

PAG Meeting

Fairview College, December 9, 2003

Attendance:

Mike Alsterlund – Public

Marilee Toews – Hungry Bend Sandhills

Marcel LeCoure – Tolko Industries Ltd.

George Friesen – Friesen Logging Ltd.

Byron Grundberg – Facilitator

Clint Soltys – Tolko Industries Ltd.

Ted Edwards – Land & Forest Division

1. Introduction

2. Administrative Items

- Review of the November 12th Public Advisory Group (PAG) meeting minutes
 - The only question regarding the meeting minutes was under Section 2 (5th Bullet) as it was a little confusing. If we remove the word “that” it would make the sentence clearer.
- With that particular item being the only change, a motion was made to accept the minutes as presented. The group agreed.
- A number of documents were distributed to the group:
 - December 9th meeting agenda
 - Draft Annex Table (December 1st version)
 - Draft Glossary of Terms (December 1 version)
 - Both the Draft Annex Table and Glossary of Terms included the “Track Changes” Option to more easily identify changes to the documents since the November 12th meeting.
- Honorarium Donations
 - As outlined in the PAG Terms of Reference, each individual participating in the process will receive mileage compensation for each meeting that was attended. This *Honararium* will be in the form of a cheque and each member can either receive the cheque personally or can make a donation to a charitable donation with the funds.
 - Marcel will contact members individually about how to handle their individual compensation.

3. Review Public Involvement Initiatives

- Since the last meeting (November 12th), there have been a number of initiatives to get input on the Annex Table. Some of these include:
 - 1 on 1 Meetings: Marcel met with Jordan Johnston earlier in November to review progress on the Annex Table, as he was unable to attend some of the recent PAG meetings. Some of Jordan’s comments have been highlighted in the December 1 Annex Table for review tonight.
 - Marcel also met with Derek Downey (Forest Protection Division) to discuss the proposed coarse woody debris (CWD) targets that have been incorporated into the Annex. Although there are changes in policy regarding CWD retention, our commitment of 5% retention should be in compliance.
 - Community Presentations:
 - On December 3rd, 4th, and 5th, community presentations were held in Rainbow Lake, High Level, and LaCrete respectively.
 - Attendance was dismal (2 people in Rainbow Lake, 1 in High Level, and 0 in LaCrete)
 - Marcel distributed the information package that was available for those in attendance. This package included the presentation itself, as well as the December 1 versions of both the Annex Table and Glossary of Terms.
 - Open Houses:
 - Open Houses have been ongoing in the last week. Assumption, Meander River, and Paddle Prairie have been completed to date.
 - John D’Or Prairie and North Tall Cree remain
 - Getting the message out has always been an issue, no matter what the subject
 - Marilee suggested that the Companies pursue the local Chambers of Commerce etc.

4. Review Draft Annex Table

- Marcel indicated that review of the Annex Table (December 1 version) has been completed in its entirety. It is the intent of the Companies to once again review the table tonight and determine

any outstanding items that we need to address, as well as review some of the changes (mostly editorial) made since the last meeting.

- Most of the proposed changes were acceptable to the group with the exception of the following:
 - 1.2.1a-2
 - a member of the group suggested that our retention trees are primarily in the form of patches which has been revised and reflected in the December 11 version of the Annex Table.
 - 1-2-1a-3
 - With regards to the 5% CWD target, we need to clearly indicate that this will be measured across the landscape and not at the cutblock level.
 - 2.1.1a
 - It was suggested by the group that we remove the phrase "...or susceptible.." from the target. Although the Companies will remain aggressive at implementing strategies to minimize impacts to spruce budworm, the target of 15% will only take into account volume currently impacted by the insect.
 - 3.1.1a-3
 - Soil Productivity
 - There was a considerable amount of discussion regarding soil productivity and its ability to be a measurable indicator.
 - There was some concern at the last meeting as to whether or not indicator plants would be a good indicator of soil productivity. A member of the public proposed that we measure timber productivity in managed stands in comparison to unmanaged stands, :however, other members voiced their concerns that this still does not address the soil productivity directly.
 - Reporting on actual soil characteristics (pre and post harvest) as was suggested at the last meeting seems impractical. Which soil characteristics should be measured? How large a sample size is sufficient? How often would they need to be completed? When a series of individual soil characteristics do change who will interpret the net impact on soil productivity?
 - To address the concern regarding the long-term effects of harvesting on soil productivity, the Companies agreed that as a means of achieving the objective and target, they would continue to participate in and/or support research initiatives in the area of soil productivity (See December 11th version of the Annex Table)
 - 4.1.1a-1
 - Reforestation Activities
 - The group agreed that we needed to change the Acceptable Variance to "No variance is acceptable unless approved by ASRD".
 - 5.2
 - There was discussion regarding local employment and whether or not the wording in the "Target" regarding local and Aboriginal businesses was required. Aboriginal businesses are specifically mentioned in the Value. In addition, the definition of local that is in the glossary specifically includes all of the First Nations communities in the vicinity. Therefore, the group felt that it was redundant to include the words " and/or Aboriginal" in the target.
 - During a recent Open House in Meander River, one of those individuals in attendance suggested that when the companies are operating near the community, then potential employment opportunities should be explored. Marcel agreed to adding a bullet to Means of Achieving Objective & Target that would further reinforce the encouragement of employment opportunities for Aboriginal workers. The group agreed in principle to draft wording to be incorporated into the final version of the Annex Table.
 - 6.2.1
 - The incorporation of "Develop SOP's to address areas of historical, cultural, and/or archaeological significance found during operations addressed the concerns from the group during the November 12th meeting

Additional Items:

- Mixedwood Management:
 - There was a concern addressed regarding the concept of Mixedwood Management and whether or not it can be included in the Annex Table.
 - There are existing commitments within the Annex Table i.e. Regeneration Standards etc., however there are also commitments in the DFMP by the Companies to develop Model II Regeneration Standards before the next submission of the DFMP.
- FSC vs. CSA (Differences?)
 - A member of the group asked whether there were significant differences between certification under CSA versus FSC. A brief discussion of different certification standards occurred. There is probably more common ground between certification standards than there are differences but, depending on your perspective, the differences may be significant. CSA is the only SFM certification developed by an independent standards organization. ForestCare and SFI were primarily developed by forest industry organizations. FSC was primarily developed by environmental groups.

5. Other

- What happens next?
 - One of the PAG members indicated that he was under the impression that the group would actually be “signing off” the Annex table.
 - Byron and Marcel discussed this prior to the meeting. The Terms of Reference don’t provide specific guidelines about “sign off” (how many participants should sign off?) As long as the meeting minutes have been ratified, then our attempt to reach consensus on each of the components has been achieved. The exception to this would be for the few items that we as a group could not receive consensus on but these items are clearly identified in the meeting minutes
 - Now that the Annex Table has been completed, development of the SFM Plan can now be initiated, as long as the changes made tonight are reflected in the Annex Table.
 - Marcel is to complete the meeting minutes, as well as the revised Annex Table by Friday December 12th for distribution to the group for review.
 - Schedule for events are preliminary, however are tentative as follows:
 - February 1st – Draft SFM Plan completed.
 - February 17th – Draft SFM Plan to be reviewed at a PAG meeting.
 - February 17th – March 1st – SFM Plan to be placed on the www.highlevelcsa.com website for review and input.
 - Early March – Community Presentation to “kick-off” the implementation of the plan.
- Marcel thanked the group for their time and efforts into this process and encouraged their ongoing input.

6. Next Meeting

- Next meeting , 5:00pm February 17th, 2004 High Level Fairview College