



HIGH LEVEL FORESTS PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Approved MINUTES

Tuesday, November 4, 2008
5:00 p.m. – Four Winds Banquet Room
High Level, Alberta

ATTENDANCE:

Jeremy Beal (CSA Coordinator)
Marilee Toews (HBSWS)
John Thurston (Chairman)
Dave Sadowsky (ASRD)

Lacey Reid (ECHO)
George Friesen (Friesen Industries Ltd.)
Les House (Paddle Prairie)
Mike Alsterlund (PAC Member)

Recording Secretary: Brenda St. Arnault

1. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 5:14pm.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Adopt Agenda as presented.

MOVED by: George Friesen

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES – October 14, 2008

Adopt Minutes as presented.

Moved by: Marilee Toews

CARRIED

4. ISSUES AND CONCERNS

4.1 Aspen decked logs

Mike: will FFP eventual lose rights on the FMA if they continue to not exercise those rights? What is the timeframe for rights to be taken away from FFP?

Action item: Dave S. to inquire with SRD regarding the above question.

Mike: will FFP lose their reduced stumpage rates of \$0.53/m³, if/when FFP starts up again prior to the planned expiry of these set stumpage rate in 2016?

Action item: Dave S. to inquire with SRD regarding the above question.

Marilee: During periods of tough times in the forest industry it has been known that such an economic climate has allowed forest companies to become better setup to take advantage when better times return. Hopefully that will not happen in High Level.

Les: Concerned that no value will remain in decked aspen while waiting for FFP to find a solution. Concerned that FFP will be allowed to operate without conditions attached or under a penalty due to wasting high volume of timber. Also concerned that decked aspen at Paddle Prairie, which was intended to be brought to FFP prior to cessation of operations, will not be worth anything and that PP Metis Settlement will be left to burden the cost.

Mike: Echoed Les' comment regarding FFP should not be allowed to operate at start up without a penalty.

Action item: Dave S to inquire with SRD regarding whether a penalty could be applied against FFP.

Marilee requested a written response from Footner Forest Products regarding the above questions/concerns and from the previous meeting, especially if a FFP employee will not be attending these meetings.

John commented that the decked aspen is a public concern and it's a situation that is on everyone's mind and we need to clarify and deal with the questions from the public.

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1. *Revision to SFM Plan for 2008/2009*

Jeremy explained that at the October meeting a list was provided of items that may be changed in the Sustainable Forest Management Plan for Tolko. At

this meeting an excerpt from the revised SFM Plan listing the Summary of Revisions was reviewed. The following captures the discussion.

Revision 3: DTAs

Mike: question asked what was meant by “annual cut levels are provided for Deciduous Timber Allocations”? Are these companies new and can they cut anywhere?

Jeremy explained the various companies have always been in the plan but that their License and volume allocation was not.

Revision 4: Ecologically significant areas

Marilee wanted clarification that the current areas identified as “ecologically significant” (Ponton River corridor and Peace River Islands) will continue to be included in this commitment and that the change is to provide an opportunity to add to these areas.

Mike asked about adding areas back into the landbase that were once identified as ecologically significant in favor of other areas for connectivity across the FMA.

Marilee clarified that we should only include areas that are ecologically significant under this commitment. .

Mike commented that he thinks we should not have removed the Ponton River corridor and Peace River Islands from the landbase.

Les House commented that the Chincanga River is important to PPMS and is one of the few rivers which PPMS consider to have been minimally impacted by oil and gas. He believes the protected buffer along the Chin should be increased.

Jeremy explained the purpose of this commitment is to identify ecologically significant areas and potentially remove them from the landbase, depending on outcomes on sensitivity analysis during the next DFMP. Areas that have been chosen were recognized as important therefore the companies decided to remove from the landbase and not include in the timber supply analysis. Likewise with future suggestions, the companies will review and provide feedback to the public and the decision to be made.

Marilee commented that herbicide spray free zones could also be considered where harvesting is being planned but due to sensitivity (ecological reasoning, recreational consideration, etc.) such silvicultural tools should be avoided. Spraying could be damaging to sensitive sites over time.

Mike said he disagrees with the notion that the companies are destroying ecosystems as harvesting is simply replacing the effects of fire. . If we keep taking landbase every year for the sake of protecting areas we consider to be ecologically significant, there will be nothing left. We need to balance out what we protect and what we harvest.

Marilee disagreed with Mike's comments and explained the areas removed along the Ponton River corridor and Peace River Islands is very small from a landbase perspective however they include areas very important to many people. Removing these areas had minimal impact on the long term sustainability of the companies, and relinquishing on areas already set aside would be a step backwards.

Revision 5: salvage harvest

John asked what is the wording being proposed by Tolko to justify reasoning for salvage / non-salvage. Jeremy read wording from amended document.

Revision 6: business agreements

Jeremy explained that we have agreements currently in place with other companies and the revision provides for seeking further strategies to maximize benefits to other timber operators.

Revision 11: Aboriginal Consultation

Jeremy stated that regular community meetings which have taken place over the last few years have yielded few results compared to the effort involved. As a way to inform FNs of our annual plans prior to consultation focused meetings Tolko is providing FNs with a First Nation Supplemental Information Package that explains our plans ahead of consultation efforts.

Marilee commented on the wording does not indicate that the document will be followed up by a visit. Jeremy said that intent is to continue to contact Council for consultation regarding plans with the anticipation of holding meetings if the FN requests.

Mike asked if Tolko considered going to communities and attending Chief and Council meetings and bring staff along to explain the document. Jeremy explained that there have been meetings with Chief and Council and community members (eg., LRRCN recent meetings).

5.2. Annual SFM Performance Review

Jeremy presented annual SFM performance review by commitment number;

8 Wildlife Zones

Marilee asked for a glossary of all the acronyms of compartments and for other items as it would be a good idea to provide one for people that don't know them.

Action Item: Jeremy to provide glossary of abbreviations to committee.

#9 Orchard Stock

Marilee commented that in Jeremy's explanation of this commitment that additional background information was provided which is not included in the Objective. Marilee suggested that the company should explicitly state that cones are gathered locally, seed extracted, seedlings grown, and then planted on the FMA to maintain genetics. As a result the companies are able to keep orchard stock to <25%.

#11

Marilee asked who does the identifying area of biological significance? Jeremy indicated that either staff or Government representatives would let us know.

#12

John commented on the Watt Mountain Natural Area; the area is of interest to him. John was hiking with his wife this summer and he was surprised to come across an area that was ribboned off which he believed to be for cutblocks and roads. Jeremy was not aware of this, however John did express his concern to Ed at Tolko, who informed John partial harvesting was proposed which is allowed in the WMNA. John requested that it would be good to consult with people that are interested in the MWNA. John asked that this be reported back to the committee on what was planned for the area.

Action Item: Jeremy to provide committee with a response about the plans for harvesting at WMNA.

Marilee exited meeting @ 7:00 pm

#17

Mike asked question regarding the commitment for the Growth and Yield program; is it to determine the growth of trees or is it to determine soil depletion/production? Mike is concerned that if we are not checking soil analyses from natural stands and from cutovers, how is Tolko going to determine the nutrient depletion following harvesting? Jeremy responded that yes the commitment is identified as Soil Productivity, however the focus is on whether future growth will be affected (+ or -) by harvesting activity, and not looking strictly at soil nutrient levels. Both agreed to put question aside for the time being.

#24 Periodic Cut Control – Quota Holders

With reference to table shown in presentation, Mike asked question regarding volume harvested by DMI: did it go to Footner Forest Products and if so did it get charged to Footner Forest Products? Dave answered that the volume that was cut to access for conifer (roads, landings, incidental take) was

charged to DMI (ie., stumpage to be paid), and the entire volume of incidental aspen in Tolko's plans was charged against DMI's cut.

5.3. *Letter of invitation*

A letter of invitation intended to invite stakeholders to the PAC was provided to Marilee at the October meeting for review and comment. During this meeting the letter was reviewed by committee, changes made and will be available at Tolko for signature by the Chair.

Marilee wanted the letter to show independence by the PAC from the companies, and to clarify the role the PAC follows.

List of organizations will be determined by Tolko and then the letters will be mailed following signing by John.

5.4. *Online Survey*

For those that were not at the October meeting the companies will be using a survey created on www.surveymonkey.com to get feedback on the PAC and other items applicable to our public involvement plan. Email notification will be sent when the survey is finalized for completion.

6. **OLD BUSINESS**

6.1 *Clipping Service (J. Beal)*

Jeremy B. distributed the latest news clippings (15) to the PAC members.

7. **CORRESPONDENCE / REPORTS**

Survey from 2008 Trade show was handed out.

8. **AROUND THE TABLE**

John thanked Les House for attending meeting and hopes to see him more often.

John requested that a visitor information package be made available at each meeting.

Action Item: Jeremy to provide visitor package for PAC attendees. Will report back at next meeting.

John would like Tolko to know that teachers in Rocky Lane do not see it worthwhile for their students to apply for Tolko's bursary when it is perceived it will always go to a HLPS graduate, and there is a perception a high school teacher from HL was on the awarding committee. John would like a response from Tolko on this.

Action Item: Jeremy to receive response from Tolko.

George commented on GPS units being used in their bunchers and front line CATS and how interesting it is to use them. Invited PAC members to go to Friesen's camp during the winter operation and view equipment.

Dave commented he will look for answers to questions Mike had regarding FFP's situation.

9. NEXT MEETING – December 2, 2008, 5:00 pm
Four Winds Banquet Room

10. ADJOURNMENT – 8:00 pm