OCP Status: The OCP was approved in 1995. It will not be reworked for 5-10 years.
Growth Management Strategy: They participate in the regional district plans.
Other Plan Development: They are constantly developing neighbourhood plans and the Gonzales and Fairfield Neighbourhood Plans are currently anticipated.

Support Materials: N/A

Scientific Support: N/A

Web Site: He thought a website would be useful, and he accesses information on the web himself.

Training Programs: They would probably send someone on a training course, but would need to clarify some issues in advance. It is ipersonnel resource dependant.

Overall Assessment: The SEI data was given to the Victoria Harbour Planner, Dennis Carlson, some time ago but it has since disappeared and as a result they have not made any use of it for any purpose and have no knowledge of it.

Migratory Bird Values: They are willing to speak to a researcher.

VIEW ROYAL (Municipality)

Contact: Alan Haldenby, Planner
Date: 24/06/99

Mailing Address: 45 View Royal, Victoria BC, V9B 1A6
Phone: 250-479-6800
Fax: 250-727-9551

Use of SEI Data: They used the SEI data in the development of their OCP.
Use Frequency: They used it once, but expect that it will begin to get further use in the future as they gear up for more planning and consultation.

Data Usefulness: The usefulness was questionable.
Data Accuracy: They would have preferred data at 1:5,000 scale. The existing information is not precise enough for their purposes.

Access & Distribution: The data was easy to use and easy to obtain in the first place.
Data Maintenance: They use the Victoria Field Naturalists to field check and maintain data. They would be interested in negotiating a data sharing agreement.

OCP Status: It will be approved in September 1999.
Growth Management Strategy: Part of OCP.
Other Plan Development: Some Local Area Studies will flow from the approved OCP.
Detailed Environmental Review Guidelines will be developed in the future.

GIS: They operate a custom-built database, based on property parcels, but not an actual GIS. They own AutoCAD and anticipate developing the GIS potential of it sometime in the future.
Topographic Base: No.

Support Materials: He was aware of the support materials (to date) but they formed part of his paper burden. He thought the Conservation Manual and the Technical Report would be useful.
Scientific Support: They were unaware of the CDC services and would like to know more about them.

Web Site: A website would be useful. They use the web to obtain information. They cannot suggest any additional topics to be added to such a site.
Training Programs: They would send a staff member on a training program. It is cost dependant, would pay a reasonable amount.

Overall Assessment: The SEI pretty much met their needs. More detail would have been nice. They would like to cooperate in any future studies or reworking of the data.

Migratory Bird Values: They will discuss with a researcher.

WATERBIRD WATCH COLLECTIVE

Contact: **Nina Raginsky**, Volunteer Coordinator
Date: 30/06/1999

Mailing Address: 272 Beddis Rd., Salt Spring Island, BC, V8K 2J1
Phone: 250-537-4515

Fax: n/a

Use of SEI Data: They use it for wildlife conservation, plan assessments and lobbying efforts. It is used to coordinate 200 volunteers.
Use Frequency: The estimate using it 10 times.

Data Usefulness: It was not useful because, in her opinion, it was not reliably ground-truthed. The map scale was 10k!

Data Accuracy: The data was all suspect because it wasn't ground-truthed.!

Access & Distribution: It was easy to obtain and easy to use.

Data Maintenance: They will update the information but will not share it because she has no idea who the originators of the information are.!

GIS: She thought that they had a GIS but had no knowledge about it.
Topographic Base: n/k

Support Materials: She was completely unfamiliar with any SEI support information. Scientific Support: She knew about the CDC services but did not use them. But she thought that they were useful just the same!

Web Site: Definitely not useful. They are a non-technical grass-roots organization and do not use any technology. A web site would be just more techno-stuff!!
Training Programs: They would attend providing the program was completely no-cost to them.

Overall Assessment: Not very useful.

WESTLAND RESOURCES LTD.

Contact: **David Harper**, Consultant
Date: 09/06/1999

Mailing Address: 1863 Oak Bay Ave, Victoria BC, V8R 1C6
Phone: 250-592-8500
Fax: 250-592-1633

Use of SEI Data: They use SEI for client-driven projects. These include the Highlands OCP, RDN Growth Management Plan, CRD Growth Management Plan and the CRD Report on the Environment as well as some environmental monitoring reports. Use Frequency: Probably used it 20 times.

Data Usefulness: The scale of polygons under one hectare in urban areas are not accurate. Its not specific enough. The work-around for incorporating secondary ecosystems is a flaw in the usefulness. The classification categories did not seem to be useful to their clients.
Data Accuracy: It has a poor reliability rating. He would like to see more sites field-checked.

Access & Distribution: Only to clients. It was difficult to get the data.
Data Maintenance: They will not maintain or add to data.

OCP Status: N/A
Growth Management Strategy: N/A
Other Plan Development: N/A

GIS: They use ArcVIEW & MapInfo.
Topographic Base: Clients provide the TRIM component.

Support Materials: He was familiar with the SEI support materials and thought they were useful. He was eager to get the technical report and the conservation manual. Scientific Support: He knew about the CDC services and used them 6 times. He felt the turnaround for the requests was too slow
Web Site: He would like to see the metadata and maplinks on a web site. He uses the web a lot for finding data and information. Also he wants more information on rare and endangered species, make-up of communities. He would like to see rare (regionally or nationally) ecosystems highlighted so he can contribute to saving them.
Training Programs: He would send someone to a training session and would pay a reasonable amount.

Overall Assessment: It wasn't everything they hoped it would be.
Migratory Bird Values: N/A

APPENDIX THREE: Questionnaire

SEI User: EXAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE

Date:

1. Have you used SEI information or products for any purpose?

No - why not?

Yes - for what purpose?

OCP?

GMS?

Parks plan?

Site specific assessments?

Other? Specify

2. How many times did you (your agency) make land use decisions based on SEI information?

3. Accuracy

Was the information accurate enough for your purpose?

Was the map scale adequate?

What were the deficiencies?

4. Data Maintenance

Will you add to or update SEI information for your own purpose? Specify

Will this be communicated to the originators of the project?

5. Access and Distribution

Was the data easy to use?

Is it easy enough to get at?

Who else have you given the information to?

How many times have you passed this information on to others?

6. Do you use SEI in GIS format?

No. If not, do you have any future plans for using GIS?

Yes: In-house? or contract out?

Software platform (acceptability, usefulness, etc.)

TRIM implications (availability of TRIM, TRIM accuracy, etc.)

Integration into other GIS

Was the metadata adequate?

7. Scientific support - provided by the Conservation Data Centre upon request

(only until March 31, 2000).

Did you know that this service was available?

Have you used this service? How many times?

Is this service useful?

Is this service available when needed?

Are there any deficiencies in this service?

How many SEI user requests have been made to CDC?

Who and Where are the users?

8. Published support materials
- Are the products listed below useful?
 - Are there any deficiencies in the products listed below in your opinion? What are they?
 - Are these products easily accessible?
- a) field data reports (for field checked sites) available from SEI offices for specific sites
 - b) newsletters
 - c) pamphlet

8. Planned outreach services and materials (see list)
- Will the following be useful to you (your agency): in making environmentally sound land use decisions? At public meetings? Responding to public enquiries? Local conservation efforts? Other?
- a) technical report
 - b) conservation manual
 - c) fact sheets
 - d) *Going, going, gone?*
 - e) training programs - would you be willing to send staff on an SEI training session? Would you be willing to pay for this session? How much?
- for planners?
 - for biologists and other land use planning practitioners?
 - f) web site
- Do you think a web site describing the ecosystems and linking to the appropriate portion of the SEI documents on the web would be useful?
 - What other information would you like to see on the web site?
 - Are there any other services or documents which would assist you in making land use decisions favouring the conservation of SEI sites?

9. Project Assessment
- Did the SEI information fulfill your expectations/needs?
 - No - in your opinion what were the main deficiencies?
 - Yes
- Are there other conservation tools that you think are needed?
 - In your opinion, will the information provided by SEI be used to help conserve sensitive areas?

10. Status of land use planning processes.
- What is the current status of your OCP?
 - What is the current status of your Growth Management Strategy?
 - Are you currently developing or considering developing any other land use plans?
11. CWS is also looking at the design and content of OCPs in British Columbia in order to develop models for inclusion in OCPs relating to the conservation of migratory bird values. Would you be willing to talk further about your OCP to a CWS researcher?

