



*FWCP REVIEW (2015):
A SURVEY OF PERCEPTIONS AND
IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES.*



*CONDUCTED BY INSIGHTS WEST,
FOR THE FISH & WILDLIFE
COMPENSATION PROGRAM*

- FINAL -

Simplified *Understanding*

May 9, 2016



Background & Objectives



Background

- With a vision for *thriving fish and wildlife populations in watersheds that are functioning and sustainable*, the Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program (FWCP or Program) was established to compensate for impacts to fish, wildlife, and their supporting habitat resulting from the construction of BC Hydro generation facilities.
- The Program is a partnership between BC Hydro, the Province, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, First Nations and public stakeholders to conserve and enhance fish and wildlife impacted by the construction of BC Hydro dams.
- The Program operates in three regions across British Columbia. In the Columbia and Peace Regions, the FWCP operates to meet fish and wildlife conditions in BC Hydro's water licenses. In the Coastal Region, the FWCP is a voluntary initiative.



Objectives

- The FWCP sought to measure the perceptions and experiences of general public, stakeholders, and First Nations with the Program, as well as discovering what FWCP does well and what improvements it could make.
 - Perceptions of the FWCP among First Nations, FWCP stakeholders, and the public;
 - Experiences with the FWCP among First Nations, FWCP stakeholders, and the public;
 - Areas where the FWCP is working well;
 - Areas where the FWCP has room for improvement; and
 - Suggestions for how the FWCP can improve.
- A copy of the questionnaire designed to address these objectives is appended.



Research Audiences



- All participants included in this research were **screened to ensure they are aware of the FWCP** so they could provide feedback about the program.
- **A total of 774 interviews were conducted**, and were comprised of three key audiences: FWCP's stakeholders, First Nations, and the general public.
 - **General Population** – 641 respondents from the Coastal, Columbia, and Peace regions.
 - A mix of 412 online surveys using Insights West's *Your Insights* representative panel of Western Canadians, as well as one-on-one phone interviews (229) were used to collect the public's feedback between September 9-29, 2015.
 - **FWCP Stakeholders** – Those who have previously agreed to be contacted or have been involved with the FWCP in the past were contacted via one-on-one phone interviews between September 9 and October 9, 2015. In total, 75 stakeholders were contacted.
 - **First Nations** – Community members selected by First Nation Board Members were contacted via one-on-one phone interviews between October 1 and November 13, 2015. Although the target was for 15 people to be interviewed, only 6 were able to be conducted during this time.
- A fourth group of **self selected respondents** was also provided the opportunity to express their views. These participants were guided to the survey via the FWCP website (29 completes) and BC Wildlife Federation (20 completes) website. Cookies were enabled and email addresses reviewed to screen for duplicates. The links to the survey were active between September 9 and October 6, 2015.



Geography

- All FWCP regions were accounted for across each of the 4 research audiences.
- The following table outlines the number of interviews collected in each region among each stakeholder group.

	Columbia	Peace	Coastal
General Public	200	229	212
Stakeholders	15	40	20
First Nations	6 telephone interviews conducted		
Self Selected	17	13	12

- Significant differences between the Gen Pop regions are indicated throughout the report with the following symbols.
- Sample sizes for regional breakouts of the stakeholder and self selected groups are very small. As such, these results are only presented at a total level given the confidence interval is too large to be representative of the subgroup when broken out by region.

- ▲ Statistically significantly higher than comparison region(s)
- ▼ Statistically significantly lower than comparison region(s)






Key Highlights

- ❑ **Familiarity & Understanding:** FWCP Stakeholders claim to understand what the FWCP's objectives are and who the partners are. There is an opportunity to build awareness and familiarity among the general population.
- ❑ **Perceptions:** The FWCP is generally perceived by Stakeholders to be credible, effective, open to feedback, and open to giving support/money. However, at least one in five Stakeholders rate the FWCP low on these attributes.
- ❑ **Satisfaction & Momentum:** Stakeholders and those aware of the FWCP among the General Population are generally satisfied that the FWCP is meeting its objective to compensate for the impacts of BC Hydro Dams. Momentum is also noted to be in the right direction or the same as in previous years among these groups.
- ❑ **Self-Selected Participants:** These highly engaged individuals who have a strong opinion about the FWCP that they wanted to voice. They are the least satisfied with the FWCP overall and that the FWCP is meeting its objectives.
- ❑ **Interactions:** Those who have interacted with the FWCP in the past generally report the interactions to have been a positive experience.
- ❑ **Communications:** There is opportunity to tell more about the program. Some of the negative perceptions of the FWCP may be softened by communicating more about the Program so that Stakeholders better understand the funding selection and allocation criteria, project prioritization rationale, partner contributions, and positive project impacts.



The FWCP has strong familiarity among its Stakeholders. Familiarity is low among the General Public, even when taking into account that only those who were aware of the FWCP were included in the study. The data in this presentation only includes those who are aware of the FWCP.

FWCP Familiarity – Among those Aware of the FWCP




▲ Statistically significantly higher than comparison region(s)
▼ Statistically significantly lower than comparison region(s)



There is a desire for more information about the FWCP, and to build awareness of the program. Some of the negative perceptions of the FWCP may be reduced by building a greater understanding of the funding selection and allocation, area prioritization, partner contribution, and project impacts.

Suggestions for Improvement – Among those Aware of the FWCP




Base: All respondents aware of the FWCP *Small base size. **Very small sample size, interpret with caution.
Q9. What suggestions do you have for improving the FWCP? Results 5% and greater are shown.




Stakeholders, and those aware of the FWCP among the general population, are generally satisfied that the FWCP is meeting its objective to compensate for the impacts of BC Hydro Dams. Self-selected participants are less satisfied, likely a reason why they might appreciate the opportunity to share their opinions about the program.

FWCP Satisfaction: *Based on what you know, how satisfied are you that the FWCP is meeting this objective in your region?*



FWCP Momentum: *Over the past few years, would you say your perception of FWCP has become more, or less, favourable?*




Base: All Respondents aware of the FWCP

*Small base size, interpret with caution. **Very small sample size, interpret with caution.



Stakeholders and self-selected participants are very engaged with the FWCP. Past interactions with the FWCP have generally been positive. Some of the few that had negative interactions indicated they were brought on by difficult topics of conversation (not the person they were speaking with) or less knowledgeable FWCP representatives.

Past Interactions With The FWCP – Among those aware of the FWCP




Base: All respondents aware of the FWCP *Small base size. **Very small sample size, interpret with caution.
Q10b - Which, if any, of the following interactions have you ever had with the FWCP
Q12. How would you rate your previous experiences with FWCP?



Stakeholders have a strong understanding of the FWCP's objectives and partners. While the majority of stakeholders and those among the general public who are aware of the FWCP agree there is a good amount of FWCP compensation offered, self-selected participants are significantly less favourable in their opinion of this.

Perceptions of FWCP – Among those Aware of the FWCP




Base: All respondents aware of FWCP (n varies *Small base size **Small sample sizes, interpret with caution.
Q8. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?



Stakeholders' perceptions of the FWCP are generally positive in regards to the Program's credibility, effectiveness, openness to feedback, and offering opportunities to be involved. However, one-quarter of stakeholders do not know enough about the steps the FWCP takes towards financial responsibility & budget allocation.

Perceptions of FWCP Performance - Stakeholders



Base: All Stakeholder respondents (n=75)* *Small base size.

Q6. For each of the following areas, how well do you think the FWCP is performing?



Observations from First Nations Interviews

Given that only 6 First Nations representatives were able to participate in the research, the learnings from the First Nations interviews have not been included as part of the graphical charts and tables. The following are general learnings from these interviews. It is important to note that these are opinions of only a few, and might not reflect the entire population.

- **Familiarity with the FWCP:** There was a desire for more information of what each of the partners is bringing to the table and how they are working together. There is also a desire for more communication with the Public about the FWCP Program and what it is meant to do.
- **Project Applications:** For some, the current application model is believed to be administration intensive and is not a true partnership given they have to apply for money.
- **Project Selection:** There are perceptions that the FWCP would rather fund three small projects over one big one. Others mentioned they believe that the FWCP is missing a holistic watershed approach that crosses boundaries.
- **Distribution of Funds:** The way funds are allocated over the life of a project can make it inefficient for some projects if costs are more heavily frontloaded.



Improvement Opportunities

Offer More Communications with the General Public To Build Awareness and Familiarity with the FWCP

- Although strategic communications plans are in place, there is still a desire to know more about the Program and the great work that is being achieved. An increased level of communications with the General Public can not only help to build awareness of the FWCP, but also familiarity among those already aware.
- Strengthening familiarity with the FWCP is important because many of the issues causing negative perceptions of the FWCP may be diminished by further educating the Public, Stakeholders, and First Nations about the Program so that they better understand the funding selection and allocation, area prioritization, partner contribution, and project impacts.
- Some of the participants also believed that more should be done to improve the fish habitats and wildlife areas. However, lower familiarity with the Program means that sometimes they were thinking of areas/initiatives that fall outside of the scope of the FWCP.
- The launch of the new FWCP website may help with this issue given the wealth of information available on it that highlight the steps being taken to achieve these goals across all regions. Consider directing part of the communications to the website.



Improvement Opportunities

- Some Stakeholders, General Population members, and First Nation partners believe that the monetary amount given as compensation is not sufficient relative to the revenue that is generated from the dams. Providing further information on how the compensations levels are determined may help to improve these perceptions.
- Continue offering support to applicants throughout the process and ensure that the process is transparent. Some stakeholders believe the application process is too tedious and is not designed to allow the most impactful projects to be successful. Other concerns noted include projects that have greater up-front capital/resources requirements, or have a longer-term project scope that does not fit into the current application requirements.