

WORKSHOP - 24TH NORTH AMERICAN MOOSE CONFERENCE

Vince Crichton,

Manitoba Department of Natural Resources, Box 24, 1495 St. James Street, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3H 0W9

ALCES VOL. 24 (1988) pp. 218-222

Delegates were assigned to one of six groups and given the task of reviewing state of the art moose management and outlining suitable directions for Century 21. The following subjects were selected as the main workshop themes:

- I. Exploring Integrated Resource Management: A design for the future.
- II. Research and Management: Finding the balance.
- III. Forest Management Guidelines: Making room for moose.

The collective results of these discussions follow.

INTEGRATED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

THE ISSUE:

Multiple use as a resource management concept has been around for a long time. However, how often has it been applied to the extent that the wildlife resource receives equal billing with economic based resource uses? To what extent are we in fact practicing integrated resource management? Traditional dollar based decision making has tilted the scale to industry (agriculture, mining, forestry). What can be done to ensure that a land ethic plays a larger role in resource management decisions? How far should our resource be compromised? How should we set priorities? To whom are we accountable? Is integrated management really feasible to implement and likely to occur by Century 21? If so, what would be an effective means by which to sort priorities and allow for truly integrated management?

Definition

Integrated resource management (IRM) was deemed to mean managing or protecting multiple resource values on the same land base simultaneously. Implicit in this process is that all values at the outset have equal weight and that the rights of the minority must be protected.

IRM is not a win - lose situation and often involves a series of compromises by various interest groups.

Present Situation

Legislation in some jurisdictions has made IRM planning mandatory. However, many jurisdictions do not have a formal process with enabling legislation.

Concerns

What's wrong? What isn't working?

1. Many jurisdictions are without IRM process.
2. Public are not educated about process and resource management and consequently do not get involved. On other hand, public involvement can cause polarization.
3. Frequently managers lack requisite information to make good decisions - frequently all values not known.
4. Wildlife needs better advocates.
5. Resource managers must take broader view and be appreciative of other resource values.
6. Concern about lack of funds makes us inactive on issues.
7. Resource managers do not heed public wants. It is noted that lobby groups are forcing government to employ IRM.
8. Lack of monitoring to ensure objectives met and compliance.
9. An amendment/appeal mechanism re-

- quired.
10. All resource groups cannot be totally satisfied.
 11. IRM extends time period for planning - delays decision making. This however can be shortened by public education.
 12. IRM should be extended to budgeting system.

Plans for the Future

Is there a place for integrated management?

1. IRM here to stay - public will demand it.
2. Anyone with an interest should be involved - government, conservation groups, resource users, aboriginal groups, antis, silent majority.
3. IRM should be applied on global scale e.g. agricultural use of land is rarely IRM.
4. Government must go public e.g. public meetings, advisory committees, public planning boards, management boards, educational system.
5. Management boards have a place - there is a danger of complacency when resource healthy. Also, it is noted that problems/concerns may be resolved when divergent interest groups communicate.
6. With IRM, managers must know needs in order to evaluate and compromise.
7. In measuring demands/values, these need not necessarily be measured in terms of dollars and cents.
8. In terms of priorities and resource allocation, it is essential to know legal obligations as well as looking at spacial and temporal issues.
9. The consumptive/non-consumptive issue is one of allocation.
10. Some issues are related to single resource management thus suggested that IRM will not be required in all cases.
11. Some politicians more aware of public concerns than resource managers which is not always a bad situation.
12. Economics and conservation may go 'hand-in-hand' in the long term however, in the 'short-term' there may/will be con-

- flicts.
13. IRM can work if:
 - i) enabling legislation developed.
 - ii) public and managers are educated and able to look at situation holistically.
 - iii) a broad base of input occurs to identify resource values.
 14. IRM will allow future generations to have a choice.

WORKSHOP II RESEARCH AND MANAGEMENT FINDING THE BALANCE

THE ISSUE:

Can management agencies afford to intensify their operational moose management programs and still have the necessary resources to address management problems through research? During current economic times when most governments are running budget deficits, wildlife managers and researchers must be innovative and use considerable ingenuity in order to complete their work on limited funds. Cooperative financing of projects between government and private organizations has been possible, but probably not fully exploited for its potential. Governments also hold back in conducting much needed research projects and often look to universities or consultants to get the work done at arm's length. Where is the balance between research and management? Can we afford to do both? How do we make the link stronger? What new methods can be used to fund our Research and Management programs? How should research activities be prioritized? What directions should we take in Century 21?

Definition

Research very simply can be defined as pursuit of unknown whereas management poses the questions and implements results to achieve goals.

General

It is axiomatic that there is close communication between both groups. In instances, it is difficult to ascertain where research ends and management starts or vice versa. When it comes to wildlife management is not a simple matter to separate the two terms - we are forced into attempting a separation by the bureaucratic system when it really cannot be done. It is important not to mix the term researchers and managers with research and management. The management/research scenario is a feedback system.

More consultation with all public groups is required to establish management/ research priorities.

Research is often not an immediate management need but one that is seen being required 'down the road'. In this area it is important to plan a course of direction and then ascertain problems that require overcoming to achieve objective.

It is not our job as 'moosers' to tell the public what they want but rather provide what they want.

There must be co-operation between managers and researchers. This means inter-agency and intra-agency co-operation as well as between government and universities and consultants. We must adopt a complex multidisciplinary, team approach to tackling the increasingly complex problems of ecological relationships. Regarding funding, we must become more innovative in attempts to acquire adequate funding. Don't depend on the consumptive user or co-operators to pay the burden. We must develop innovative ways to raise funds and government must recognize the need to 'ear mark' funds. It is suggested that the public would be more willing to donate funds to specific wildlife projects rather than seeing donations go to 'general revenue'. The ear-marked fund concept is much more readily accepted by politicians in the United States than Canada.

It is important not to make research the sacrificial lamb - in other words during the

budgetary process and in times of constraint to resist the temptation to sacrifice or do away with research. To do so will hamper effective management.

We must facilitate the process to attract private sector funds which will/can be directed to needed research. The economic value of wildlife must be recognized and we must identify public expenditures on wildlife related activities to establish a basis of improved funding.

Recommendations

- i) communication is essential and must be developed.
- ii) ear-marked funding is an efficient mechanism to generate funding and moosers should espouse the values of it for generating new funds.
- iii) diversify management
- iv) more sociological research required - an understanding of what the public wants from 'their resources'.
- v) so long as the resource is the 'peoples', management of it must remain with government.
- vi) there is an urgent need for those involved in moose management to work together.

WORKSHOP III FOREST MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES MAKING ROOM FOR MOOSE

THE ISSUE:

Global forest resources are being subjected to unprecedented pressure to supply wood materials for a growing world demand. In an effort to keep up, many disciplines have focused on forest technology alone. New and more efficient ways have been found to harvest trees and silvicultural efforts have accelerated to find ways of producing fast growing, highly competitive, disease resistant forests. What are the impacts of this singular approach? Do we really know what is going on? What has been the impact on moose populations? How can things be changed? What needs to be done to improve the situ-

ation for moose? What have other countries like Sweden done? Are sustained yields for forest and moose in the same area realistic goals? What can forest and wildlife managers do to make room for moose in Century 21?

Definition

Forest management can be defined in different ways depending on one's perspective. Simply put, it can be land management planning. A somewhat more complex definition used by foresters states it as the act and science of applying business principles and scientific methods to maintaining a sustained yield of forest products from a given unit of land. Products are defined as wood fibre, wildlife, water, fish, air and recreation. The wildlife definition of forest management is it is the interaction of all resource concerns for overall protection and utilization of the forest ecosystem.

General

What is needed is a definition acceptable to both wildlife and foresters.

Guidelines for forest management exist in Ontario, Minnesota and Alaska with Manitoba, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia and Sweden either in the process of preparing such guidelines or with documents that resemble guidelines.

Guidelines should be constructed such that they suggest modifications to timber operating plans which ensure maintenance and protection of critical habitat of other resources. They should be flexible with more specifics being applied on a site by site basis.

Attendees in the workshop were somewhat polarized on the issue of guidelines working. Some felt that 'guidelines' work whereas something made compulsory advocates a reactionary position.

The major concerns are a lack of planning and the general lack of support for an integrated resource management system by government. In addition, many forestry manage-

ment plans are already made before other resource managers and users have an input.

One workshop concluded that there needs to be a legally binding mechanism for ensuring all resource management interests are taken into consideration prior to forest extraction. The same can be said of fire protection plans i.e. other resource interests need input at the planning stages.

Attendees raised concern for forestry activities such as access, size and configuration of cut, buffers or lack thereof, clear vs selective cutting, timing of cuts, habitat component loss and short sighted fibre management. In terms of silviculture, concern was expressed relative to herbiciding, stand conversion, reduction of stand diversity, stocking standards favourings oftwoods and site preparation techniques.

Economics will always play a role but not only for forestry but other resource opportunities e.g. red meat production, recreation etc. It is essential that wildlifers obtain better information on wildlife economics than is now available.

Because of the environmental movement about today, it may be easier to develop and pass appropriate legislation. It is important to emphasize the need for an information base to properly implement integrated planning. It was generally agreed that we still do not know enough about moose - there is a paucity of data in some fields that needs to be addressed.

Guidelines developed must be adoptive and effects of guidelines should be monitored so that they can evolve with time to meet contemporary changes.

Recommendations

Government

1. Government must establish a mechanism for integrated resource management through a mandatory public review process.
2. Government must enforce compliance with the process and conditions as set out.

3. Government must ensure that other resource interests such as wildlife and fisheries establish specific management goals for each species or geographic area.
4. Government must provide information to establish management goals.

Industry

1. Industry must be involved in planning process. What are their goals and plan for the future?
2. Must be involved in contributing to costs of assessment of impact of forest extractions.

Public

1. Must be able to contribute to review process.