



HIGH LEVEL FORESTS PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

“DRAFT” MINUTES

Tuesday, December 7, 2010

5:00 pm - Four Winds Hotel, Banquet Room
High Level, Alberta

ATTENDANCE:

Jeremy Beal (CSA Coordinator)
Jon Goertzen (LaCrete Forestry)
Marilee Toews (HBSWS)
Teresa Griffith
Paul Catt (WMWA)

Aaron Doepel (LaCrete Sawmills)
Scott Miller (LRRF)
Joy Friesen (HBSWS)
Mayor Peter Ernst (HL)
Steve Butler (WMWA)

Recording Secretary: Brenda St. Arnault

1. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 5:10 pm

2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS (meal)

Introductions made from guests attending meeting.

Jeremy provided overview of the intent of the meeting and the proposed revised process and what to accomplish this evening.

3. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

4. NEW BUSINESS

4.1. Overview – 30,000 foot level – Public Involvement Process

Handouts of presentation were provided to attendees in order for them to follow along, and the presentation will be posted on the external public website

www.highlevelwoodlands.com under Public Participation\Public Advisory Committee for the public to view.

Questions/comments during presentation:

Aaron – The Defined Forest Area excludes FMU F01, but how can we include the conifer portion of that unit under our certification?

Jeremy – F01 is part of DMIs FMA and not within our scope, similar to our quotas in P10 and F14.

Jeremy - Various stakeholders including First Nations, O&G, local government, Chambers, etc., were included in the general invite all of tonight's attendees received. Invitations will be on-going.

Joy F. - Are the ground rules also decided by the public or is it just Tolko and government that make the decisions?

Jeremy B. – The public has an indirect involvement in the Ground Rules. Because the public has input in the Detailed Forest Management Plan, and the Ground Rules are meant to allow implementation of the Plan, the public can take credit for being involved.

Teresa - What is a non-timber value?

Jeremy B. - Anything that is not timber ... wildlife, scenery, habitat, etc.

Marilee – emphasized that the companies (Tolko & FFP) moved towards certification as a result of customer and public pressure.

Joy - Who does QMI answer to? What do they have to do to get in the position where they can audit?

Jeremy – QMI is a registering body to multiple certifications. Ultimately they need to prove their clients meet the certification Standard but I will need to inquire how their business is monitored. Their Auditors are held accountable through an “auditor association” but I will ask about QMI.

ACTION: Jeremy to inquire.

Marilee – With regards to the role of the public process, if the focus of the committee is now going to be predominantly sustainable forest management, where do the issues, that may not be SFM but do have value to the stakeholders attending these meeting, get discussed? There has been proven benefit and results of discussing non-SFM issues at this committee in order to give those

attending a place for drawing attention to issues that may not be forest company focused.

Jeremy B. - There is a proposed adjustment in the Terms of Reference that details how the topic will be handled. If the item is considered not to be SFM or tied to the Defined Forest Area it may be decided the topic needs to be discussed elsewhere and information will be provided to the stakeholder of who to contact, etc.

Marilee T. - Were these guidelines put in place from the Government or is it from the public?

Jeremy B. - These guidelines for the Terms of Reference is from the CSA Standard that provides an overview of how a public process can be structured.

Marilee T. - How can we maintain an interest with the group when there is such a change in the process when dealing with issues?

Marilee provided examples of various issues & resulting decisions that have developed over the years with the PAC, and it is something that would like to continue to involve in the process and not lose.

Jeremy – If you really look at what SFM covers, it is a very broad subject that would cover many of the topics stakeholders will bring forward. From protected areas to biodiversity, communities, First Nations, wildlife, recreation, etc., many things are covered. However, we will not devote much time to discuss topics that are not within the companies control such as, quality of steel within the Boyer river bridge, salvage volume, private wood, etc.

Joy – mentioned that there needs to be value in the process and members don't want to leave thinking it is a rubber stamp process and the companies are controlling everything.

Jeremy – the process involves the equal exchange of information between companies and stakeholders. Participants that may leave thinking the process is a rubber stamp may not be contributing in the process then critique it afterwards, or, the participant's issues are quite a bit different than the scope of the committee therefore they might be at the wrong venue.

Mayor Ernst. - Provide an example of what it means by "the company is to provide SFM related information"?

Jeremy B. – The companies will provide information on SFM through presentations, such as what is happening this evening, through the clipping service, etc, or through presentations by guest speakers for various topics that relate to our area. Information provided to stakeholder group to assist with

understanding of forestry issues/topics, and for decisions around forestry related management targets that will need to be created when discussing VOITs.

With regards to previous VOIT creation Marilee commented that when she was on the PAC over 5 years ago that due to the complexity of the topics being discussed and the little information of what targets should be at the local level, there were only 2 people left on the committee: Marilee and company rep.

4.2. Review Terms of Reference

Mayor Ernst – Considering that the group has only received this document at this meeting, recommended that group take the document home to review and come with an informed understanding for the next meeting when we can delve into the details.

Consensus amongst the committee it was a good idea to delay making decisions on the ToR.

Instead of detailed review line by line Jeremy provided a quick overview of the reason why items have changed.

Discussion on wording around “invited stakeholder”. Suggestion that wording needs to change.

Mayor Ernst: Suggested that invitation be sent to stakeholder listing again with the DRAFT Terms of Reference ahead of the next meeting.

Joy – asked what was meant by members will “select topics to discuss that are within the Company’s ability to control or influence...”?

Jeremy – New process on Page 5 should how Topics will be resolved. If not applicable then topic will not be discussed.

Marilee – Concern about losing the ability to discuss topics that are not SFM or DFA related. Commented on the reason why the Hungry Bend society had joined PAC. Pressure to harvest Hungry Bend Sandhills by small mills in F11 was alleviated by Tolko working with small mills after issue was brought forward at the PAC meeting.

Jeremy – many broader landscape issues and local mill volume requirements fall under the heading of SFM or DFA, therefore many topics could be discussed at the table.

Mileage compensation will be removed from the ToR.

Aaron - Will there be compensation for a Facilitator?

Jeremy – Yes.

Marilee – will the companies be acknowledging the years of service John Thurston provided to the PAC?

Jeremy will be working on something for him.

5. AROUND THE TABLE

Steve / Paul – were curious what this committee is about and were surprised to find out this was the PAC. They are glad to be part of the process.

Marilee: requested list of persons at Tolko – Woodlands as the list she has is outdated

Scott M. – Cautioned the companies on narrowing the scope of the process to the exclusion of stakeholders who want to come and share their interests.

Jon - as a contractor for Tolko and small mills in La Crete he would like to be aware and learn about the process

Jeremy B.: If anyone knows of a person that could be a good Facilitator please forward along their name.

6. NEXT MEETING – January 11, 2011, 5pm

7. ADJOURNMENT – 7:53 pm