

MANNING DIVERSIFIED FOREST PRODUCTS LTD.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION PLAN

Revision Submitted May 12, 2004

Revised April 22, 2004

Revised October 2, 2003

Original submission March 2002

Manning Diversified Forest Products Ltd. (MDFP)

Public Consultation Program (PCP) for the FMA0200041

Contents

	Page
1. MDFP vision of Public Consultation	3
2. History of MDFP with Public Consultation	4
3. List of Stakeholders	5
4. Focus Areas for Public Interaction	7
a) Forest Management Planning	8
b) Issues Management	12
c) Communication and Information Availability	13
5. Criteria for Success of PCP	14
6. Dispute resolution process	15
7a. Meetings held in 2002/03	16
7b. Meetings held in 2004.	17
8. Issues list. (as of October 2, 2003)	18

1. MDFP's Vision for Public Consultation in forest management

Our company harvests trees from forests that are owned by the Province and managed for the public of Alberta. The timber dispositions we have been granted allow us the rights to harvest the trees in the forest but gives us no rights to the other parts of that ecosystem. The public, through the Lands and Forest Division (LFD) of the Alberta Government, have entrusted us to manage the trees in the forest for the benefit of our company and the community as a whole. This responsibility comes with the understanding that we would operate and plan in a way that is sustainable for both the community and the biodiversity. To keep that trust we must understand the following two points.

1. The other biotic and abiotic portions of the forested area still belong to the public.
2. Sustainability is a human concept that is complex and evolving. It is therefore important to understand what the public wants at any given time.

If we lose the public trust in our ability to operate in an ecologically sustainable way, we will lose our rights to harvest the trees. For this reason, it is important that we understand what the public wants, and for the public to understand what we are doing in the forest. Two-way communication with the public is critical to keeping both the company and the public aware of each other's issues before problems escalate requiring third parties to become involved.

We consider the "public" for this planning exercise to be the Manning and Keg River area, though any other public is free to comment. This is not a large group of people and many of the leaders in the area are well known to us through this and other community events. That public is supportive of our operations, for the most part, from what we have seen in our first meetings. We want to ensure we maintain that support through this process.

MDFP's vision for public information is to maintain close contact with the stakeholders we identify. We are from a geographical area that is small in terms of population and stakeholders, so we want the public to feel comfortable in talking to us anytime, anywhere, although we will have formal meetings with the stakeholders who wish to have us present. The past history is that much of our "public information sessions" happen at the post office lobby or the hockey rink. We would like to keep it that way, as it is less formal and more from the heart.

While we hope to develop a different approach to public consultation, we must note that this is intended to be an open process where anyone is welcome to provide input. This is also an evolving process as we try new methods and see what works and what doesn't.

While this presentation discusses many aspects of how MDFP deals with the public issues, many of them have nothing to do with the forest management plan. The section on Forest Management Planning and Communication are the only sections that we are submitting for approval.

2. History of Public Consultation at MDFP

MDFP was allocated a Coniferous Timber Quota in 1993. This was a time in Alberta where forest management was center stage with the ALPAC hearings and a large amount of the forest being allocated. While this disposition did not have a requirement for a public input process, due to the times, we did start holding occasional open houses as well as meeting yearly with the Town of Manning and M.D. 22, Northern Lights. While we did not meet with the complete list of the potential stakeholders, we did visit the most public ones. I would like to think that those early meetings are one of the reasons that we have community support at this time. The open houses did not generate any interest, concerns or issues and were discontinued.

We began doing vegetation management on our cutovers in 1995. As part of this process, we are required to hold public information sessions. We had these sessions in the early years and had very low turn out. We have asked and been granted permission to advertise the program in the newspaper prior to approval every year. If sufficient interest was expressed, we would hold a public meeting. To date there has been very little public interest in this area as well. We did have a public meeting on May 22, 2003 for the vegetation management program. Once again, no public showed up.

In 1996 and 1999, we were audited by the Alberta Forest Products Association (AFPA), for Forest Care certification. A part of this audit was on the public consultation and the associated processes. MDFP was Forest Care certified both times.

Now that we have signed the Forest Management Agreement (FMA), we will continue to build on the relationships that we began a decade ago. We will continue to work towards having good, open, two-way communication with all of the stakeholders.

3. Stakeholders

Section 1 mentioned that we considered our stakeholder region to be the Keg River and Manning areas. To the best of our knowledge the list of stakeholders below covers the stakeholders and interest groups of that area. The region has few special interest stakeholders such as snowmobile clubs, fish and game associations and naturalist clubs. As such, the list of stakeholders is quite short.

There may be groups that we do not know about that come forward, or there may be others that come into existence during this process. The list is not meant to be final or complete, and is to be considered a living document. Advertisements will be placed in the Peace region newspapers mentioning that we have started a Forest Management Planning Process and that any groups or individuals wishing to provide input are welcome to contact us.

Stakeholders	Contact	Phone Number	e-mail
<u>Energy Sector (just the main players)</u> BP Amoco Pennwest Exploration Primewest Energy Bonavista Petroleum Transcanada Pipelines Transworld Oil and Gas	Ron Klatchuk Gordon Tim Dave Berge Sylvia Law Darrel Hicke	780-836-3364 403-777-3347 403-699-7324 403-514-7313 403-777-4695	 davidbe@primewestenergy.com sylvie_l@bonavistapete.com dhicke@transphillips.com
<u>Federal Government</u> Department of Fisheries and Oceans	Doug Low	618-3230	lowdo@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
<u>Metis and First Nations</u> Paddle Prairie Metis Settlement	Alden Armstrong	780-981-2227	
<u>Municipalities</u> MD 21 MD 22 Town of Manning Keg River(part of the MD 22 but still significant)	Marlene Maxwell Jim Kincaid Penny Kary No one yet	780-685-3925 780-836-3348 780-836-3606 ???	mdnorth@mdnorth22.ab.ca
<u>Provincial Government</u> Sustainable Resource Development LFD Sustainable Resource Development Fish Sustainable Resource Development Wildlife Forest Research Institute Culture Environment	Al Benson Jim Rosin Dave Moyles Ted Szabo Jack Ives Terry Sawchuk	780-624-6473 780-624-6498 780-624-6465 780-415-0013 780-624-6498	al.benson@gov.ab.ca jim.rosin@gov.ab.ca dave.moyles@gov.ab.ca ted.szabo@gov.ab.ca jack.ives@gov.ab.ca terry.sawchuk@gov.ab.ca
<u>Public at Large</u> Open public meetings	n/a	n/a	n/a
<u>Special Interest</u> Manning Board of Trade Trappers Association Various caribou committees	Ken Britton Glen Stone Ralph Woods	780-836-4045 780-836-2412 780-624-6221	ralph.woods@gov.ab.ca
<u>Timber Disposition Holders</u> Peace River Pulp Division	Wayne Thorpe	780-624-7355	wthorp@prpddmi.com

4. Focus Areas of Public Consultation

There are many ways of fostering public participation and involvement. Our company engages the local public in many ways. Some of these are aimed at particular areas such as school education while others are more general such as supporting the Forest Explorers conference. The first is targeted at helping students learn about the environment while the second is aimed at providing students, public and professionals access to the research that is done and to give the researchers a forum to share their results. We provide a list of all of the things that we do in the area of public involvement below. The sections Forest Management Planning and Communication, are the only sections that is submitted for approval under the FMA. The others are for information only.

These are required as part of the Detailed Forest Management Process. They are explained further on pages 8 to 12.

- (1) Forest Management Planning
 - a) Preliminary Forest Management Plan
 - b) Detailed Forest Management Plan
 - c) Ground Rules
 - d) GDP, AOP and Stewardship Report
- (2) Communication and Information Availability

These are other public involvement and educational items that we do, but we are submitting only as information and not for approval.

- (3) Boreal Forest Research Center
- (4) Forest Explorers
- (5) Boreal Forest Education Award
- (6) Mackenzie Forest Education Society
- (7) Forest Educators
- (8) School Tours (Grade 5 logging, Grade 6 reforestation and Grade 11/12 Ecology tours)
- (9) Miscellaneous tours and speaking sessions (Cultural history evening example)
- (10) Professional development sessions
- (11) National Forest Week
- (12) Research Trust Fund and its Website
- (13) Mill tours and other tours of our operations
- (14) Helping with Junior Forest Rangers program

As mentioned, item number 1a, 1b, 1c and 2 are the ones that are included in this document, as they require approval of the LFD.

4(a) Forest Management Planning:

Clause 10. of the FMA states:

- (1) Before the company submits a plan referred to in subparagraphs (3), (4) and (5) to the Minister for his review and approval, the Company shall:
 - (a) make the necessary arrangements required for and shall conduct public reviews of its proposed management plans ; and
 - (b) provide the opportunity for third parties holding timber quota(s) on the forest management area to participate, as specified in the forest management planning manual, in the formulation of the Company's proposed forest management plans to ensure that the long-term sustainable objectives and principles of forest management are maintained.
- (2) After these reviews with the public and timber disposition holders, the Company shall incorporate in the forest management plan its response to the concerns raised by the public and timber disposition holders respecting the proposed forest management plan and shall submit this plan to the Minister within the time specified in subparagraphs (3), (4) and (5) as the case may be for the Minister's review and approval.

The following section is our strategy to meet the intent of this clause in a way that we think will be best for the local public and our company. As stated in our Public Consultation Vision above, we are hoping to have an open dialogue with the stakeholders throughout the program. The proposal does not follow the current standard practice but we think that it will work better for us. Since it is a departure from the norm, the criteria for success are important, as they are the only way that we will be able to tell if we are achieving our goals. The criteria for success will be listed in Section 5.

As stated in the Preliminary Forest Management Plan (PFMP), the Alberta Forest Planning Manual is under revision. This plan, as well as the PFMP, is being completed with the manual approved in 1998. If the new planning manual is approved during this process, we may incorporate some of the new items, where both parties agree to the change.

The following is a summary of the phases we see in this process. These are not fixed as we expect this PCP to go through many revisions prior to the completion of the Forest Management Plan. These changes are a normal part of any long term planning process, and we expect this to be increased due to the novel process that we have.

1. Phase 1. This is the first years plan to get some feedback for the PFMP and TOR.
2. Phase 2. This is in year 2 to 5 of the FMA, to deal with the DFMP.
3. Phase 3. This is to deal with the longer term, ongoing, issues such as the AOP, GDP, performance monitoring and plan implementation.

The first two phases are linked to the Terms of Reference (TOR). The last one is mentioned in the TOR. The three phases are explained in greater detail below.

Phase 1, PFMP, (March 12, 2003).

This phase is to be implemented prior to approval of the PFMP. The objective of this stage is to identify and meet with the stakeholders. There were two main points to cover with the stakeholders.

- a) discuss our proposed approach for consultation, and
- b) ask for any issues/input they may have already

We informed them of the public information requirements of the FMA and to get some feedback on what type of process they would prefer. The following is a list of what we set out to do as well as what we have achieved to date.

- a. Get a commitment from the government as to what geographic area we have to work with. We must try to keep it as local as possible. Get approval for the list of stakeholders that we must contact. Done by verbal commitment (Sept 02) but may change if situations arise.
- b. Meet with DMI to go over our proposed public input process to get their input and to discuss any overlaps in our two processes. First meeting held, will continue. DMI has no concerns to date.
- c. Give a presentation to the stakeholders listed above letting them know about the FMA and the requirement for Public Involvement. Ask them if and how they would like to be involved. Follow up with phone calls if necessary. Major ones completed.
- d. Develop and maintain an issues list to track the issues by whom, when and why they were brought up, as well as to how the issue was resolved. A spreadsheet of the issues is Appendix 1.**

Using the input derived after the first round of presentations and our company wishes, do a rough draft of our broad management objectives and Terms of Reference for the DFMP. The drafts of the Management Objectives and the Terms Of Reference that have been submitted in this PFMP have incorporated the forest management issues identified through this process.

There are several stakeholders that were contacted that did not wish to be on the planning team. These were all of the companies listed in the Energy sector, as well as Department of Fisheries and Oceans. They wish to be kept informed of any developments that may affect them. I told them that we would forward any final documents that come out of the process and that I would let them know about any decisions that would impact them.

This stage is complete for all intents and purposes.

Phase 2, DFMP process (March 12, 2003 to March 12, 2007)

This portion will take place from March 13, 2003 to the approval of the DFMP. We will continue to visit the stakeholders directly as we develop the DFMP. We expect that this will be about a biennial event but we will be flexible depending on what the issues are and how we progress through the steps and the wishes of the various stakeholders. As we have discovered already, various stakeholders have different stages in which they are more interested. Most are more interested in the goals while others such as the trappers are more interested in the Operating Groundrules.

The first stage (by March 31, 2004) that we will bring to the stakeholders is the draft Terms of Reference submitted in the PFMP. During Phase 1 we gathered their concerns and incorporated them into the Terms of Reference. In this Phase, we will:

- a) show and explain PFMP, PCP and TOR (by September 2003) (**This is complete**)
 - a. ask about concerns and comments on PFMP, PCP and TOR (by September 2003)
 - b. how we have incorporated their concerns and see if our proposal addresses their issues.
 - c. we will again ask if they have any concerns with what has been done to date and at what stage they would like to be consulted next.
 - d. discuss LFD comments, as per May 21 letter (by September 2003)
- b) Get feedback on MDFP resource management philosophy (by September 2003)
- c) Begin developing Values, Objectives, Indicators and Targets (VOIT's)(by March 2004)
- d) Develop final VOIT's (by February, 2005)
- e) Discuss socio-economic resources (by December 2003)
- f) Discuss landbase netdown (by December 2004)
- g) Discuss timber supply
 - a. 2002 runs (by October 2003)
 - b. Round 1 runs (by October 2004)
 - c. Round 2 runs (by July 2005)
- h) Discuss implementation strategies (by August 2005)
- i) Discuss draft plan (by August 2005)
- j) Discuss final plan (by August 2006)
- k) Operating Groundrules (by October 2007)
- l) Discuss plan implementation and performance monitoring (ongoing)

Phase 3. This is the ongoing portion of the DFMP that involve the implementation, monitoring, GDP, AOP. These plans will be discussed on an ongoing, yearly basis when we have the meetings with the stakeholders. In the past, as a quota holder, these were the only planning stages that we were required to complete. Those are the plans we showed

to the stakeholders in the past. We will continue this process with the stakeholders on an annual basis, where requested.

The Stewardship report that is written by the company will be shown in some form to the stakeholders at this time.

4(b). Issues Management

The process that we have described so far outlines how we will communicate with the stakeholders and the general public. We hope that this will be both a positive method for getting issues identified, as well as a good educational opportunity. This section explains what we do with issues once they have been raised.

Due to the nature of the meetings with the stakeholders and general public, most of the issues are brought up verbally. To avoid losing the issue, we have been writing back to the stakeholder after the meeting to summarize what we think was discussed, as well as asking again if there are any issues that came up after the meetings. That letter, and any response back are used to update the issues list. The issues list is an ongoing spreadsheet that lists all of the issues that have been brought up at any point. The present list is in Section 7 below. The columns list the stakeholder, the issues brought up by that stakeholder, the date, the date of the response, the action item that we propose for that issue, whether the issue is resolved or ongoing as well as a comments section. (The list in Section 7 contains only the issues that relate to forestry or forest management. Other business issues, such as log hauling on school bus routes, are listed and dealt with elsewhere and will not be submitted to the Province.)

There may come a time when a planning team may want to meet with the stakeholder(s) to discuss an issue and possible resolutions. Experts may be required to explain and make recommendations. This will be arranged at the time depending on the team, the stakeholder and the issue.

4. (c) Communication and Information availability

Good, two way, communication is the main intent of this program. Issue identification and attempts at resolution are a close second. We suggest some methods of assessing the success or failure of this method in the next chapter of this proposal.

The one area of communication that is not present to this point is with the Provincial Government. We propose three main methods for this. The first is to inform the FMA forester of any meetings we have scheduled. They are welcome to attend any session that we have. The second is to submit our updated issues list and a report on the year's activities in the annual Stewardship Report. The FMA forester will also be involved with the Core Team and will see the Values and Objectives that are reviewed by the public.

We will offer several ways for the Province to be involved. First, they will be invited to the meetings with other stakeholders. Second, they can provide input to this plan and it may be modified to suit their needs. Third, we would meet with them at their request on any or all of the issues involved with this process. We expect that there may be some comment on the actions that we have proposed in response to issues listed on our issues spreadsheet.

The DFMP, GDP, AOP documents are public documents, but we will not be giving out free copies to anyone who wishes due to the cost and work involved. If anyone wishes to see a plan, we will initiate contact to discuss the issues. We may at that time give them copies of the pertinent sections of the plans. This process is also to make sure that they understand the plan and the context of what we have written. If copies of parts or the entire plan are requested, there may be some costs attached.

5. Measuring success

A public input process has two main purposes. The first is to improve the forest management plan using the input from the public and secondly, to let the public know what is happening on the public land. The effectiveness is quite important but difficult to measure. We suggest two focus areas to measure over time and a third that we will monitor but not measure.

The first is simply to see if we actually did what we proposed in this plan. In the three phases mentioned above for the Forest Management Planning section, we state several phases with dates. In our annual Stewardship Report (Section 5 of this PFMP) we will report on what phases we have been working on and what public consultation we have had in that regard. The information would be on whom we met when, and what we discussed. An example is in Section 5 for this years report. An updated issues spreadsheet would always be attached. This would allow for a review of what has been done as compared to what was supposed to be done. An action plan to address the shortfalls would be a part of that annual submission. This list of questions would be completed.

1. List the steps that you committed to do this year. Did you complete these tasks? How?
2. Did you document all concerns that were raised?
3. Did you respond to all of the concerns and input?
4. Is the issues list up to date?

The second success measurement would be a poll of the individuals and organizations that are on the stakeholders list. The questions posed to the stakeholders would be:

1. Did MDFP communicate with you this past year? If no, go to 2. If yes, then;
 - a. What items did they bring to you for discussion?
 - b. Did they ask for issues and input?
 - c. Did they address the issues or outline how they would look into the issues.
 - d. Are you satisfied with their public input process? If not, what would you like to see changed?
 - e. In your opinion, have they reached all of the interested stakeholders?
2. If MDFP has not included you in their communication strategy,
 - a. Do you think that MDFP should consider you a stakeholder and why?
 - b. Have they contacted you in the past?
 - c. Do you wish to be contacted? If yes,
 - d. On what issues?

The feedback from the stakeholders to these questions would lead to improvements in the process. Any concerns that come out of the questions would have to be addressed in the annual stewardship report.

6. Conflict Resolution Process

Conflict in life is inevitable. Dealing with public issues on public land will invariably lead to some conflicts. This may be between other users and/or the public and/or the FMA holder. There needs to be a plan to deal with this possibility before it happens. Allowing an issue to become a fight, or emotional issue allows things to get out of hand and cause a lot of wasted time and effort on everyone's part.

The following are a series of tools used in conflict resolution. It is not possible to predict which tools would be used in every situation, as all conflicts are a little different. The tools are listed in an order of action but some steps might be bypassed in some situations.

Good Communication: A large part of conflict resolution is to have good communication and trust. This allows conflict to be dealt with in rational manner. This is always the best place to start. We will use our public participation process to try and deal with the issues before they get out of control.

Independent expert: When conflict does occur, we may be able to resolve the issue by bringing in an independent expert on the topic that is agreeable to both parties. That expert would be asked to give some background on the issue in general as well as his opinion on the matter at hand. This would allow both sides to have a better understanding of all facets of the issue and hopefully resolve the debate with some sort of resolution. Failing that, we would go to the next step.

Mediation: In any conflict resolution process, there is option of bringing in a qualified independent individual to arbitrate the discussion. Our process does not use a facilitator as a part of the ongoing meetings. For this reason, there will be no independent person to arbitrate an issue immediately. If we cannot resolve the issue through discussion and expert opinion, we will look at bringing in a mediator. If the issue is still not resolved there are then two different options.

Documenting: The issue may simply need to be documented as part of the DFMP. A follow up in the DFMP would have to deal with the potential of the issue if either side was right and the risks associated with both opinions. The approval agencies would have to look at the matter and approve the management plan or not.

Legal Solution: Conflict resolution processes have a legal solution as the last option. We will use this option only as a last resort as it is expensive and the resolution usually pleases no one. It does need to be listed as the final option.

Any conflicts will be included in our annual Stewardship Report. If the conflict is deemed to be important, we will communicate to the Province as to what is taking place. They will be kept informed of the development of the issue.

7. Meetings held last in 2002/03

The following is a list of meetings that were held over the past year. The issues and responses are listed on the issues spreadsheet.

Date	Stakeholder	Communication
Oct. 28, 02	Paddle Pr.	Meeting with Council
Nov. 25, 02	DMI	Meeting with Wayne, Eva and Frank
Nov. 20, 02	Trappers	Meeting with group
Nov. 29, 02	MD 22	Meeting with Council
Jan. 21, 03	MD 21	Meeting with Council
Jan. 22, 03	Public	Open public meeting in Manning
March 24, 03	Trappers	Attended their AGM
June 9, 03	Paddle Pr.	Meeting with Council
June 10, 03	MD 22	Meeting with Council
June 17, 03	MD 21	Meeting with Council
June 25, 03	Town	Meeting with Council
August 18, 03	Paddle Pr.	Presented to a community meeting
Sept. 3, 03	Board of Trade	Presentation at their monthly meeting
Sept. 4, 03	Public	Joint Stakeholder meeting
Sept 30, 03	Paddle Pr.	Attended Trade Fair

7b. Meetings held in 2004

Date	Stakeholder	Communication
Jan. 19, 04	Woods Team	Presented the VOIT,s and discussed
Jan. 20, 04	MD 21	Presented the VOIT,s and discussed
Jan. 22, 04	Mill Management	Presented the VOIT,s and discussed