



**Spray Lake Sawmills**

## Detailed Forest Management Plan 2001 – 2026

### Chapter 4 – Requirement for Public Involvement



December 15, 2006

## Chapter 4 - Summary of Requirement for Public Involvement

Under the provisions of the FMA Agreement Section 10, Item (1) and (2) Spray Lake Sawmills was required to conduct public reviews of their proposed DFMP prior to submission to the Crown.

A public advisory group (PAG) was formed in July 2002 to meet the requirements for the FMA Agreement. Representatives from the ranching community, community timber use holders, guiding, outfitting & trapping, motorized recreation, environmental/non-motorized recreation, environmental, industrial and municipality representatives as well as Sustainable Resource Development were represented.

The PAG group met throughout 2002, 2003 and 2004. Over that period they identified issues associated with the DFMP and developed strategies for gathering public input. The following is a summary of events and activities: (For a detailed list see the attached tables).

- Development of the Terms of Reference.
- On-going review of the Interim Management Objectives and Strategies.
- In March 2003 with input from the PAG SLS launched a public involvement website as a tool to gather and communicate with interested stakeholders throughout the process.
- A questionnaire and information package was developed in June 2003 and distributed to 444 stakeholders. The Committee reviewed the responses and developed strategies to deal with the issues.
- Open houses were held May 10 and 17, 2003 over the three days 24 stakeholders attended.
- Presentations were given to interest groups, stakeholders, government and municipalities throughout 2002, 2003 and 2004.
- A workshop was held October 29, 2003. Invitations were sent to 40 potential participants, 35 confirmed and 21 attended the workshop. Tesera facilitated the one-day workshop and prepared a summary report. The Committee reviewed the report, made revisions as required and approved it. The report was posted on the SLS website and an email was sent to participants advising them accordingly.
- Open houses were held May 4<sup>th</sup> in Black Diamond, May 5<sup>th</sup> in Cochrane and May 6<sup>th</sup> in Water Valley. A total of 44 attended the open houses.
- Regular progress reports were submitted to SRD on April 7, 2003, September 2, 2003 and April 5, 2004.
- At the June 15, 2004 PAG meeting the M.D. of Bighorn attended the meeting and gave a presentation of their concerns to the group.
- Throughout the Planning Review Team meetings SLS kept the PAG group updated on their progress.
- All the feedback received to date was summarized and reviewed by the PAG group. (See the attached tables).

Hundreds of stakeholders contributed comments through a variety of different venues, from questionnaires, advisory committees, workshops, open houses, direct correspondence and conversations. The feedback SLS received from all these venues was summarized and where possible incorporated into the plan's development. Not all the feedback applies to the DFMP but all the comments were addressed. Names were not included in the summaries to protect the participant's privacy.

Media advertisements were posted in local and rural newspapers throughout 2003 and 2004 to advise stakeholders of the process and seek public input.

On May 14, 2003 SRD sent registered letters to the First Nations requesting their input. No responses were received.

The Public Advisory Group met on June 15, 2004, September 23, 2004, October 7, 2004 and October 26, 2004 to review the DFMP. The Committee agreed to discuss a future public involvement role once the DFMP was submitted.

Spray Lake Sawmills Detailed Forest Management Plan for our Forest Management area was submitted to Sustainable Resource Development for approval in November 2004.

Following the November 4, 2004 DFMP submission Spray Lake Sawmills gave presentations to several different stakeholder groups to help them abreast of the plans contents and development/approval status. Presentations included several area municipalities, oil and gas companies and the Ghost River Watershed Alliance.

With receipt of SRD's decision document in April of 2005 a revised terms-of-reference for a continuance of the public involvement process was developed. The primary focus was to provide a minimum six week review period for stakeholders to review the completed plan in its entirety.

Events and activities arising out of the new terms-of-reference through to the DFMP's final submission are outlined as follows:

- Review sessions and ongoing meetings were held with embedded quota holders and permittees in order to finalize sequencing locations for their operations
- Aboriginal – a presentation was made to the Siksika. While they expressed interest they did not feel they had the capacity to provide comment. The Piikani's interest was contained to the C5 management unit and not Spray Lake Sawmill's FMA. ASRD send another round of letters to the Stoney and Piikani. No Response.
- Several meetings were held with the Public Advisory Group to review the revised terms-of-reference and various chapters as they were revised.
- A series of four workshops were held with the ranching community to solicit feedback on draft #3 of the SRD's Grazing Timber Integration policy and manual and to ask them to identify stands on the proposed sequencing map which may

have possible areas of conflict. Invitations to these workshops were extended to all ranchers overlapping the DFMP planning area.

- A workshop was held to review the final DFMP submission package with the same group of stakeholders that were part of the Workshop from October 2003. This workshop was by invitation. Attendees were each provided a CD of the plan to take home for further review.
- An advertised open house was held to present a mixture of display material and hard copies of the assembled DFMP package.
- Stakeholders were invited to further review and provide comments on the plans that were made available through SLS' office in Cochrane, SRD's offices in Calgary and Sundre, and community libraries adjacent to the FMA.
- The DFMP package was posted on the company's website.

**Spray Lake Sawmills**  
**HIGHLIGHT OF ACTIVITIES**  
**For the period July 04, 2002 to August 28, 2006**

---

**December 15, 2006**

- Developed and finalized Terms of Reference for the Public Involvement Process
- Developed Website – now up and running effective March 03, 2003  
[www.spraylakesawmills.com](http://www.spraylakesawmills.com)
- Developed Issues and Values List
- Developed Tools List (attached)
- Developed Table “Issue List/Grouping of Issues/Application of Tools for Gathering Input” (attached)
- Determined PAG member participation on the various initiatives
- Set timelines and deadline dates for making recommendations from the various groups (see GANTT chart)
- Internal Survey to gauge PAG members’ level of satisfaction with the process (summary attached)
- Terms of Reference for the Access Management Working Group
- Terms of Reference for the Water Quality & Quantity and Fisheries Resources
  - Invited participants to the above two working groups
- Terms of Reference for the three Workshops:
  - Wilderness Values & Aesthetic Values
  - Biodiversity & Wildlife Habitat Supply
  - Adaptive Management & Research/Monitoring/Reporting
  - Invited participants to the above three workshops
- See attached “Issues List/Grouping of Issues/Application of Tools for Gathering Input” for various upcoming events i.e. Open Houses, Workshops, etc. and associated timelines
- Objectives regarding the Community Timber Program were presented and discussed.
- Discussed the Interim Management Objectives and Strategies.
- A presentation of Spray Lake Sawmills Timber Supply Analysis was made to the Committee.
- The public involvement letter and survey were mailed June 3, 2003 to approximately 444 stakeholders. Of the questionnaires sent out SLS received 27 responses via mail, fax, e-mail and the website.
- Ed Kulcsar gave a presentation on June 11, 2003 to the Bow River Basin Council.
- Ed Kulcsar attended a lunch meeting on September 19, 2003 with CPAWS representatives specific to the DFMP public involvement/development process.
- Ed Kulcsar gave a presentation to the Alberta United Recreationists Society on October 14, 2003.
- A Public Involvement Workshop was held October 29, 2003. Invitations were sent to over 40 potential participants, 35 confirmed and 21 participants attended the workshop. On December 8, 2003 an email was sent to participants advising them the results of the workshop were posted on the SLS website.
- Gord Lehn gave a presentation to the Kananaskis Improvement District on December 2, 2003.
- Gord Lehn and Rick Blackwood gave a presentation to the Ghost and Waiparous Area Residents on December 16, 2003.
- Gord Lehn gave a presentation to the Calgary Field Naturalists on January 21, 2004.
- Public Involvement updates were posted in newspaper’s throughout 2003 and 2004:
  - March 11, 2003 – Development of a DFMP
  - April 30, 2003 – National Forestry Week Open Houses
  - August 19, 2003 – Public Update
  - August 20, 2003 – Public Update

**For the period July 04, 2002 to August 28, 2006**

---

- August 26, 2003 – Public Update
- January 21, 2004 – Public Input Thank You
- Tjerk Huisman gave a DFMP update to the Elbow Valley Watershed Partnership on February 25, 2004.
- Public involvement updates and the announcement for the open houses were posted in newspapers:
  - February 17, 2004 – Public Update
  - April 21, 2004 – Open Houses (May 4, 5, & 6, 2004) notices were posted in the Cochrane Eagle, High River Times, Diamond Valley Scoop and the Sundre Round Up.
  - Presentation by Gord Lehn to RMFRA AGM Meeting, May 4, 2004.
- Presentation to North CTP holders, July 12, 2004.
- Presentation to Rotary Club of Calgary, August 17, 2004.
- Gord Lehn met with Rob Simieritsch from CPAWS on Tuesday, September 14<sup>th</sup>.
- The public advisory group submitted regular progress reports to SRD to keep them updated on the process and activities of the group. These progress reports were approved by the public advisory group and submitted to SRD on April 7, 2003, September 2, 2003 and April 5, 2004.
- SLS met with the Ghost CTP Holders on October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2004 to discuss the concerns raised in their letter to SRD. They advised the wording in their letter was incorrect; they were not concerned about the DFMP process but rather the sequencing issue. SLS agreed to meet with them to rollout the sequencing.
- SLS met with the Ghost CTP Holders on October 21<sup>st</sup>, 2004 and reviewed the sequencing. No major issues or concerns were raised.
- Meetings were held with the Public Advisory Group on October 7, 2004 and 26, 2004 as part of the lead up preparation for the November 4, 2004 submission
- Developed and finalized an addendum to the previously approved Terms-of-Reference for the Public Involvement Process.
- Several presentations were given by Ed K and Gord L to different stakeholder groups as a briefing to what had been submitted in the November 04, 2004 plan.
  - December 13, 2004 – Ghost River Watershed Alliance
  - January 17, 2005 – Oil & Gas companies, (Shell, Husky, Petro-Can)
  - February 7, 2004 – Municipalities (City of Calgary, Town of Cochrane, MD Bighorn, Kananaskis ID, Village of Waiparous).
- Embedded quota and permit holders – ongoing meetings were held with both the north and south groups to help solidify sequencing to the satisfaction of all sides. A joint field validation exercise was conducted with the north group to assist with the sequencing process. The south group opted to go through this exercise on their own. SLS provided all parties with the required maps.
- Aboriginal – Ed K and Gord L gave a DFMP presentation to the Siksika on October 25, 2005. Rick Blackwood was also in attendance. While the Siksika expressed an interest they did not feel they had the in-house capacity to provide a meaningful review. Requests for funding have been made to the Alberta Government to assist them in this regard. Further meetings are anticipated between SRD representatives and the Siksika.
- Aboriginal – Several “relationship building” meetings have been held with the Piikani. They indicated that their interests were in the C5 management unit and not SLS’s FMA.
- Aboriginal – SRD had sent another letter of invitation to the Stoney, which, at the time of this writing, had not yet been responded to.

- Three PAG meetings were held between July 6, 2005 and April 17, 2006. The primary focus of these meetings was to review and solicit feedback on various updated chapters of the DFMP as they were finalized and to gather their advice on recommended review strategies for the broader public during the six week review period during May/June.
- Ed K and Gord L provided a second DFMP review session with the Ghost River Watershed Alliance on November 23, 2005
- Four workshops were held, by invitation, for all ranching operations overlapping the DFMP planning area.

- March 6, 2006 at Longview
- March 7, 2006 at Cochrane
- March 7, 2006 at Sundre
- March 31, 2006 at Cochrane

There were two agenda items for each workshop. First, to review the Provincial Grazing Timber Integration manual, draft 3, and invite feedback. Second, to review proposed harvest sequence maps and ask them to mark any stands they felt might have operational integration issues requiring a GTA (Grazing & Timber Agreement).

- May 10, 2006, stakeholder workshop, by invitation, in Cochrane. Invitees to this workshop were similar to the guest list from the October 2003 workshop. The intent of this workshop was to “close the loop” with the original group which provided input on issues/objectives. Participants were provided take home copies of the plan in CD format.
- May 11, 2006, open house in Cochrane. This was an advertised open house in Cochrane open to the general public. Poster displays were available to view as well as six hard copy versions of the completed plan.
- Copies of the plan were made available for general viewing at SLS’s office in Cochrane, SRD offices in Calgary and Sundre, and Public libraries in Black Diamond, Cochrane and Sundre.
- Media adds were placed as follows:
  - February 2, 2005 – soliciting public input
  - April 27, 2005 – advertising open house at SLS for May 4, 2005
  - January 11, 2006 – add seeking public input
  - April 11, 2006 – advertising open houses at SLS, Cochrane on May 4, 2006 and SLS, Blairmore, on May 3, 2006
  - April 20, 2006 – advertising DFMP open house in Cochrane for May 11, 2006
- June 23, 2006 a PAG meeting was held to review the recent reaction from the public on the DFMP public review process.
- July 19, 2006 a presentation was made to the Tsuu T’ina Council, arranged with Bryce Starlight.
- August 28, 2006 a PAG meeting was held to review the feedback received from the DFMP public review process. SLS also advised the group the DFMP submission was delayed until September 30, 2006 because of the MPB susceptibility model.

**CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS**  
**Semi-Annual Report**  
**Spray Lake Sawmills**

**Development of a Detailed Forest Management Plan**  
**Public Involvement Process**  
**August 28, 2006**

<b>DATE</b>	<b>EVENT</b>	<b>ABSTRACT (if any)</b>
July 04, 2002	Initial Meeting	<p>PAG members reviewed the information package provided to them. Included in the information package are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal for a Public Involvement Process for Development of a Detailed Forest Management Plan</li> <li>• Executive Summary, Public Involvement Process for Development of a Detailed Forest Management Plan</li> <li>• Forest Management Agreement (O.C. 284/2001)</li> <li>• Interim Forest Management Planning Manual Guidelines to Plan Development Version: April 1998 (LFD)</li> <li>• Interim Forest Management Planning Manual Supplemental Guidelines-Timber Supply Analysis Documentation Requirements Version: April, 1998 (LFD)</li> <li>• Series of Newspaper articles that ran in the Fall 2001 to January 2002</li> <li>• Detailed Forest Management Plan Terms of Reference</li> <li>• GANTT Chart detailing the timelines of the process</li> </ul> <p>Additional information is also made available to the PAG members such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timber Management Regulations</li> <li>• Forest Act</li> <li>• Timber Harvest Planning &amp; Operating Ground Rules</li> <li>• Water Act</li> <li>• Fisheries Act</li> <li>• Navigable Waters Works Regulations</li> <li>• Navigable Waters Bridges Regulations</li> </ul>
August 27/28/29, 2002	ForestCare Audit	5 PAG members acted as "Observers" throughout Spray Lake Sawmills (1980) Ltd. ForestCare Certification audit.
September 09, 2002	Smart Skills Session	PAG members participated in a The Rhode's Thinking-Intentions Profile to determine personalities and styles within the PAG group.
September 22, 2002	Helicopter Tour	PAG members were given a helicopter tour of the FMA area.
October 7, 2002	PAG Meeting	<p>The October 7, 2002 Public Advisory Group Meeting included the review and finalization of the Terms of Reference for the Public Involvement Process together with the strategy for monitoring the effectiveness of the Public Involvement Process.</p> <p>The PAG were also presented the Terms of Reference for the Detailed Forest Management Plan by Ed Kulcsar. The ForestCare audit results were also reviewed.</p>
October 25, 2002	PAG Meeting	<p>As a starting point for the identification of issues and their associated action plans for the DFMP, the Advisory Group was given a summary presentation of the Interim Management Objectives and Strategies from the company's Preliminary Forest Management Plan. The Public Advisory Group (PAG) will be spending the next couple of meetings consolidating an issues list and strategies for dealing with them.</p> <p>The PAG also spent a bit of time finalizing some of the administrative aspects of the Public Involvement Process - Terms of Reference. This included such things as formatting and distribution of minutes, website development, format for reporting progress to the Land and Forest Service, upcoming PAG information sharing sessions and future meetings.</p>
November 07, 2002	PAG Meeting	No Quorum
December 13, 2002	PAG Meeting	The December 13, 2002 Public Advisory Group meeting included discussion around a number of general update and information sharing topics: development of an updated SLS website for gathering public comments, update on the City of Calgary's interest in management plan development, discussion of resource management issues requiring input, discussions dealing with developing action plans around the various issues.

**CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS**  
**Semi-Annual Report**  
**Spray Lake Sawmills**

**Development of a Detailed Forest Management Plan**  
**Public Involvement Process**  
**August 28, 2006**

DATE	EVENT	ABSTRACT (if any)
		Action items agreed to at the end of the meeting were for Judy Stewart to prepare a draft sample of a terms of reference for a working group and for Gord Lehn to prepare a write-up of a “tools” list and accompanying issues.
January 10, 2003	PAG Meeting	The January 10, 2003 Public Advisory Group meeting involved a review of a list of “tools” or mechanisms for gathering public input as part of the development of the Detailed Forest Management Plan. The suite of tools included redevelopment of the SLS website, questionnaires/surveys, open houses, workshops, working groups or sub/committees, print media and the Public Advisory Group as a final coordinating body for consolidating input. Further to this, an issues list was reviewed, grouped and organized with respect to which mechanism would be the most appropriate for gathering input. Finally, a draft presentation of the new SLS website was reviewed and approved. Stakeholder advisory letters and newspaper articles will be sent out to coincide with the launch of the new website.
January 24, 2003	PAG Meeting	No Quorum
February 14, 2003	PAG Meeting	At the February 14, 2003 Public Advisory Group meeting, discussion continued on the Public Involvement Tools Package. PAG members volunteered for participation in their areas of interest. As part of the semi-annual reporting to the provincial government, an internal survey was distributed to gather input from the PAG members as to their level of satisfaction with the process to date. The DFMP Development portion of the SLS website was reviewed with excellent feedback from the PAG members. Changes to be made, with launch date of March 3rd. Newspaper announcements will also take place the week of March 3rd.
February 28, 2003	PAG Meeting	The February 28, 2003 Public Advisory Group Meeting included the amendment of timelines regarding stakeholder management recommendations and the application of tools for gathering input. The Terms of Reference for Access Management and Water Quality & Quantity and Fisheries Resources are progressing. Initial participants’ list for the 2 working groups were determined. The format for 3 workshops; Wilderness Values & Aesthetic Values, Biodiversity & Wildlife Habitat Supply and Adaptive Management & Research/Monitoring/Reporting will be discussed at the next meeting on March 14, 2003.
March 3, 2003	Website Developed	Spray Lake Sawmills (1980) Ltd. Public involvement website was launched.
March 14, 2003	PAG Meeting	On March 14, 2003 the Public Advisory Group fine-tuned the previously distributed Terms of Reference for our two Working Groups – a) Access Management and b) Water Quality & Quantity and Fisheries Resources. Workshops were discussed for Wilderness Values & Aesthetic Values; Biodiversity & Wildlife Habitat Supply; and Adaptive Management & Research/ Monitoring/Reporting. A preliminary list of participants was also discussed. The Community Timber Program will be revised and finalized at our next session on April 4, 2003.
April 4, 2003	PAG Meeting	The April 4 <sup>th</sup> , 2003 Public Advisory Group Meeting reviewed and approved the PAG Progress Report submission to the Alberta government. It has proven to be quite challenging to obtain participation from the list of possible candidates for both working groups and the three workshops that were planned. Rick Blackwood and Gord Lehn will be meeting to discuss options for moving forward with the Public Involvement Process. The objectives regarding the Community Timber Program were presented and discussed. Pat Bouck, CTP representative, confirmed the objectives are addressed in the existing process with implementation of the SLS Forest Management Agreement.
April 25, 2003	PAG Meeting	The April 25 <sup>th</sup> , 2003 Public Advisory Group Meeting reviewed public participation levels to date and discussed

DATE	EVENT	ABSTRACT (if any)
		<p>options for moving forward with the Public Involvement Process. The PAG proposed a multi-tiered approach focused on providing opportunities for meaningful public participation.</p> <p>Gord Lehn will be communicating with individual PAG members to determine options for improving participation levels. Other options for ensuring quorum were also discussed. Options included scheduling alternate meeting dates and times.</p>
May 7, 2003	PAG Meeting	<p>On May 7<sup>th</sup>, 2003 the Public Advisory Group met and reviewed display boards, which will be used for information purposes. PAG also refined the Questionnaire and Information Package that has been developed. This is to be mailed to all possible stakeholders, with a deadline for questionnaire returns of June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2003.</p> <p>Gord Lehn discussed reforestation and advised the group on the government reforestation requirements. There are strict requirements as presented in the Alberta Regeneration Survey Manual published by Alberta Sustainable Resource Development.</p> <p>PAG agreed to the existing strategies as presented and also recommended adding the following strategy to the reforestation issue:</p> <p>To promote alternate reforestation strategies to address specific resource values and/or silviculture situations that are not addressed by current regulations.</p>
May 10, 2003	Open House	<p>Spray Lake Sawmills took part in the open house for Banks &amp; Branches, Tree Planting Project. About 300 walked through and of that about 7 came by Spray Lake Sawmills booth and asked for detailed information.</p>
May 17, 2003	Open House	<p>An open house was held at Spray Lake Sawmills Main Office. About 17 stakeholders attended.</p>
May 21, 2003	PAG Meeting	<p>On May 21<sup>st</sup>, 2003 the Public Advisory Group met and discussed the Interim Management Objectives and Strategies document.</p> <p>The Environmental Protection issue was reviewed. It was recommended that the title be changed to be more specific to soil. SLS will revise the wording and will continue to follow the existing guidelines.</p> <p>The Forest Health issue was reviewed and a recommendation was made that the title be changed to <i>Forest Health (Insects and Diseases)</i>. The current strategy is generic as it's difficult to go into all the different types of insect and disease possibilities.</p> <p>The Forest Protection issue was reviewed and a recommendation was made that the title be changed to <i>Forest Protection (Fire)</i>. It was suggested SLS approach the government and request the current policy pertaining to fire control agreements be revised.</p>
June 5, 2003	PAG Meeting	<p>On June 5<sup>th</sup>, 2003 the Public Advisory Group met. A presentation of Spray Lake Sawmills Timber Supply Analysis was made to the Committee. The presentation provided the Committee with an overview of the analysis that's been done to date and the assumptions that have been made.</p> <p>SLS updated the Committee on several outstanding items.</p> <p>The public involvement letter and survey were mailed June 3, 2003 to approximately 444 stakeholders. Once the responses are returned SLS will prepare a report.</p> <p>SLS will prepare a draft progress report of what's been done to date for the Committee to review and decide how best to proceed.</p>
June 11, 2003	Presentation	<p>Ed Kulcsar gave a presentation to the Bow River Basin Council.</p>
June 17, 2003	Presentation	<p>Gord Lehn gave a presentation to the Calgary Chamber of Commerce.</p>
July 7, 2003	Presentation	<p>Gord Lehn gave a presentation to the MD of Bighorn Council.</p>

**CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS**  
**Semi-Annual Report**  
**Spray Lake Sawmills**

**Development of a Detailed Forest Management Plan**  
**Public Involvement Process**  
**August 28, 2006**

<b>DATE</b>	<b>EVENT</b>	<b>ABSTRACT (if any)</b>
July 28, 2003	PAG Meeting	On July 28 <sup>th</sup> , 2003 the Public Advisory Group met. The Committee reviewed the responses received to date for the questionnaire sent June 3, 2003. The Committee will continue to review the responses at the August 25 <sup>th</sup> , 2003 meeting. The Committee reviewed a draft progress report for Government Submission. The Committee will hold off finalizing the progress report until the review process is complete. The Committee agreed, at this time, not to accept additional requests for representation on the Committee.
July 31, 2003	Presentation	Gord Lehn gave a presentation to the City of Calgary.
August 25, 2003	Presentation	Ed Kulcsar gave a presentation to the CTU/CTP Holders in the North. Included a presentation on DFMP development and the specific involvement requirements/outcomes relative to the CTU program.
August 25, 2003	PAG Meeting	On August 25 <sup>th</sup> , 2003 the Public Advisory Group met. The Committee reviewed the strategies for dealing with the issues raised from the Questionnaire. The Committee agreed to submit their Semi-Annual Progress Report to the Government. The Committee finalized arrangements for gathering public input. A one-day workshop will be held either the end of October or the first of November. SLS will put the issues into three or four categories for discussion. SLS will meet with interested groups prior to the workshop to provide background and gather interest.
September 19, 2003	Meeting	Ed Kulcsar attended a lunch meeting with CPAWS representatives specific to the DFMP public involvement/development process.
October 6, 2003	PAG Meeting	On October 6 <sup>th</sup> , 2003 the Public Advisory Group met. The Committee reviewed the agenda, terms of reference and the structure for the Workshop October 29, 2003. The Committee reviewed the list of potential participants, the groups they represented and the areas they will focus on.
October 14, 2003	Presentation	Ed Kulcsar gave a presentation to the Alberta United Recreationists Society specific to the DFMP.
October 29, 2003	Workshop	Invitations were sent to over 40 potential participants, 35 confirmed and 21 attended the workshop. Total attendees for the day were 41. Presentations were given by SLS, SRD (Access Management), M.P. Rogeau (Fire History), URSUS (Biological Diversity & wildlife Habitat) and G. Townsend (Water), Several SLS presentations scheduled for the morning had to be deferred due to weather conditions as the workshop started late. All presentations and the Summary Report are posted on the SLS Website <a href="http://www.spraylakesawmills.com">www.spraylakesawmills.com</a> . The afternoon was broken into three break out groups: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access Management/Integration with other users.</li> <li>• Biodiversity/wildlife Habitat</li> <li>• Water Management/Fisheries.</li> </ul>
November 25, 2003	PAG Meeting	On November 25, 2003 the Public Advisory Group met. The Committee reviewed the Facilitators Summary Report from the Workshop October 29, 2003 and made revisions as required. The Committee approved the report and asked that it be forwarded to the Committee for a final review and then posted on the SLS Website. The Committee discussed future direction for the public involvement process and reviewed the evaluation questionnaires from the Workshop. It was agreed to hold open houses in the first week of May 2004. Several presentations were scheduled with key interest groups for early in the New Year.
December 2, 2003	Presentation	Gord Lehn gave a presentation to the Kananaskis Improvement District.
December 16, 2003	Presentation	Gord Lehn and Rick Blackwood gave a presentation to the Ghost and Waiparous Area Residents.
January 20, 2004	PAG Meeting	On January 20, 2004 the Public Advisory Group met. Members of the Planning/Review Team attended the

**CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS**  
**Semi-Annual Report**  
**Spray Lake Sawmills**

**Development of a Detailed Forest Management Plan**  
**Public Involvement Process**  
**August 28, 2006**

DATE	EVENT	ABSTRACT (if any)
		<p>meeting. Copies of their Terms of Reference were distributed to the PAG group. The Planning/Review Team, SLS and PAG are working on the objectives, strategies and monitoring options for inclusion in the DFMP. The Committee reviewed the feedback from questionnaires, the workshop, PAG group and additional comments. The Committee discussed future direction for the public involvement process. The open houses for May 2004 were confirmed.</p> <p>A progress report will be forwarded to the government late March 2004.</p>
January 21, 2004	Presentation	Gord Lehn gave a presentation to the Calgary Field Naturalists.
February 24, 2004	PAG Meeting	<p>On February 24, 2004 the Public Advisory Group met. The Committee continues to review the feedback received to date. The final review will be distributed to the Committee before being posted on the website.</p> <p>The open houses were confirmed for May 4, 5 and 6, 2004 from 3:00 – 8:00 p.m. SLS will work with the Committee on what information should be available at the open houses. The feedback documents will be available at the open houses.</p> <p>Tesera Systems Inc. gave a presentation to the Committee of their model, which creates spatially, and temporally explicit harvest/resource “schedules”.</p>
April 5, 2004	Bi-Annual Progress Rpt	The third bi-annual progress report was submitted to SRD.
April 20, 2004	PAG Meeting	<p>The Public Advisory Group met. The Bi-Annual Progress Report was submitted to the Government for their review.</p> <p>SLS updated the public advisory group on the Planning/Review Team meeting of April 13/14, 2004 and a watershed management workshop on May 11, 2004.</p> <p>The Committee reviewed the visualization sensitivity maps and the arrangements for the open houses scheduled for May 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup>.</p>
May 4 <sup>th</sup> , 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> , 2004	Open Houses	<p>Open houses were held and a summary was prepared of the feedback received from each:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tuesday, May 4, 2004 – Black Diamond = Total Attended 12</li> <li>• Wednesday, May 5, 2004 – Cochrane = Total Attended 21</li> <li>• Thursday, May 6, 2004 – Water Valley = Total Attended 11</li> <li>• Total Attendance = 44</li> </ul>
May 4, 2004	Presentation	Gord Lehn gave a presentation to the Ranching Association RMFRA – AGM meeting.
June 15, 2004	PAG Meeting	<p>The M.D. of Bighorn attended the PAG Meeting and gave a brief presentation to the Committee of their concerns. A brief question and answer period followed.</p> <p>The Committee reviewed the feedback received from the open houses in May 2004.</p> <p>SLS updated the public advisory group on the Planning/Review Team meetings of May 18/19, 2004 and June 1/2, 2004. SLS also updated the public advisory group on the watershed management workshop on June 14, 2004.</p>
July 12, 2004	Presentation	Gord Lehn and Ed Kulcsar gave a presentation to the North CTP Holders, primary topic was timber sequencing.
August 17, 2004	Presentation	Gord Lehn gave a presentation to the Rotary Club of Calgary.
September 14, 2004	Meeting	Gord Lehn met with Rob Simieritsch from CPAWS on Tuesday, September 14 <sup>th</sup> . Rob is the new forest issues specialist with Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society. He requested the meeting to discuss the DFMP.
September 23, 2004	PAG Meeting	The group reviewed the DFMP Chapters 1 to 5 and discussed strategies for future public involvement. It was decided that SLS would provide opportunities for workshops after the DFMP was approved. SLS met with a

**CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS**  
**Semi-Annual Report**  
**Spray Lake Sawmills**

**Development of a Detailed Forest Management Plan**  
**Public Involvement Process**  
**August 28, 2006**

<b>DATE</b>	<b>EVENT</b>	<b>ABSTRACT (if any)</b>
		representative of CPAWS on September 14 <sup>th</sup> . SLS distributed copies of questions they had.
October 7, 2004	Meeting	SLS met with the Ghost CTP Holders to address the concerns raised in their letter to SRD regarding the DFMP process. The CTP Holders advised the wording in the letter was incorrect and they were not upset with the process. They were concerned about the sequencing only. SLS agreed to meet with them to go over the sequencing.
October 7, 2004	PAG Meeting	The group continued their review of the DFMP Chapters. SLS gave a visual presentation of the Chapters and discussed questions from the group. The group also discussed the future direction for public involvement. SLS updated the group on their meeting with the CTP Holders on October 7 <sup>th</sup> , 2004.
October 21, 2004	Meeting	SLS met with the Ghost CTP Holders and reviewed the sequencing, no major issues or concerns were raised.
October 26, 2004	PAG Meeting	The group continued their review of the DFMP Chapters. SLS gave a presentation on the Timber Supply Analysis and the criteria used to develop the model. SLS advised the ECA and Wildlife Analysis was being developed and would be incorporated into the plan for the November 10 <sup>th</sup> roll out.
December 13, 2004	Presentation	Gord L and Ed K held a DFMP review session with the Ghost River Watershed Alliance
January 17, 2005	Presentation	Gord L and Ed K held a DFMP review session with the three major oil and gas companies operating in the area, Shell, Petro-Can and Husky
February 2, 2005	Media add	General add in the local weekly soliciting public input
February 7, 2005	Presentation	Gord L and Ed K held a DFMP review session with a collection of municipalities, City of Calgary, Village of Waiparous, Town of Cochrane, Kananaskis ID, MD Bighorn.
April 27, 2005	Media add	Advertisement for SLS open house and mill tours to be held at the mill May 4, 2005
April 28, 2005	Decision Document	SRD Decision document for the November 4, 2004 DFMP submission
May 27, 2005	Quota holder mtg	A Meeting was held with Bell Pole
May 31, 2005	PIP Addendum	A revised terms-of-reference for the DFMP public involvement process was submitted to SRD
June 28, 2005	PIP Addendum	SRD response to the proposed PIP terms-of-reference
July 6, 2005	PAG Meeting	The purpose of the Meeting was to update the public advisory group on the progress to date, review the executive decision summary report from SRD and determine the role the public advisory group would like to have in taking the process to completion. A date of May 1, 2006 was decided on to have the review period start with an end date of June 15, 2006. This will allow time for SLS to incorporate any comments/feedback that may or may not be incorporated into the final submission.
July 13, 2005	Quota holder mtg	A Meeting was held with the south timber disposition holders, including SRD as the representative for the open category
July 14, 2005	Quota holder mtg	A Meeting was held with the north timber disposition holders
July 28, 2005	PIP Addendum	Based on the SRD June 28/05 response letter SLS submitted an amendment to the Terms-of-reference
October 19, 2005	Quota holder mtg	A Meeting was held with the south timber disposition holders
October 25, 2005	Aboriginal – Presentation & Meetings	Gord L and Ed K gave a DFMP presentation to the Siksika. They did not feel they had the capacity to do an adequate review. No specific comments or feedback received. Rick Blackwood was also in attendance. Several other Meetings were held with the Siksika but were related more to relationship building rather than the DFMP.
October 25, 2005	PIP Addendum	SRD approval letter for the final PIP terms-of-reference
Fall of 2005 and winter 2006	Aboriginal - Meetings	Several Meetings were held between SLS and the Piikani. The primary purpose was general relationship building. Inquiries were made as to their level of interest in the FMA DFMP. Their area of interest was stated as the C5

**CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS**  
**Semi-Annual Report**  
**Spray Lake Sawmills**

**Development of a Detailed Forest Management Plan**  
**Public Involvement Process**  
**August 28, 2006**

DATE	EVENT	ABSTRACT (if any)
		management unit.
Unknown	Aboriginal letters	SRD, Rick Blackwood, advised that his office had sent out additional letters to aboriginal groups but no response had been received.
January 11, 2006	Media add	General add in the local weekly soliciting public input
January 18, 2006	Quota holder mtg	A Meeting was held with the south timber disposition holders
February 9, 2006	PAG Meeting	SLS reviewed the status of the plan to date with the Committee. SLS reviewed the updated sections with the Committee which covered Self Inspection Agreement; H Road; Silviculture Strategy Table; Public Involvement Process; Structural Retention; Grazing Timber Integration; Growth and Yield Program and Roads and Landings Monitoring Program. SLS also updated the Committee on the Mistletoe Management Strategy and the Long Term Road Strategy. The Committee was pleased with the review process to date. It was agreed that as chapters were ready SLS would forward them via email to the Committee for review. Once sufficient chapters had been forwarded a Meeting would be scheduled to review them.
March 6, 2006	Rancher Workshop	A rancher DFMP workshop was held in Longview, by invitation. The agenda focus was to review the spatial harvest sequence map and solicit feedback on the provinces draft #3 of the provincial Grazing Timber Integration manual
March 7, 2006	Rancher Workshop	Same as above only in Cochrane
March 7, 2006	Rancher workshop	Same as above only in Sundre
March 14, 2006	Quota holder mtg	A Meeting was held with the north timber disposition holders
March 28, 2006	Rancher Workshop	A rancher DFMP workshop was held in Cochrane, by invitation. The two agenda points were the same as noted above for the other three rancher workshops
April 10, 2006	Quota holder mtg	Meeting with Bell Pole on spatial harvest sequence
April 11, 2006	Advertisement	Advertisements were placed in the local weekly newspapers of Blairmore and Cochrane to announce open houses for the 3 <sup>rd</sup> of May in Blairmore and the 4 <sup>th</sup> of May in Cochrane. The focus of these open houses was on GDP and operational plans.
April 17, 2006	PAG Meeting	SLS reviewed the outstanding items and reported on the progress to date. SLS asked if the Committee were happy with the review process and the material circulated to date to review. The Committee felt the process was working well. The Committee discussed several options for the six week public review process. It was decided to have a ½ day workshop and invite the participants from the 2003 Workshop. The workshop will have a presentation format. The following day will be an open house with on-going presentations at several intervals. The DFMP will be available at both sessions for review, in hard copy and on a CD. One CD per attendee. The DFMP will also be available to review at SLS Offices, SRD Offices and on SLS Website. A copy will also be posted in libraries in Sundre, Black Diamond and Cochrane.
April 20, 2006	Advertisements/press release/email announcement	Advertisements were placed in the weeklies adjacent to the FMA announcing an open house in Cochrane for the 11 <sup>th</sup> of May. A press release was also sent out to the Calgary dailies. All stakeholders on SLS's email stakeholder list were forwarded a copy of the announcement as well.
May 10, 2006	Stakeholder Workshop	By invitation, stakeholder workshop was held in Cochrane to present the final DFMP package. Invitations had been extended to the same group of participants as for the October/03 workshop. This was a mixed group of participants representing all identified stakeholder groups. The primary objective of the workshop was to close the

**CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS**  
**Semi-Annual Report**  
**Spray Lake Sawmills**

**Development of a Detailed Forest Management Plan**  
**Public Involvement Process**  
**August 28, 2006**

DATE	EVENT	ABSTRACT (if any)
		loop with the original group which had helped with establishing baseline issues and objectives. The day's agenda provided them with an overview of the plan, guidance on how to navigate through the plan to find points of particular interest to them and how to provide feedback if they wished. Attendees were given a CD of the plan to take home to review further on their own
May 11, 2006	Open House/public access to plans	An open house was held in Cochrane for members of the general public to view the finalized plan. Six hard copies were on display for people to browse through. Following the open house these same hard copy plans were sent to various places for display and public accessibility. This included: SLS's office in Cochrane, SRD offices in Sundre and Calgary, public libraries in Sundre, Black Diamond and Cochrane.
June 23, 2006	PAG Meeting	SLS brought the Committee up to date on the comments and feedback received from the six week review period. The Committee suggested they send a letter of support to the Minister. One of the members of the PAG Committee agreed to draft the letter and circulate for comments. SLS asked if the Committee were comfortable with the process, the Committee agreed they supported the process.
July 19, 2006	Presentation	A presentation was made to the Tsuu T'ina Council.
August 28, 2006	PAG Meeting	A meeting was held to review the feedback from the six week review period and advise the DFMP was delayed because of the MPB susceptibility model.

**Addendum to the Public Involvement Process  
For the Development of Spray Lake Sawmills (1980) Ltd  
Detailed Forest Management Plan**

**Introduction**

On April 29, 2002 the Lands and Forests Division of Sustainable Resource Development approved a Terms-of-Reference under which Spray Lake Sawmills would conduct a public involvement program as part of the development of its Detailed Forest Management Plan (DFMP).

The Plan was submitted to the Department for its review on November 10, 2004 with a decision document provided back to Spray Lake Sawmills April 28, 2005. Spray Lake Sawmills is required to resubmit the Detailed Forest Management Plan by September 4, 2006 incorporating direction provided to the company through the decision document. Part of this direction is to conduct additional public involvement activities along with the revision of several other chapters.

This paper outlines the terms-of-reference for the balance of the stakeholder or public input and review opportunities for the completion of the revised DFMP submission. Stakeholder and Public are used synonymously as an all-encompassing term to include a range of other commercial interests on the landbase, recreational groups, government and non-government organizations, environmental groups, aboriginal consultation, embedded quota holders and the public at large.

This terms-of-reference does not provide for a duplication of activities already conducted as part of the original DFMP development and submission. Rather it seeks to outline further areas of activity to supplement specific areas of interest the Lands and Forests Division wished to expand upon.

A similar matrix style of reporting public comment and SLS's response to the comments will be used in the final report as was used in the original submission. With the exception of the specific areas outlined in this document the company's response to the stakeholder comments received to date has been accepted as satisfactory to Lands and Forest Division.

**Public Advisory Group**

The Public Advisory Group (PAG) has been contacted and re-established itself to review the revised chapters of the DFMP as they are completed. The PAG will also be invited to a closed review session of the completed package prior to the six week open stakeholder review period.

The first PAG meeting to deal with the revised DFMP development was held July 6, 2005. Minutes can be made available through the SLS website:  
[www.spraylakesawmills.com](http://www.spraylakesawmills.com)

### **All Stakeholders**

Spray Lake Sawmills will ensure all stakeholders have a minimum of six weeks to access, review and provide input on the final plan in its entirety prior to its re-submission. Advertisements and notices will be sent out to advise stakeholders when and how the plan may be viewed. The PAG has recommended making hard copies of the plan available through the library system and digital access through the company's website. One or more overview presentations will be planned for various groups at the start of the six week review period in order to help people get a start on their review. The September 4, 2006 re-submission will include a listing of the comments received and SLS's response to how they have been addressed within the plan. It will also include a generalized listing of groups or organizations that have been invited to participate.

### **Embedded Quota Holders**

Since the signing of the Forest Management Agreement and the approval of the previous Public Involvement terms-of-reference permit holders within the Community Timber Use Program have had their permits converted into quotas. SLS will work together with the quota holders to identify AVI polygons for sequencing Quota Holder operations until 2026. These polygons will provide Lands and Forests Division with an outline for areas of future licence issuance. Partitioning of the identified polygons for the quota holders will be dealt with by the quota holders. Note: this does not constitute generalized spheres-of-interest but specific operating areas for licence issuance. These new embedded quota holders will be invited with the same opportunity to review the completed plan within the six week review period. Meetings with the quota holders may also include agenda items related to other topics beside sequencing, at their request.

SLS will identify, as part of the plans spatial harvest sequence, an area for SRD to use for long term Christmas tree management and polygons suitable for open category CTU permit sales.

### **Aboriginal Consultation**

While Spray Lake Sawmills recognizes the requirement for aboriginal consultation it is also recognized as a government lead obligation. SLS will work in a supportive role with the Department of Sustainable Resource Development during any consultation initiatives the Department undertakes. This will include providing technical support and documentation as may be required and the

summary of any resulting discussions and outcomes. Aboriginal consultation is anticipated to occur during the final six week review period.

### **Fire Smart Plan Development**

The Forest Protection Division of Sustainable Resource Development is currently in the process of developing “Fire Smart” plans for the communities of Waiporous Village and the Hamlet of Bragg Creek. A component of these plans includes community consultation. SLS will continue in a supportive role with Forest Protection Division in the development and delivery of these plans.

### **Progress Reports**

The terms-of-reference for the original DFMP contained a commitment to provide Lands and Forests Division bi-annual progress reports on developments within the Public Involvement Program. As the time frame for this final terms-of-reference is fairly short the requirements for formal on-going progress reports will be discontinued. There will however be ongoing discussions between SLS and SRD to ensure progress is being made to everyone's satisfaction. A more specific schedule will be set up upon approval of this terms-of-reference.

Public Involvement Summary of Returned Questionnaires – June 2003

Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
							emulating natural disturbance patterns. No additional strategy required.
Dust control on gravel roads.			X	X	N/A		Integration of SLS's operations with other commercial and non-commercial stakeholders has been recognized through the existing issues list. Dust control is a site-specific and timing specific issue to be dealt with on an operational basis. No strategy required.
Reclamation makes cattle disbursement and round-up difficult. Want easy access to cut blocks for grazing.		X	X	X	Yes	Integration with Other Commercial Users (Sec 5.12).	This issue is a potential area of conflict between pressures for cutblocks to be used for grazing and SLS's reforestation obligations. On an operational basis SLS will do its best to work with other stakeholders, however, SRD policy will need to be developed to deal with issues of competing/conflicting land uses. Guidelines for communication processes between SLS and the ranching community can be dealt with through the ground rules. No additional strategy required as part of the DFMP.
Access development will open up new areas. Proposed Strategy – want reclamation strategies to address this.		X	X	X	Yes	Access Management (Sec 5.1).	Access Management is identified as an issue and has been included as a strategy.
Planning horizon is too short. Proposed Strategy – expand to a 40-50 year plan.		X		X	No		The planning manual cited within the Forest Management Agreement specifies the planning horizon for the DFMP. Changing the Agreement is outside the scope of the DFMP. No strategy required.
More info on the relative benefits of clear cutting versus selective harvesting.				X	No		Public education is not a specific mandate of the agreement or the DFMP. SLS does however hold periodic open houses, presentations and articles which may satisfy the need for further information. No strategy required specific to the DFMP.
Maintain wildlife diversity.		X	X	X	Yes	Biodiversity & Wildlife Habitat Supply (Sec 5.4).	This issue is already dealt with through the Wildlife Habitat Supply and Biodiversity issues and strategies. No new strategies required.
Maintain visual quality of Square Butte.			X		N/A		Visual Quality issues for Square Butte have been addressed through the landscape level visualization sensitivity rating. As a site specific area it was also dealt with through the McLean Creek harvest plan.
Various user groups should use common access.		X	X	X	Yes	Access Management (Sec 5.1).	Falls within the Access Management issue. Already dealt with in the existing strategies.
Research is needed into controlling MPB and forest fire research.		X	X	X	Yes	Forest Health (Sec 5.7) Forest Protection (Sec 5.9). Adaptive Management & Research (Sec 5.2).	Falls within the context of Forest Health, Research and Forest Protection. Existing management strategies are already in place. Note: SLS has conducted monitoring activities of our operations, have supported research activities through third parties but is not a research organization in itself.

Public Involvement Summary of Returned Questionnaires – June 2003

Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
Consider landscape diversity.		X		X	Yes	Biodiversity & Wildlife Habitat Supply (Sec 5.4).	Landscape diversity addressed through the Biodiversity issue and strategies.
Consider wildlife corridors.		X	X	X	Yes	Biodiversity & Wildlife Habitat Supply (Sec 5.4).	Wildlife travel corridors are, in part, dealt with through the Wildlife Habitat Supply issue but primarily come into play during the ground rule discussions for guidelines on developing operational plans. Connectivity is recognized as a component of habitat effectiveness.
Conduct follow-up monitoring to gage impact on fish.		X		X	Yes	Water Quality & Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17).	Monitoring and reporting isn't a strategy onto itself but is an obligation of the FMA overall and is incorporated as part Chapter 10.
Consider aesthetic values when close to areas used by public.	X	X	X	X	Yes	Aesthetic Values (Sec 5.3). Integration of Other Values and non-commercial uses (Sec 5.11).	The issue on Aesthetic Values addresses this. The FMA has been categorized for visual sensitivity and appropriate management strategies implemented accordingly.
Minimize impacts of logging on riparian areas to accommodate water, fish and wildlife.	X	X	X	X	Yes	Water Quantity & Quality, & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17). Biodiversity & Wildlife Habitat Supply (Sec 5.4).	Strategies are in place.
Trees are needed to hold snow on snowmobile trails.		X	X	X	Yes	Integration of Other Values and non-commercial uses (Sec 5.11).	Included as part of the issue on Integration on other Values and Non-Commercial uses. Recreation trails are recognized as a key use in this regard. Specific strategies to deal with trail integration with harvest operations are best dealt with through the ground rules and operational level of harvest plan development. The location of trails within reserve areas and use of treed buffers are recognized as two possible options. Excessive use of treed buffers could have an AAC impact.
Don't disturb salting, watering or fencing within grazing allotments.			X	X	N/A		Operational in nature, defer to discussion on ground rules development, also an AOP/harvest design issue Operational in nature, needs to be dealt with on a site-specific basis, not a DFMP scale of issue.

Public Involvement Summary of Returned Questionnaires – June 2003

Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
Keep pre-existing trails open from slash build-up for cattle distribution.			X	X	N/A		Operational in nature, defer to discussion on ground rules development, also an AOP/harvest design issue. Needs to be dealt with on a site-specific basis. The Provincial Grazing Timber Integration Committee may also provide a framework for dealing with this as an issue. No new strategy is needed specific to the DFMP at this time.
Control motorized access.	X	X	X		Yes	Access Management (Sec 5.1).	Included under the issue of Access Management. SLS can install access controls as approved or required by SRD however SLS does not have any mandate to regulate non-commercial users. Commercial users of SLS's road system require road use agreements that may contain some restrictions. For the most part this is a road specific, operational issue. The DFMP will recognize various land use zones, access management plans and situations where access is controlled by another entity.
Fencing to control cattle.			X		No		This is an operational level of issue to be dealt with on a site-specific basis. Coordinating activities with ranchers does not necessarily mean assuming responsibility for their fencing. No specific DFMP strategy required.
Want more open houses and public consultation.		X	X		N/A		Addressed through the PAG under the approved PIP Terms of Reference. The obligation for public involvement ends with the submission of the DFMP although the company has customarily provided opportunities for stakeholder input. In the time since the June 2003 questionnaires there have been further opportunities for stakeholder input through a workshop, SLS presentations and the SLS website. Further options for open houses have also been held.
Don't understand public involvement process, inadequate.		X			N/A		The approved PIP terms of reference is posted on the company website. The website also contains contact names and numbers for further reference and follow-up. Since this comment was made there have been additional public involvement opportunities. See comments above.
How will first nations be consulted.		X			N/A		The manner of consulting with First Nations has not been addressed as part of the PIP Terms of Reference. The SRD Area Manager has been assigned by SRD to take the lead role in the aboriginal consultation process.
Increased logging access is resulting in	X	X	X	X	Yes	Access Mgmt (Sec. 5.1) &	See comments above under "control motorized access"

Public Involvement Summary of Returned Questionnaires – June 2003

Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
increased damage from OHVS.						Integration of Other Values & non-commercial uses (Sec 5.11).	
Residents need to be considered in wilderness and aesthetic values.		X	X	X	Yes	Aesthetic Values (Sec 5.3).	Included as part of Aesthetic Values. Addressed within the existing strategies.
Road use agreements need to be considered for coordinated use.		X	X	X	Yes	Access Management & Integration with other Commercial Users (Sec 5.12).	Dealt with as part of strategy of Access Management. See comments above under "control motorized access"
Reforestation issues important (timing, tree species).		X	X		Yes	Reforestation (Sec 5.15).	The Reforestation issue and accompanying strategies cover this off. Government regulations & policy mandate and direct these activities.
Should consider a public education program.				X	No		Public education in itself is not one of SLS's mandates or requirements of the DFMP. SLS does, however, have a company communications plan, which may help address this.
Should have preservation areas with no activity.	X				No		Protected areas were negotiated and deleted as part of the original FMA boundary. The remaining area within the FMA is designated as working forest. No further strategy required.
Need trees to prevent flooding.		X		X	Yes	Water Quality & Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17).	Included under the issue of Water Quality and Quantity. There is no specific strategy other than abiding by pertinent government ground rules and management guidelines. The ECA model has been run to help confirm surface run-off projections.
Wildlife need large areas.		X	X	X	Yes	Biodiversity & Wildlife Habitat Supply (Sec 5.4).	Falls under the issue of Wildlife Habitat Supply. HSI modeling is used as a tool to help gage wildlife habitat needs. Note: there is a temporal consideration in managing wildlife habitat supply. Today's cutover is tomorrow's cover.
Disagree with SLS having been granted an FMA.				X	No		Outside of scope of DFMP. No strategy required.
Need to recognize abutting residential areas and local economies.	X	X		X	Yes	Integration of Other Values and non-commercial Users (Sec 5.11).	From conversation with the respondent his concerns are focused more at the IRP level of plan development, the overall integration of various resource values and cumulative effects. No specific strategy for inclusion into the DFMP.
Need to recognize impacts of logging on noise traffic & disruption of recreation uses.		X		X	Yes	Access Mgmt (Sec 5.1). Integration of Other Values and non-commercial uses (Sec 5.11). Public Safety (Sec 5.14).	These issues are site and timing specific. Existing strategies require linkages and coordination with other user groups. This will provide the avenue for input on areas of concern. The ground rules can be crafted to provide direction for communication on these issues. The details of operational

Public Involvement Summary of Returned Questionnaires – June 2003

Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
							delivery can also be dealt with at the time of operational plan development.
Should conduct a water quality monitoring program (financial and material support for a community managed program).					No		A monitoring and stewardship-reporting requirement is part of the FMA. There may be opportunities for coordinating monitoring efforts with other groups but the DFMP is not intended to be a vehicle for funding third party activities.
Concerns over public involvement process, broader and more meaningful.		X	X	X	N/A		Public involvement opportunities to be addressed through PAG. Since this comment was received there have been several further opportunities for public involvement. The questionnaire that this comment was based on was still early in the public involvement process.
Results of water and wildlife monitoring should be published on SLS website.		X		X	N/A		Comment to be taken under advisement. How the monitoring/stewardship report is distributed is a follow up item to be determined at a later date.
SLS should consider buffering protected areas such as the Don Getty Wildland Provincial Park				X	N/A		Protected areas and buffers required for the protected areas were negotiated as part of an all inclusive package at the time the FMA was established. The remaining area within the FMA is considered a “working forest”. Establishing, growing, harvesting and removing timber has been established as the primary use of the forest management agreement area. Management practices within the FMA will still make use of buffers during operational plan development for such things as watershed protection but not for buffering other land use zones or designations.
SLS should conduct research on water runoff quality and quantity.		X		X	Yes	Water Quality & Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17). Adaptive Management & Research (Sec 5.2).	Falls within the context of Research and Water Quality & Quantity. Existing strategies are already in place. Note: SLS has conducted monitoring activities of our operations, have supported research activities through third parties but is not a research organization in itself.
SLS should become FSC certified.					No		Certification is outside of the scope of the DFMP. SLS is currently ForestCare certified.
Want further opportunity to provide input prior to plan approval.		X			N/A		Public involvement opportunities to be addressed through PAG. Further opportunities have since been provided since this comment was received. The questionnaire response that this comment came from was still in the early stages of the overall public involvement process.
Need to do a better job of informing the public of their right to provide input.		X			N/A		See comments above.
Should incorporate research results from the Eastern Slopes Grizzly Bear Research project and the Central Rockies Wolf Project.		X	X	X	Yes	Adaptive Management & Research (Sec 5.2).	Accommodated.
Should incorporate a prescribed burn		X		X	No		Cannot accommodate. The primary purpose is to harvest not

Public Involvement Summary of Returned Questionnaires – June 2003

Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
component to the DFMP.							burn.
Public involvement process is vague and insufficient.		X			N/A		Public involvement opportunities to be addressed through PAG. Please see comments from four boxes above.
Need to keep a good working relationship with Grazing associations.		X	X		Yes	Integration with Other Commercial Users (Sec 5.12).	Dealt with under the issue of Integration with Other Commercial Users. Details for future communication processes to be dealt with as part of ground rules. The work currently being developed by the Provincial Grazing Timber Integration Committee will be used a reference in local ground rule development. No need for further strategy.
Want to know vision beyond 2023? I.e. impacts on land and people for the next 100 years.	X	X			No		The timber supply analysis extends out for 2 rotations. The DFMP is a 20-year time frame with a 10-year rolling renewal. The parameters for plan development are defined through the FMA.
Want to see more selective logging rather than clear-cut logging.	X	X	X	X	Yes	Sustainable Timber Supply (Sec 5.16).	Harvest system must be determined with consideration for all issues, objectives and strategies, not as a recommendation in isolation. The issue behind this recommendation was not provided. The majority of timber within the FMA is pine and does not lend itself to selective harvesting if the reforestation standards are to be met.
Need to ensure objectives are measurable. Concerns over the strategies not supporting the objective.		X			General		Comment will be taken under consideration; will review final package and determine/define monitoring opportunities for each.
Want to see elevated drinking water standards for Elbow R.		X	X		N/A		The DFMP does not define drinking water standards they are outside the scope of the DFMP. More generalized water quality and quantity issues are dealt with within the DFMP.
Want to see abandoned roads made impassible.		X	X		Yes	Access Management (Sec 5.1). Integration with Other Commercial Users (Sec 5.12) Integration with other values and Non-commercial uses (Sec 5.11).	Included under the issue of Access Management. This recommendation cannot be dealt with in isolation of other Objectives and Strategies. In general, abandoned roads are not left open to access without a specific purpose or reason. This is typically addressed through SLS's annual Road Maintenance & Abandonment Plan.
Want cumulative effects to be modeled.	X				No		Cumulative effects are an SRD responsibility outside of the scope of the DFMP.
Want SLS to tap into research findings of the Foothills Model Forest.		X	X		Yes	Adaptive Management & Research (Sec 5.2).	Accommodated under the issue and strategy of Research.
Shouldn't degrade biodiversity of the landscape at all.		X			Yes	Biodiversity & Wildlife Habitat Supply (Sec 5.4).	Addressed under the issue Biodiversity. Note: Creating a diverse mosaic of cover types on the landscape through logging may well increase the biodiversity. This will be monitored and reported. See Chapter 10.

Public Involvement Summary of Returned Questionnaires – June 2003

Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
SLS should specify research funding.				X	No		Falls within the context of Forest Health, Research and Forest Protection. Existing strategies area already in place. Note: SLS has conducted monitoring activities of our operations have supported research activities through third parties but is not a research organization in itself. No specific \$ amounts identified at this time. Expenditures will be driven by need rather than a predefined budget.
Don't degrade water quality or quantity. Current Ground Rules insufficient. Concern over erosion potential.		X	X		Yes	Water Quality & Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17).	Addressed under Water Quality and Quantity. Rationale for position on ground rule inadequacy not provided. Erosion control strategies dealt with as part of ground rules development and operational practice.
Provide details on how we will work with DFO.			X	X	Yes	Water Quality & Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17).	Communications with DFO occur at the time of operational plan development and at any time if it is suspected that a HAD may be triggered.
Need more time for public consultation.		X			N/A		Public Involvement opportunities to be addressed through PAG. Further time and opportunities for public involvement have been provided since this comment was received. The respondents to the questionnaire were early in the overall public involvement process.
Want an independent third party to synthesize the public input and provide back to the public.		X			N/A		This is a function of both the PAG and SRD review process. The overall process is defined through the approved PIP terms of reference.

Public Involvement Summary of Additional Feedback Received

Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
We feel the current strategy for wildlife habitat supply is excessively narrow. The DFMP should incorporate information not only from SRD but also from other research studies within the FMA area. It is critical that SLS and its stakeholders understand how wildlife use the landscape, not just within the FMA area but also in the adjoining areas, both wild and disturbed. Info on effective habitat, habitat quality, connectivity, and requirements within harvesting units, wildlife corridors, and species road density thresholds must all be incorporated into the DFMP. SRD may not have all this or other critical information.	X	X		X	Yes	Biodiversity & Wildlife Habitat Supply (Sec 5.4).	Other available wildlife research projects, as they are known, will be evaluated for their applicability to the DFMP. While the DFMP only addresses areas directly within the FMA boundaries, efforts will be made to incorporate strategies for connectivity to adjacent areas. There are many other landuse activities on the landscape that may impact habitat effectiveness and quality. SLS can only model and address these issues from the perspective of the company's forest management activities. The topics of thresholds and cumulative effects are an SRD responsibility as defined within the Agreement. This falls into an IRP level of plan development.
In John Kansas' presentation he briefly discussed that a preferred approach for monitoring biodiversity is to select a few species from different criteria. In the breakout groups it was clear that SLS had not yet made a decision on a monitoring strategy nor is there any mention of monitoring in the topic terms of reference. We recognize the workshop focused on broad level strategic planning. However, this lack of significant information confirmed for us the need for a follow up workshop for public input as greater detail is being developed on each of the topics.		X			Yes	Biodiversity & Wildlife Habitat Supply (Sec 5.4).	This comment is related to monitoring of activities rather than the establishment of specific objectives or strategies. The monitoring program is outlined in Chapter 10. The PAG is the guidance body to help give direction for how follow-up stakeholder input will be gathered.
We also have concerns with whether the buffer zone requirements around watercourses will be met. We understand that, based on variables such as slope, soil, aspect, wildlife use as well as a few others, the width of a water buffer zone is determined. In some cases the buffer zone will exceed requirements where as in other cases it will be less than required. Measurements given were five meters to thirty meters. Minimum requirements must always be met however, we strongly encourage the DFMP also exceed the requirements in all cases. The most significant criteria which must always be borne in mind is what is required to actually maintain water quality and anchoring soils.		X	X		Yes	Water Quality and Quantity & fishers Resources (Sec 5.17).	Traditional buffer sizes as specified in the provincial ground rules are being used as a start point for plan development. Deviations from this, whether bigger or smaller, need to be made with sound reason and justification. The maintenance of water quality and site stability is recognized as the primary purpose for watershed buffers. An excessive area set aside for buffers could have an impact on AAC (sustainable harvest level) just as too small a buffer could have an impact on water quality. The key is in finding the appropriate balance, hence the need for a monitoring program and principles of adaptive management.

Public Involvement Summary of Additional Feedback Received

Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
<p>Managing access is also very important to ensure that habitat remain effective for wildlife. We understand that currently the devices used by SLS to monitor access do not distinguish between whether a vehicle or people have accessed a forestry road. We wish to bring to your attention a device created by Jake Herrero, which is able to distinguish between people and vehicles. To address challenges with access management it is important to understand what users are involved. This information would assist in identifying how access management needs to be addressed and in making better decisions on future access.</p>	X	X		X	Yes	Access Management (Sec 5.1).	Access is recognized as an important contributing factor towards areas effectiveness for wildlife habitat. The company's monitoring program is focused on activities and impacts associated with the DFMP. The company has no mandate to control or manage other landuse activities, whether commercial or recreational. The issue of how access controls (road closures) will be managed will be included as part of the ground rules to be developed after the DFMP has been approved.
<p>We were pleased to hear that SLS excludes slopes with poor regeneration potential from harvesting. However, we would have been interested in hearing your presentation reforestation and other operating practices. We would like to suggest that a follow up workshop be scheduled where input could be gathered at a more detailed level and combine it with the presentation on operating practices.</p>				X	N/A		Operating practices are outside of the scope of DFMP management objectives. The intended presentation for the Workshop was intended as supplemental background information to help the participants get an overall picture of how all of the various plans and operations fit together. Group presentations can still be made upon request. Operating ground rules flow out of the DFMP objectives/strategies and are established after the DFMP has been approved.
<p>Hello, I'm pasting in the link to the New York example of upstream investment as well as an article I found with a dollar value put to water supplied by a forest. These are designed to compliment some of the ideas I brought forward during the public consultation last Wednesday in k-country. I believe similar opportunities for spray lakes exist.</p> <p>September 03, 2003 Associated Press: Woodlands Called Vital to Supply of Clean Water. The World Wildlife Fund looked at 105 metropolises in rich and poor nations and concluded that cities worldwide can slash the cost of supplying clean, safe drinking water simply by protecting and expanding nearby forests. Forests buffer against pollutants, prevent erosion, and stop sediment from getting into rivers and streams. New York City decided against building a filtration plant but decided instead to boost</p>	X	X	X	X	Yes	Water Quality and Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17).	The value of proper watershed management to safeguard water quality and downstream users that are dependent on it are recognized. SLS has no mandate to require other organizations to contribute \$ towards watershed management efforts. However, outside of the DFMP, SLS is investigating options for collaborative efforts in data collection and monitoring.

Public Involvement Summary of Additional Feedback Received

Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
<p>protection of woodlands in the Catskills and Delaware watersheds. Melbourne draws 90% of its water from forested areas. The growth of cities is putting pressure on forests, which are destroyed to make farmland. Protecting forests around water catchment areas is a necessity, and when gone, the costs of clean and safe drinking water will increase. Some countries need to do more. Mount Kenya's forests save Kenya more than \$20 million a year by protecting the catchment area of two of the country's river systems. Charcoal burning and road construction have hurt the quality of water going to Nairobi. Tokyo, Barcelona, Rio de Janeiro, and Bombay were some of the other major cities that can benefit.</p> <p>New York Watershed Link  <a href="http://www.nyc.gov/html/dep/html/watershed.html">http://www.nyc.gov/html/dep/html/watershed.html</a></p>							
<p>Thanks for the update. It's a relief to hear that a broad cross-section of interests will be at the meeting (including the ones I identified, I hope).</p> <p>My general concern here is one of process: how can an industrial user of resource be reasonably charged with soliciting and vetting public responses to its plans? It's a bit like being judge, jury, &amp; executioner (to use a tired metaphor). I don't think that it's fair for the people of AB, who own the resource, to ask Spray (or any other industry) to do this.</p> <p>One way to nudge the present process in the direction of benign fairness is to have the whole process overseen by an arms-length board, which seems to the case here. Great! I just hope that the board's involvement is one of public advocacy (i.e., what is the public's interest here?), and not one of flexible industrial advocacy (e.g., how to best accommodate Spray's logging plans given various public concerns, but within the tight constraint's of Spray's economic "bottom line").</p>	X	X	X	X	Yes	<p>Aesthetic Values (Sec 5.3).                      Access Management (Sec 5.1).                      Reforestation (Sec 5.15).                      Biodiversity &amp; Wildlife                      Habitat Supply (Sec 5.4)</p>	<p>SLS may be developing the DFMP however approval of the plan is still subject to review and scrutiny from both SRD and the areas stakeholders The April/98 version of the provincial planning manual provides the company with guidance on plan content and standards for plan development. The DFMP is prepared in keeping with higher order planning documents such as the East Slopes Integrated Resource Plan, other associated IRP's for the area and pertinent provincial and federal legislation. Certainly, Spray Lake is concerned with operational logistics and economic feasibility of the plan but it is not the sole driver behind the plans development or approval.</p> <p>In a two-pass harvest design system there are corresponding reserve blocks to the blocks proposed for harvest. Likewise there are numerous slopes, buffers and other deletion areas which can be used as benchmark areas to some extent. From the broader perspective of protected benchmark areas, these had already been negotiated between the Crown and the Company as part of setting the FMA boundary in the first place. The remaining area within the FMA is intended as a working forest with timber management recognized as the primary activity. A fire Regime study is currently underway which should give some direction for doing a better job of dovetailing harvest patterns with natural disturbance patterns.</p>

Public Involvement Summary of Additional Feedback Received

Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
<p>On the environmental front, my own preferences would be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. leave large control (unlogged) areas from which meaningful comparison with logged ones is possible. If this means larger clearcuts, so be it.</li> <li>2. The logging roads made unusable to off-road motorized vehicles, and fewer of them (roads, that is).</li> <li>3. The logged forest should be allowed to regrow to its original state (not just to pine).</li> <li>4. The logging should follow habitat boundaries in the same way that fire does.</li> <li>5. The logging should NOT be hidden from view from roads. If we think that logging has a place on the landscape, it should be there for all to see, easily. This is essentially a continuing reminder of a public contract: we have collectively decided to allow logging on our landscape, so reminders of that collective decision need to be clear.</li> </ol> <p>In this spirit, hiding logging behind a thin facade of trees is undesirable.</p> <p>Once the plans are clear, I (&amp;BCEC?) would like to meet with John/Doug to discuss sampling locations.</p> <p>Hope that the meeting goes well! All the best,</p>							<p>The DFMP will include a long-term road strategy for the FMA. Other existing access management plans, landuse zones, grazing leaseholders rights to control access and provincial legislation are recognized within the DFMP. SLS has no mandate to directly control/regulate recreational use of the area, nor does the company regulate other commercial access developments.</p> <p>Reforestation requirements and standards are directed through provincial legislation and policy. Pre and post harvest site assessments are conducted to help develop a site-specific reforestation prescription. The general rule of thumb is to reforest with a similar species mix as was harvested. In this area that means about ¾ pine content.</p> <p>The Spray Lake FMA is located in a high profile area with a large amount of recreational interests. Aesthetics are an important consideration in developing a harvest plan. A focus on using natural boundaries and validating the plan through modelling exercises are all tools in meeting landscape aesthetic objectives. In general, we agree with the recommendation not to hide what we do. Do it well and be proud of it.</p>
<p>Thank you for making arrangements for me to attend this very important workshop. Unfortunately the ride to Kananaskas was cancelled due to the winter storm. I was very disappointed as I had remembered the Alberta forestry public forums so well attended years ago to create the " Alberta Timber Harvest Planning and Operating Ground Rules" 1994. I reread them and found that in 1999 they were to be updated and wondered if that had happened</p>				X	N/A		<p>The provincial ground rules are currently being used by Spray Lake but only as an interim measure until the DFMP is approved and a new set of ground rules can be developed specific to the FMA. The objectives and strategies developed within the DFMP will act as the foundation on which to build the ground rules.</p>

Public Involvement Summary of Additional Feedback Received

Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
<p>The Department of Alberta Environment Protection was very responsible at that time and seemed to provide many valuable resources to the licensee. The annual operating plan process seemed to cover so well all aspects of logging and sustainability of the ecosystem in the process. Perhaps the only thing missing was the current alarming invasive plants threatening the delicate mountain ecosystem which Alberta Sustainable Resources Development web site recounts. I also wished to point out that there have been very many changes since 1999 and it seems government cutbacks have been imposed upon us all to live up to past expectations. An example of this:</p> <p>We have had a detailed report of the workshop from ..... who was able to attend along with forty others for which I am grateful.</p>							
<p>Impacts on water quality both during and after harvesting – We feel it is important you implement a comprehensive monitoring program to evaluate impacts on water quality. You indicated at the meeting that you presently monitor water quality annually in the fall. In our opinion, more frequent monitoring is required to assess impacts on water quality. It is particularly important to conduct monitoring during spring runoff and during high flow events when erosion is more likely to occur. The City of Calgary Waterworks' watershed monitoring program includes monitoring sites on the main stem of the Bow and Elbow Rivers and on various tributaries. We would be pleased to meet with you to discuss partnering opportunities with respect to water quality monitoring.</p> <p>Impacts on water quantity – Your strategy for protecting water quantity is to follow Provincial Ground Rules. There appears to be very little in the Provincial Ground Rules regarding protection of water quantity. We are concerned runoff regimes may be affected by logging. Loss of forest cover may result in earlier</p>	X	X	X	X	Yes	Water Quality and Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17). Access Management (Sec 5.1). Integration with other commercial users (Sec 5.12). and Integration with other non-commercial uses (Sec. 5.11).	<p>Agree with the statement for the need of a monitoring program. The framework for a monitoring program is included as part of the DFMP, Chapter 10.</p> <p>The existing provincial ground rules do not specifically address water quantity or runoff regimes. Not that it isn't recognized as an item of concern, however, previous experience in applying the Wrens model has indicated that the effect of logging on these issues is insignificant. Harvesting only occurs on a relatively small percentage of the landscape, is spread out over a 100 year time horizon and is subject to prompt reforestation and green-up. As of confirmation of anticipated impacts of surface run-off the DFMP contains results from the ECA model. Should run-off rates result in any erosion/siltation problems the monitoring program should pick it up and provide us with an indication that we need to modify our practices. Historically, our monitoring program has not shown this to be a problem.</p> <p>The DFMP will contain a long term road strategy for the FMA. Issues of integration with other commercial users and access management strategies will be contained as part of the plan. Having said that, SLS does not have the mandate or authority or regulate recreational access on public land. The DFMP</p>

Public Involvement Summary of Additional Feedback Received

Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
and faster melting of snow cover which may result in higher spring runoff, more downstream erosion and lower river flows in the summer. Loss of forest cover may also increase the runoff rate from rainstorms, resulting in additional downstream erosion. Access Management – We are concerned that construction of forestry roads may increase public access to the areas within the FMA. We feel one of your objectives should be to minimize the impact of activities that may occur on the land during and after harvesting by limiting and controlling public access. The Ghost-Waiporous and McLean Creek areas are examples of locations where inadequate access management has resulted in significant and in some cases, irreparable environmental damage.							road strategy will be prepared in keeping with existing land use zones, access management plans (Ghost/Waiporous), and the recognition that grazing lease holders have the right to manage access on their leases.
Have measures in place to limit public access	X	X	X	X	Yes	Access Management (Sec 5.1).	Included under the issue of Access Management. SLS can install access controls as approved or required by SRD however SLS does not have any mandate to regulate non-commercial users. Commercial users of SLS's road system require road use agreements that may contain some restrictions. For the most part this is a road specific, operational issue. The DFMP will recognize various land use zones, access management plans and situations where access is controlled by another entity.
Incorporate new information from research into forestry practices, not relying solely on Provincial guidelines.		X	X		Yes	Adaptive Management & Research (Sec 5.2).	Objectives & Strategies have been incorporated into the DFMP to address this issue.
Would like to participate in the development of the ground rules.				X	No		There is a Public Involvement objective contained within the DFMP, sec 5.13 although it does not specifically address ground rules. The ground rules discussions occur after the DFMP has been approved. The DFMP merely provides some cursory direction for future ground rules negotiations.

Public Involvement Process – Recommendations from PAG

Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
Monitor research/literature on knowledge related to climate change and it's potential impacts on forest management. Address as part of next DFMP. (Oct. 25/02)	X	X		X	No		Is not planned to be part of the current DFMP but will be noted for future DFMP updates
To promote alternate reforestation strategies to address specific resource values and/or silviculture situations that are not addressed by current regulations. (May 7/03)		X		X	Yes	Reforestation (Sec 5.15)	The initial obligation SLS has towards reforestation is to abide by existing provincial policy and legislated standards, however, the DFMP will identify areas of opportunity where alternate standards need to be developed.
Continue to follow existing guidelines regarding soils management/rutting. (May 21/03)		X	X		Yes	Soils Conservation (Sec 5.6)	This recommendation is a re-confirmation of a proposed strategy to address soil conservation
Include reference to our periodic newspaper articles as part of the strategy for dealing with Forest Health.		X			Yes	Forest Health (Sec 5.7)	Public education in itself is not one of SLS's mandates or requirements of the DFMP. SLS does, however, have a company communications plan, which may help address this.
Also note as part of the strategy that SLS is providing operator/contractor training for forest Protection. (May 21/03)		X			Yes	Forest Protection (Sec 5.9)	SLS does not yet have a Forest Protection Agreement in place with SRD which would spell out specific training requirements. However, outside of any agreement SLS has still be doing some contractor/operator fire training. This recommendation simply states that SLS should recognize this as part of the strategy in order to get credit for doing it.

Public Involvement Workshop 2003 – Summary of Comments

Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
<u>Water Management:</u>							
Incorporate new science (e.g. U of A Research forest hydrology research as applicable to the Eastern Slopes) – (suggestion that this be a coordinated effort among SLS, SRD, oil/gas industry, etc.).		X	X	X	Yes	Adaptive Management & Research (Sec 5.2).	Dealt with under Adaptive Management & Research strategies to gather the pertinent information. This information will also be considered as part of the ground rules development to allow for inclusion of new practices. Ground Rules development is sequenced after the DFMP is approved.
Incorporate new approaches/science regarding harvesting, reforestation, site preparation, etc. that positively effect water values.		X	X	X	Yes	Adaptive Management & Research (Sec 5.2).	Same comments as above
Create partnerships for watershed management as a mechanism to address water objectives.		X		X	Yes	Water Quality & Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17).	SLS cannot compel other organizations to participate, as such, the DFMP is being prepared without the concept of a “watershed partnership”. Having said that there is good merit in this concept and it is being pursued independent of the DFMP.
Forest management activities that improve water quality should be valued by the end user (e.g. City of Calgary); thus, the end user should be willing to pay for activities that improve water quality. (Rationale: Increasing water quality reduces the costs needed to treat water and also if water is retained longer in the landscape, it reduces the need for water storage facilities).				X	No		Not within SLS’s mandate to compel other organizations to participate or to contribute \$.
With regard to previously used crossings, the aim should be to not only maintain water quality, but improve it (specific to management activities).			X		N/A		Point well taken. We should look for opportunities for improvement and not necessarily be satisfied with the status quo. Having said that, many of the creeks in our area already have exceptional water quality. Best management practices, monitoring and adaptive management opportunities will go a long way in meeting water quality objectives. Other landuse activities may also impact water quality.
Incorporating downstream user feedback as well as encouraging involvement / participation of downstream users throughout the DFMP process (i.e. prior to approval, after approval and in the monitoring and reporting phases).		X		X	N/A		The approved PIP terms of reference and PAG provide direction for stakeholder input into the DFMP. Opportunities for feedback into monitoring and reporting have not yet been determined but will likely be through the company’s website.

Public Involvement Workshop 2003 – Summary of Comments

Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
Involvement of public in the monitoring process (i.e. stakeholders, community groups, schools, volunteer groups, etc.)				X	N/A		Public participation in the monitoring process is more of an item related to operational delivery rather than a specific objective or strategy in itself. There may be issues related to sampling protocols/consistency/validity etc depending on the type of involvement desired. This may be good public relations but is it meaningful science? (see issue below)
Embrace a true watershed approach to monitoring, research, management, etc. (e.g. community watershed approach – involve SLS, oil/gas companies, SRD, AB Env., and municipalities). Needs to be meaningful and supported by science and have the ability to implement changes (i.e. involving those that are responsible for management and operational activities)				X	No		Not within SLS's mandate to compel other organizations to participate or contribute \$. SLS is exploring options along these lines but is being dealt with independent of the DFMP.
Consider Forest Stewardship Council certification (includes specific water quality/quantity standards that are endorsed by the wider environmental community).				X	No		FSC certification is not part of the DFMP requirements. SLS is currently certified through "ForestCare". There are also several other certification schemes to consider.
Science Based ground rules (SLS could lead the development of improving Ground Rules with respect to water quality). This could also be economically viable if costs of changing to activities that address water quality/quantity issues could be partially offset by end user.			X	X	N/A		Ground Rules development follows DFMP approval. SLS is not in a position to compel others to pay.
Requirement to report monitoring data on an annual basis.		X			N/A		The Planning Manual specifies an annual monitoring program coupled with a five-year stewardship report.
<b>Biodiversity/Wildlife:</b>							
Concern: How does the objectives/strategies address agricultural grazing issues related to encroachment of natural forests on agricultural grazing area? Need an objective to address this issue (i.e. Forest succession will, over time, reduce grazing potential).	X			X	No		Natural encroachment of forest cover on rangeland is not a DFMP issue. It is something best dealt with through a range management plan.

Public Involvement Workshop 2003 – Summary of Comments

Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
Suggested objective: To recognize natural forest encroachment on grazing Animal Unit Months (AUM) in relation to habitat modeling outputs.				X	No		A DFMP does not model or determine grazing carrying capacity or the integration between grazing and wildlife habitat
Alternative objective: To recognize the effects of livestock grazing on the re-growth of reforested areas.		X	X	X	Yes	Reforestation (Sec 5.15). Integration with other commercial users (Sec 5.12).	Regen establishment and performance survey requirements are directed through SRD Policy and Regulation. It does not address damage specific to grazing as part of the survey but this can be added on. This is an important consideration from many perspectives: integration of range management plans and forest management plans, SRD policy development, AAC sustainability, compensation due to regen damage.
To define the fire regime (natural/man caused) or disturbances on the landscape (as related to monitoring). a. to conduct a fire history study b. to assess/monitor historical fire data c. to define the natural range of variability over time.		X			Yes	No specific Objective	Conducting a Fire Regime Study in itself is not an objective. It does however provide useful insight that may be used in the refinement of other management strategies and future operating ground rules. Such a study is currently underway.
To maintain and/or enhance the visual aesthetic and the integrity of wilderness as to minimize the impact on areas where visitors and other outdoor enthusiasts go: a. use existing interim strategy.		X	X	X	Yes	Aesthetic Values (Sec 5.3).	Aesthetic Value management strategies dealt with under current Issue listing. No further strategy required.
To consider the impact of new/increased access on wildlife habitat effectiveness (e.g. road density) with regional cooperation, all access users. (as related to monitoring).	X	X	X	X	Yes	Biodiversity & Wildlife Habitat Supply (Sec 5.4).	SLS has developed a long term road strategy as a part of the DFMP but have no control and minimal knowledge of other resource sector developments. That said SLS does attempt to integrate with other commercial users. Likewise SLS has no mandate to require others to participate in a monitoring program. This limits our ability for long term habitat effectiveness planning and reduces monitoring to being a "snapshot in time".
<u>Biodiversity:</u>							
It is understood that wildlife is a part of biodiversity. There is a concern that wildlife objectives and strategies are defined separately		X		X	Yes	Biodiversity & Wildlife Habitat Supply (Sec 5.4).	Agree that wildlife is part of the overall concept of biodiversity. Wildlife and biodiversity have now been combined A

Public Involvement Workshop 2003 – Summary of Comments

Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
from biodiversity objectives and strategies. The suggestion is to provide a definition of "biodiversity".							definition of biodiversity is easy enough to include, however, the challenge is in establishing a baseline target to work from.
The current assumption is that the habitat data collected by the province is adequate. The province will provide existing wildlife data to SLS and data gaps will be dealt with by SLS.		X			Yes	Biodiversity & Wildlife Habitat Supply (Sec 5.4).	Habitat data provided by the Crown is in the form of AVI (a vegetation inventory). It requires interpretation and modelling in combination with other landscape uses and attributes to convert it into habitat values. The Crown has not provided specific wildlife data. Note: data &/or data gaps for non-timber values are the Crowns responsibility to provide as defined in the agreement.
Government is responsible for managing wildlife populations. The FMA holder, through their forestry management/practices, is responsible to manage wildlife habitat with other stakeholders. The linkage between population numbers and habitat is difficult to specifically define. (Qualification: effective habitat is different from available habitat).					Yes	Biodiversity & Wildlife Habitat Supply (Sec 5.4).	General comment with no specific recommendation. Agree with comment.
How does SLS plan to measure the Biodiversity Objective (i.e. recognizing that gaining understanding is a long term process)? Suggest new strategy: To complete a survey of vegetative diversity across the FMA. Suggest alternative wording to objective: To maintain biodiversity at various levels within the natural range at landscape, community and species levels.	X	X			Yes	Biodiversity & Wildlife Habitat Supply (Sec 5.4).	The intent was to gain an understanding by virtue of completing an Ecological land classification for the FMA. This includes a composite assessment of vegetative species composition, slope and aspect. It can then be used as a baseline database for completing follow-up habitat value modelling. The challenge is in defining the natural range (or target range) of variability to work within. The scale of the DFMP is intended to work with issues at a landscape level, not at a community or species level. The exception to this is if a listed 'species at risk' has been identified.
Current wording of interim strategy regarding "area of Ecological Land Classification" may need to consider areas outside and adjacent to the boundaries of the FMA.	X	X			N/A		It is recognized that natural ecological processes don't follow administrative boundaries, however, as the FMA holder our mandate for DFMP development ends at the FMA boundary. Having said that there have

Public Involvement Workshop 2003 – Summary of Comments

Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
							been some coordinated efforts with adjacent organizations to provide some standardization of ELC formats.
What dates relate to the ELC start/completion? What is the 3-year period?		X			N/A		The ELC is targeted for completion together with the submission of the DFMP, Oct/04.
<u>Wildlife Supply &amp; Effective Habitat:</u>							
Suggest alternative wording for objective (a): To develop a landscape and local level ecosystem understanding of wildlife habitat needs over time (as related to projection of habitat).		X			Yes	Biodiversity & Wildlife Habitat Supply (Sec 5.4).	Habitat values can be projected through time, as affected through activities contained within the DFMP. There is limited knowledge or control of other landuse activities to be taken into account. A local level ecosystem understanding (depending how it is defined) may be too fine a level of resolution for inclusion within the DFMP.
Suggested new objective: To plan for a sufficient supply of effective and high quality habitat to maintain native wildlife species over time.		X			Yes	Biodiversity & Wildlife Habitat Supply (Sec 5.4).	Agree with concept, however, the same issue arises with the lack of information to project other landuse activities which may impact the effectiveness and quality of the habitat.
Concern with strategy (a). There are other information sources. This should be expanded to include other sources (i.e. in addition to SRD).		X			Yes	Biodiversity & Wildlife Habitat Supply (Sec 5.4).	Agree, information will be gathered from whatever sources can be found. Note: the strategy specified SRD in order to be consistent with the terms of the FMA.
Where the information comes from and how it is analyzed can influence outcomes. How can this be standardized to maximize consistency? (relates to rigorous methodology, up-to-date standard approach and information that is accepted).					N/A		General comment on data management. This needs to be referenced back to a previous comment about involving community groups and the contradiction in doing this and the need for scientific rigor in data collection.
The spatial and temporal distribution of wildlife habitat should be incorporated into the objective/strategy.		X			Yes	Biodiversity & Wildlife Habitat Supply (Sec 5.4).	Good recommendation. Is included within the objectives/strategies.
Adaptive management principles should be applied (as related to monitoring) (e.g. maintaining aspen, specific locations (stands), and the percentage of coniferous/deciduous stands).		X	X	X	Yes	Adaptive Management & Research (Sec 5.2).	Agree with concept. The challenge is to find the appropriate balance between regulatory requirements, which leans towards more structure and the flexibility needed to apply an adaptive management philosophy.

Public Involvement Workshop 2003 – Summary of Comments

Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
Consideration of managing riparian buffer zones and watercourse buffers on a site-specific basis (e.g. sensitive soils, aspect, geology, risk of slope failure, sedimentation (fisheries concern), blow down, wildlife specific requirements) – potentially consider on a watershed level management basis.		X	X	X	Yes	Water Quality and Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17).	Agree with concept. The DFMP acknowledges and states the intent to evaluate riparian management opportunities but is not the scale of plan to get into specifics. The ground rules will need to be developed to accommodate operational activity within areas historically regarded as deletion areas.
<u>Access Management:</u>							
Must ensure that the [access] planning is enhanced (i.e. more proactive coordination between the industrial stakeholders to reduce the access-related footprint.	X	X	X	X	Yes	Access Management (Sec 5.1). Integration with other commercial users (Sec 5.12).	Covered under existing management objectives and strategies. No further strategies required.
Meet with Oil/Gas/First Nations high level representatives (senior VP's, band chiefs, etc) to plan access for a block in time (i.e. next 10-20 years). Due to the competitive nature of oil/gas development, sign a confidentiality agreement not to disclose exact plans. But the intent is to just show where logging is to occur in the DFMP and not show where oil/gas activity will occur (i.e. can the oil/gas companies "live with" the planned road network in the DFMP). The possibility of data sharing (using the same GIS data, etc.) might be enough in terms of cost reductions to enable this to happen.	X	X	X	X	Yes	Access Management (Sec 5.1). Integration with other commercial users (Sec 5.12).	Same comment as above
Establish long-term recreational use plans that not only identify known trails & uses but potential trail routes and uses.				X	No		Outside of the scope of a DFMP. This is an Alberta Community Development mandate. From an operational perspective SLS will endeavor to accommodate existing recreation areas to minimize impacts.
Meet with recreation user groups, SRD, etc. to develop strategic recreational plans identifying zones of recreational use as well as potential trail systems (i.e. recreation nodes). This has already been performed in some areas of the province. Also, try to integrate information from other High Level Plans and Recreation Plans into the DFMP.	X	X	X	X	Yes	Integration with other commercial users (Sec 5.12). Integration with other values & non-commercial uses (Sec 5.11).	There is an Alberta Community Development lead process underway to evaluate potential recreation development nodes within East Kananaskis Country. SLS is part of the process. The outcome of the process will be addressed as part of the DFMP development once it has been completed and ready to be made public.

Public Involvement Workshop 2003 – Summary of Comments

Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
Promote responsible stewardship with respect to access while on the land base.		X	X	X	Yes	Access Management (Sec 5.1).	No specific issue or strategy cited in the comment.
Increase the use of signage to educate the public. Development of the signage could be a joint venture between SLS and SRD and related agencies or user groups. With increased education and awareness, hopefully the damage of access routes, gates, etc. and related resources would be minimized. Theoretically, fees from off-road motor vehicle licensing could be used for signage if changes in legislation were made.		X	X	X	Yes	Access Management (Sec 5.1). Public Safety (Sec 5.14).	Signage has been and will continue to be used. To this point the use of signage has focused on meeting objectives related to safety. While the concept of joint educational signage will be explored there is no mandate within the DFMP to require participation from others. Likewise there is no requirement for a public education program within the DFMP. It will however be explored outside of the DFMP.
Increase enforcement related to recreational user access.	X			X	No		This is a provincial government issue

Public Involvement Process – Open Houses, May 2004

Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
Whispering Pines Bible Camp – the main concern is the visual effect any future logging would have on the immediate camp. Plus the area around Cow Lake which is N.W. of our lease area. We have a “Beach” area and use the lake for canoeing & water skiing, etc.		X	X	X	Yes	Aesthetic Values (Sec 5.3) & Integration of Other Values and non-commercial uses (Sec. 5.11).	Visual Quality is recognized as an issue. The DFMP contains a broad landscape level visual sensitivity rating. Based on the comment received the Bible camp has been identified as a “high”. Management strategies for the area will be dealt with as such. i.e. Visualization modeling at the operational level and stakeholder referral.
Given the proximity of Calgary and its rapidly growing population, the highest and best use of forested lands west of Calgary is outdoor recreation, not timber harvesting. Why isn't someone addressing this issue? Existing and proposed timber harvesting will impact forested areas west of Calgary to a degree that is not in the public's interest. Who is looking at the long-term implications of all this timber harvesting, vis-à-vis alternative land uses?	X				No		Timber harvesting has occurred in the area by Spray Lake Sawmills for over sixty years. It has been addressed as a suitable activity within the East slopes policy and subsequent IRP's for the area. The Forest Management Agreement was negotiated with the company and approved in accordance with these higher order-planning documents, which included a public involvement process. The DFMP is intended to address how the forest will be managed for timber harvest and how it will be done in recognition of other resource values.
Almost no consideration is being given to the recreational potential of the lands harvested and to be harvested, despite the fact that SLS is committed to “planning for multiple use”, and despite the fact that SLS has several consultants collecting all kinds of baseline data. What SLS needs is a detailed inventory of recreation potential of an area and to plan according? Note: A map of existing trails is not a suitable substitute for a detailed assessment of an areas recreation potential.	X	X			Yes	Integration of Other Values and non-commercial uses (Sec 5.11).	Inventories and/or databases on other resource values remain a Crown responsibility. SLS will include and address “detailed inventories of recreation potential” as it is made available. Commitments have been made within the Plan for a system of cross referral of any adjacent operational plans between Community Development and SLS.
Another objective of SLS is to maintain aesthetic values/visual quality. However, much of the clear-cutting appears to have occurred in square rectangular blocks, some of which are on tops of ridges. Is it possible to have clear-cutting on a large scale and retain an area's visual qualities. Think no.		X	X	X	Yes	Aesthetic Values (Sec 5.3).	Visual quality is recognized as an issue. The DFMP will contain a broad landscape sensitivity rating. Various management strategies will be employed depending on the rating.
A SLS representative reports that SLS offered to cooperate with the Province in upgrading some of the recreational infrastructure in the McLean Creek area, e.g. by replacing a ford with a SLS bridge. This proposal was turned down by the Province, however. This on the face of it is very unfortunate. Again, in my opinion this was unfortunate, because this is precisely the kind and level of involvement that should be coming			X	X	N/A		This is a comment dealing with a site-specific issue and an overall need for cooperative planning and operational delivery on the landscape. It is a point well taken. While it is not a specific SLS responsibility to manage other resource uses opportunities for operational coordination will be sought.

Public Involvement Process – Open Houses, May 2004

Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
from major stakeholders such as SLS.							

Public Involvement Summary M.D. of Bighorn #8

Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
Ensure that watershed protection is completely addressed and engage best management practices	X	X	X		Yes	Water Quality & Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17)	Watershed protection is recognized as a high priority issue and is addressed within currently proposed management objectives for the DFMP
Engage landscape architectural services in consideration of pre-logging actions and post logging restoration activities		X			Yes	Aesthetic Values (Sec 5.3) Soil Conservation (Sec 5.6)	The exact intent of this comment is not clear but is assumed to deal with recognizing aesthetic values within the harvest design and appropriate standards of reclamation once logging is complete. Both of these issues have been included as part of the DFMP objectives listing and accompanying management strategies. SLS has in-house expertise to deal with these issues and has various computer modeling capability available when needed.
SLS should engage in full ecosystem based planning		X			Yes	All	There isn't one objective within the DFMP which specifically deals with ecosystem based planning, however this is the intent and will be accomplished through a combination of objectives
Take into account all of the various competing land uses, including potential uses.	X	X	X		Yes	Integration of Other Values and Non-commercial Uses (Sec 5.11)  Integration with Other Commercial Users (Sec 5.12)	Currently addressed within the two management objectives as listed. Land use activities must still abide by the terms of any higher order plans (IRP's). SLS can only deal with uses and issues that we are currently aware of.
There is a need for on-going dialogue with the M.D. (Bighorn) and on-going opportunities for community involvement		X	X	X	Yes	Public Involvement (Sec 5.13)	SLS will set up a process of on-going information sharing with the MD related to plan delivery and operational practices. SLS has historically provided opportunities for community involvement in our operating plans. The current Terms-of-Reference for the DFMP development doesn't extend into operational delivery or monitoring however SLS will examine systems for achieving this once the DFMP has been finalized. The current focus is on completing the DFMP.
Take into account today's changing world		X			Yes	Adaptive Management and Research (Sec 5.2)	Covered off under the objective as listed
Acknowledge the MD's function with respect to roads				X	No		The MD's authority is already entrenched via the Municipal Government Act and doesn't require a restatement within the DFMP. SLS will strive for improved communication processes with the MD as noted above.

Rancher Workshops 2006 – Summary of Comments

Identified Issues ( <b>Integration Process</b> ) <b>Grazing Timber Integration Manual</b>	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
Southern Alberta grazing community should have representation on the committee				X	N/A	_____	These comments are for the SRD provincial document entitled "Grazing Timber Integration Manual"
Expenses with respect to the dispute resolution process should be the responsibility of the government				X	N/A	_____	Same as above
Government enforcement would eliminate the need for a lot of dispute resolution				X	N/A	_____	Same as above
There should not be any restrictions on grazing within regenerating cutblocks. Does not believe grazing has any detrimental effects on regen.				X	N/A	_____	Same as above
Question whether the government should be playing a role in covering fencing costs				X	N/A	_____	Same as above
Communication protocols are reasonable and necessary				X	N/A	_____	Same as above
Timber industry must be given more range information up front so that it can be integrated into their operations earlier				X	N/A	_____	Same as above
GTA mapping requirements need to be clarified. Who is responsible for providing the required info				X	N/A	_____	Same as above
Feels the document weighs heavily in favour of the timber industry				X	N/A	_____	Same as above
Issues will arise. Parties must be prepared to bargain in good faith				X	N/A	_____	Same as above
Step in the right direction but beef producers in the south need more representation				X	N/A	_____	Same as above
SRD should set up an arbitration panel to make final rulings on items of dispute				X	N/A	_____	Same as above
The old process didn't need fixing. It needed enforcing and it can't be enforced only one way				X	N/A	_____	Same as above
Civil action is not a realistic option and should be avoided however the legal system may be the only option left to protect my grazing rights and improvements				X	N/A	_____	Same as above
Regional Grazing Integrated Management Options #1 and 2 will have little application for established operations				X	N/A	_____	Same as above
Doesn't like the notion of a grazing assoc representing a permit holders interests				X	N/A	_____	Same as above

Rancher Workshops 2006 – Summary of Comments

Identified Issues ( <b>Integration Process</b> ) <b>Grazing Timber Integration Manual</b>	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
Government should be taking the responsibility of fencing costs in areas where natural barriers have historically served the purpose				X	N/A	_____	Same as above
Grazing disposition holders shouldn't be required to fence cutblocks. Develop management strategies with the timber operator instead.				X	N/A	_____	Same as above
Weed control is the responsibility of the grazing disposition holder however with increased activity from other user groups it should not be at the rancher's expense.				X	N/A	_____	Same as above

These are paraphrased comments received over four different workshops with the ranching community:

- Longview            March 6, 2006
- Cochrane            March 7, 2006
- Sundre              March 7, 2006
- Cochrane            March 28, 2006

Invitations were sent out to 144 ranchers who had dispositions covering the DFMP planning area

A total of 53 attended

A total of 7 provided comments

Comments are on Draft #3 of the Grazing Timber Integration Manual

Rancher Workshops 2006 – Summary of Comments

Identified Issues ( <b>spatial harvest sequence</b> )	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
	IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
There needs to be a meeting before harvesting begins.			X	X	Yes	5.12 Integration with other commercial users	The DFMP makes a reference to following the provincial policy document entitled "Grazing and Timber Integration Manual". This document has been developed with sector representation from both the Forest Products Assoc and the Alberta Beef Producers. It contains operational details on how the two resource sectors will be integrated.
Meetings should be held at three separate steps during the planning process: spatial harvest sequence, preliminary harvest design and annual operating plan.			X	X	Yes	Same as above	Same as above
Meeting results should be signed-off by both sides.			X	X	Yes	Same as above	Same as above
Enough time should be provided in case any dispute resolution required along the way			X	X	Yes	Same as above	Same as above
Did not feel enough information was provided to circle any problem areas.				X	N/A	_____	The comment was in relation to the rancher workshops that were help rather than the DFMP itself.
Natural barriers can be an issue within allotments as well (not just between allotments).			X		N/A	_____	Will be addressed through the provincial Grazing Timber Integration manual but the comment is not a process item or of a level of detail applicable to the DFMP
Areas left for cattle and wildlife shelter could also be a concern.			X		N/A	_____	Same as above
Felt that SLS should meet with ranchers "prepared with up to date aerial photos with the new harvest sequence marked on them with proposed roads and other infrastructure..."			X	X	Yes	5.12 Integration with other commercial users	The DFMP makes a reference to following the provincial policy document entitled "Grazing and Timber Integration Manual".
Felt that SRD should play a stronger enforcement role.			X		N/A	_____	SRD operational enforcement is not an item of a nature suitable to the DFMP

Public Involvement Comments – Final Six Week Review Period

Category	Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
		IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
CC	Opposed to clear cutting Kananaskis Country, a popular recreation area	X	X	X		Yes	Biodiversity & W/L Habitat (Sec 5.4) Forest Health (Sec 5.7) Reforestation (Sec 5.15) Sustainable Timber Supply (Sec 5.16)	Harvest methods are primarily driven by the physiological characteristics of the tree species being managed and the best option for achieving reforestation success.
	Need to have adequate information on the impact of clear cut logging				X	N/A		The Forest Management Agreement area is approximately 70% lodgepole pine, a species requiring open sunlight to regenerate. Hence the preference towards clear cut harvesting over a partial removal such as thinning.
	Should consider alternate cutting methods besides clear cutting		X	X		Yes	Biodiversity & W/L Habitat (Sec 5.4) Forest Health (Sec 5.7) Reforestation (Sec 5.15) Sustainable Timber Supply (Sec 5.16)	Landscape biodiversity, Wildlife habitat values, water related issues, and forest health issues have also been factored into the forest management plan and assessed to ensure an appropriate balance of resource values.
	Request that the Ghost Watershed be spared from clear-cut logging and that other harvesting and forest management methods will be developed and implemented (e.g. selective logging, from single trees to small patches and ongoing forest care)		X	X		Yes	Biodiversity & W/L Habitat (Sec 5.4) Forest Health (Sec 5.7) Reforestation (Sec 5.15) Sustainable Timber Supply (Sec 5.16)	There may be area or site specific cases where alternate cutting systems will be employed. Examples of this could be operating plans within Firesmart zones or visual screening for areas with high aesthetic values. Details for "on the ground" management of harvest systems employed will occur in the next level of plan development, the annual operating plan.
FireSmart	Skeptical that a FireSmart plan will be of help in providing fire protection to Bragg Creek residents. May be open to considering a thinning program.		X	X	X	Yes	Forest Protection (Sec 5.9)	The Forest Protection Division of Sustainable Resource Development will be taking the lead role in developing a Firesmart plan for the areas identified within the DFMP (Waiparous and West Bragg Creek).
	Public input from residents of Bragg Creek needed specific to FireSmart plan.				X	N/A		The Firesmart planning process will include an opportunity for public involvement. Spray Lake's DFMP defers to the Firesmart plan as the operating plan for the area. This is the level of plan development

Public Involvement Comments – Final Six Week Review Period

Category	Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
		IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
	Accelerated cutting is seen as dangerous (with a reference being made to the identified beetle priority areas and the two FireSmart zones)		X			Yes	Forest Protection (Sec 5.9) Forest Health (Sec 5.7) Sustainable Timber Supply (Sec 5.16)	which will address the specific topics of concern. The DFMP simply identifies the generalized area and stands to be addressed as part of the Firesmart plan.  As a side note, both Firesmart zones have also been identified as high risk areas for the mountain pine beetle. Both fire and beetle susceptibility should be addressed within the Firesmart plan. Proactive plan development for both of these issues will provide better opportunities for influencing future forest and stand dynamics than waiting for a salvage operation in its aftermath.
	Believe the Alberta FireSmart program is being misinterpreted within the plan. (should be based on building ignitability rather than wildland fires)		X			Yes	Forest Protection (Sec 5.9)	
	Disagree with the intense logging proposal for the 10 km zone (referring to the two fire smart zones)		X		X	Yes	Forest Protection (Sec 5.9)	
	No additional fire protection value derived from clear cutting		X		X	Yes	Forest Protection (Sec 5.9)	
	Propose Alternative logging in 10km FireSmart zone		X		X	Yes	Forest Protection (Sec 5.9)	
Review and Approval	The public has been provided with an inadequate amount of time and opportunity to conduct a thorough review of the plan. Request extension to the review period. Need to start a proper public hearing. The plan should have a full independent review.		X			Yes	Public Involvement (Sec 5.13)	Spray Lake Sawmills has been conducting a public involvement process for developing the DFMP since its inception four and a half years ago. The process had been designed based on feedback from a variety of stakeholder groups, has been endorsed by a Public Advisory Group and approved by SRD. The process has included a variety of options/opportunities for public review and input. It has included such things as: email notifications and questionnaires, website postings, workshops, open houses, group presentations, advertisements and a Public Advisory Group. Further details related to the process and activities within the process can be found in Chapter 4 of the DFMP.  The FMA outlines the public input requirements for this DFMP and the next DFMP. In addition, SLS commits in the DFMP to providing public review opportunities during operational planning. Details are not provided at this time because experience shows that public
	Concern that future public involvement plans are vague.		X			Yes	Public Involvement (Sec 5.13)	
	Clarify website information regarding where, when extent of logging				X	N/A		

Public Involvement Comments – Final Six Week Review Period

Category	Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
		IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
	Want to see a moratorium placed on logging and any other industrial activity being planned for K-Country	X				N/A		interest varies greatly across the FMA and therefore different approaches will be developed for different areas.  The review and approval process conducted by the Crown is outside of the DFMP mandate or terms of reference.
	The DFMP should be based on the "2006 Alberta Forest Management Standard" and should be reviewed by a team of external professionals	X	X			Yes	Terms of the Forest Management Agreement	Logging and other industrial activity has been designated as permissible activities for Zone 5, Multiple Use Zone, within the IRP. This decision has been re-confirmed by the Crown by virtue of the Forest Management Agreement having been signed off in 2001. It is outside of the terms of reference for the DFMP planning process to re-address land use designations from higher order plans.
	SLS should have had stakeholder input prior to the draft plan having been developed		X			Yes	Public Involvement (Sec 5.13)	The time frame allowed for the final stage of public review of the plan was as specified in the Decision Document from the plans first draft submission.  The target submission date for the plan is specified in both the FMA and the Decision document.  The FMA specifies that development of the DFMP will follow the interim Forest Management Planning Manual, dated April 1998. The intent of this was to allow for a clear and un-moving target during the term of the plans development.
	Want the decision document provided by SRD on the plans first draft made available to the public				X	N/A		The intent of the final plan review was to provide stakeholders with a complete final package to examine irrespective of the steps leading up to it. The Public Advisory Group had been part of the Decision Document review.
	Recommend a moratorium on approving and implementing the DFMP	X			X	N/A		

Public Involvement Comments – Final Six Week Review Period

Category	Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
		IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
	Propose mechanism for interim approvals of various plan components				X	N/A		
	Concern that ten year review period for water yield is too long, should be assessed more frequently to determine if there is an effect on quality		X		X	Yes	Water Quality/Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17)	
	Demand for independent plan review				X	N/A		
Park	Stop all logging activities until a decision has been reached regarding the proposed Moose Mtn Wildland Park	X				N/A		<p>The FMA and DFMP terms of reference takes the zoning framework from higher order IRP's as the start point for the DFMP planning process.</p> <p>Spray Lake Sawmills had voluntarily given up approximately 11% of its cutting rights in FMU B10 at the time of FMA negotiations in order to facilitate the creation of the Don Getty, Blue Rock and Sheep River Wildland Provincial Parks. This was done with the understanding and agreement that the remainder of the FMA would remain as "working forest".</p>
	Support the development of a Wildland Provincial Park	X				N/A		
Values (\$)	Concerns over the loss of tourism and recreation values of the West Bragg Creek area	X	X	X	X	Yes partial	Aesthetic Values (Sec 5.3) Integration of Other Values & Non-Commercial Uses (Sec 5.11)	<p>Permissible land use activities stem from zoning designations from higher order planning documents, the IRP's.</p> <p>The DFMP addresses integration with other resource values and uses but does not address an economic assessment of other uses, whether Crown or private. This is outside of the DFMP terms of reference.</p> <p>Likewise the plan does not address adjacent private land activities outside of the FMA boundary. It does,</p>
	Believe recreational use to have a higher economic value than logging	X			X	N/A		

Public Involvement Comments – Final Six Week Review Period

Category	Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
		IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
	Effect of logging on property values in Bragg Creek				X	N/A		however, address trans-boundary issues on adjacent Crown land zones.
	Concern over economic impact on Bragg Creek businesses				X	N/A		
	DFMP understates the conflicts and the forest amenity for non-motorized recreation	X	X	X		Yes partial	Aesthetic Values (Sec 5.3) Integration of Other Values & Non-Commercial Uses (Sec 5.11)	
	The economic value associated with water treatment may outweigh the revenue generated by the forest industry				X	N/A		
Water	Concern over damage to the Elbow River watershed (nutrient and sediment levels, flooding)		X	X		Yes	Water Quality/Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17)	<p>Water related issues are recognized as a high priority for the east slopes. The DFMP has netted out watershed buffers prior to doing the timber supply analysis. In other words, buffer areas do not contribute to the sustainable timber supply and are not sequenced for harvest.</p> <p>Also as part of the DFMP, Spray Lake has used the Equivalent Clearcut Area Model to predict the potential change in water yield following harvesting and the associated rate of hydrologic recovery over time. Dr. Uldis Silins, an independent forest hydrologist out of the U of A was then contracted to evaluate and interpret the results of the model output. Generally streamflow increases in the south (Kananaskis Country) were found to be negligible with greater streamflow increases predicted in the northern portion of the FMA. None of the FMA compartments were found to be over 15%, the threshold specified by SRD. Timing of surface run-off was predicted to have a degree of shift towards the spring</p>

Public Involvement Comments – Final Six Week Review Period

Category	Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
		IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
	There is currently a shortage of water supply and industrial logging will only exacerbate this threat		X		X	Yes	Water Quality/Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17)	<p>A set of ground rules will be developed for the FMA upon completion of the DFMP. While they will be FMA specific ground rules they will follow the provincial template, including standards for watershed protection and erosion control.</p> <p>Other land use activities have not been assessed for contributions they may have towards water related issues.</p> <p>Historical monitoring programs conducted by Spray Lake have not shown any water quality issues as a consequence of timber harvesting (including clear cut harvesting). The monitoring programs and resulting reports were developed independently of the DFMP and are referenced in the plan. The reports are available for reading at SLS.</p>
	Concern over a possible shift in the timing of surface flow/runoff		X			Yes	Water Quality/Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17)	
	Question the rationale behind the size of watershed buffers				X	N/A		
	Watershed protection is very inadequate and not given a high enough priority		X	X	X	Yes	Water Quality/Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17)	
	Did not address the important question of the expected water flow regime change		X			Yes	Water Quality/Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17)	

Public Involvement Comments – Final Six Week Review Period

Category	Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
		IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
	A concern with erosion, subsequent siltation of waterbodies and nutrient run-off into streams with sometimes detrimental impact on aquatic life and water quality due to clear-cut logging		X	X		Yes	Water Quality/Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17)	
	Request to have the impact on water assessed by independent scientists		X		X	Yes	Water Quality/Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17)	
	Major degradation of water quality and water flow regime is likely to occur		X	X		Yes	Water Quality/Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17)	
	Concern over importance afforded to wetland areas		X	X		Yes	Water Quality/Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17)	
	Concerned about increase in bovine fecal matter in streams due to increased erosion following clear cutting		X	X	X	Yes partial	Water Quality/Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17)	
	Recommendation to include water quality monitoring results in DFMP.				X	N/A		
	What are the strategies to address erosion		X	X	X	Yes partial	Water Quality/Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17)	

Public Involvement Comments – Final Six Week Review Period

Category	Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
		IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
	Concern over increased run off and sedimentation as result of clear cutting		X	X	X	Yes partial	Water Quality/Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17)	
Calgary Water	Concern with the effect logging may have on Calgary's water supply		x	X	X	Yes	Water Quality/Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17)	
	City of Calgary concerned that harvest impacts on water will impair their ability to withdraw their full water license allotment				X	N/A		
Biodiversity	Concerned that the ecosystem will be forever changed		X	X	X	Yes	Adaptive Management & Research (Sec 5.2) Biodiversity & W/L Habitat (Sec 5.4) Water Quality/Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17) Sustainable timber Supply (Sec 5.16)	The concepts of ecosystem functioning and sustainability are addressed through several different sections of the DFMP. As a forest products company Spray Lake has a strong interest in the timber sustainability part of the equation, however, timber and harvest planning must be done in recognition and coordination with other forest values. The DFMP has included outside resource management specialists as required to help model the impacts on other resource values. There is also a monitoring program included as part of the DFMP  Reforestation activities will follow provincial reforestation standards. This includes stratifying the landbase and developing reforestation prescriptions which will see the same species mix on the landscape as existed prior to harvest
	The sustainability and viability of our natural environment is being threatened		X	X	X	Yes	Adaptive Management & Research (Sec 5.2) Biodiversity & W/L Habitat (Sec 5.4) Water Quality/Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17) Sustainable Timber Supply (Sec 5.16)	Approximately 1/3 of the FMA landbase will not be subject to harvest due to streamside buffers, inoperable slopes and other ground rule deletions. This will result in pockets of old growth spread throughout the forest management agreement area  Concerns over forest health could relate to the overall ecological functioning of the forest ecosystem or to

Public Involvement Comments – Final Six Week Review Period

Category	Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
		IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
	Concern that tree planting with only one tree species and age will impact natural biodiversity		X	X	X	Yes	Reforestation (Sec 5.15)	specific insect or disease infestations. A section on forest health has also been included within the DFMP.
	50% of West Bragg has already been deforested and much of the remaining area is rock. The impacts of forestry on the remaining trees may be greater than anticipated				X	No	Incorrect Statements	While cumulative effects as an aggregate of mans activities on the landscape are important it is outside of the scope or mandate of Spray Lake's forest management agreement. It is an item more appropriately dealt with through an IRP planning process. That said, a major portion of the objectives and strategies are directed at integration and minimizing the impacts of timber harvest activities.
	The DFMP contains no strategy to protect remaining pockets of old-growth. It is SRD policy to rid the province of trees over approximately 80 years of age.		X	X		Yes	Biodiversity & W/L Habitat (Sec 5.4) Sustainable Timber Supply (Sec 5.16)	While the DFMP is not labeled as an EIA it includes many of the elements of an EIA.
	Need to ensure long-term ecosystem sustainability. The DFMP fall short of incorporating new ideas to achieve this.		X	X	X	Yes	Adaptive Management & Research (Sec 5.2) Biodiversity & W/L Habitat (Sec 5.4) Water Quality/Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17) Sustainable timber Supply (Sec 5.16)	
	Concern over loss of biodiversity & consequential impacts on forest health and ecological functions		X	X	X	Yes	Adaptive Management & Research (Sec 5.2) Biodiversity & W/L Habitat (Sec 5.4) Water Quality/Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17) Sustainable timber Supply (Sec 5.16) Forest Health (Sec 5.7)	

Public Involvement Comments – Final Six Week Review Period

Category	Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
		IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
	Concern over cumulative effect of increasing land uses and timber harvesting on watershed and other values.	X	X			Yes partial	Water Quality/Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17) Integration of Other Values & Non-Commercial Uses (Sec 5.11) Biodiversity and wildlife habitat supply (Sec 5.4) Historical Resources and Unique Areas (Sec 5.10) Sustainable Timber Supply (Sec 5.16) Integration with Other Commercial Users (Sec 5.12) Access Management (Sec 5.1)	
	Expectation of thorough EIA		X		X	Yes	Overall DFMP	
Safety	Concerned over safety problems resulting from increased traffic levels		X	X	X	Yes	Public Safety (Sec 5.14)	The DFMP briefly addresses the need for safety within Spray Lake's operations but is not the level of plan to provide the details. Spray Lake has a detailed safety program including the log haul, emergency response plans, training, fire/medical and environmental emergency preparedness and so on. The company will be happy to review this with any interested parties
	Safety of recreational users during logging operations		X	X	X	Yes	Public Safety (Sec 5.14)	
Planning	Propose the suspension of all new industrial activity pending review of the area structure plan. Too many land uses for this small area.	X				N/A		Comments related to other over-arching plans (IRP), broad scale land use allocations or planning initiatives outside of the forest management agreement and FMA boundaries are beyond the terms of reference for the DFMP.  SLS, as a FMA holder is part of the notification/consent process in place for the issuance of Energy sector dispositions. SLS further commits to defining a referral process with the Energy Sector that is more proactive in nature.
	There is a need for a new IRM initiative for area west of Bragg Creek.	X				N/A		
	It lacks coordination with other land plans. Want to see a broader, over-arching land use plan for the whole region	X				N/A		
	Priority should be given to coordinating with the Energy sector (Government and Industry)		X	X		Yes	Integration with Other Commercial Users (Sec 5.12)	

Public Involvement Comments – Final Six Week Review Period

Category	Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
		IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
	The same standards should be applied to cutblock design and location throughout the FMA		X	X		Yes	Overall direction provided to and through the Ground Rules	Standards are consistent. What may vary based on sensitivity and prioritization are the assessment and communication processes. Experience shows that values and public interest varies greatly across the FMA and therefore different approaches will be developed for different areas.
	Don't rush plans into place until communities are able to formulate their own watershed and community safety plans				X	N/A		
Climate Change	The plan does not take global warming and pollution into account	X	X		X	Yes partial	Carbon Sequestration (Sec 5.19)	The DFMP addresses Carbon Sequestration as it relates to climate change but only from an information monitoring perspective. At the present time there is insufficient methodologies to incorporate this issue into the DFMP. The DFMP will be updated every ten years. As more information becomes available it will be incorporated into future plans.
	It dismisses climate change. Serious planning should be undertaken to help curb climate change	X			X	No		
Trails	The Jumpingpound Creek area is important to the mountain biking community. They would like to be included as part of the operational planning process to ensure that the inventory of trails is accurate and proper understanding of use is obtained.			X		Yes partial	Integration of Other Values & Non-Commercial Uses (Sec 5.11)	<p>Many of the comments received related to recreational trails within the planning area are at an operational level of detail and will be dealt with more fully during the annual operating plan. Detailed location of the recreation trails and steps taken to ensure their protection will be addressed here.</p> <p>Spray Lake's intent is to develop a structured on going process for public involvement during DFMP implementation as well as for General Development Plans and annual operating plans. The details for this program have not yet been finalized. They will be developed after the DFMP submission and together with the Public Advisory Group.</p> <p>Options to disseminate information to the public will be discussed as part of the public involvement process.</p> <p>Spray Lake has an obligation to monitor and maintain its road system until it is either reclaimed and stabilized or assumed by another party. Conversion of roads into a usable trail system is a site specific decision that will</p>
	Convert logging roads into a useable trail system for recreational use	X		X	X	No		
	Concern that impact of logging on trails will result in reduced recreational activity and increased obesity			X	X	No		
	Concern over failure to indicate location of known trails, etc		X	X	X	Yes partial	Integration of Other Values & Non-Commercial Uses (Sec 5.11)	

Public Involvement Comments – Final Six Week Review Period

Category	Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
		IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
	Concern over protection of current recreational trails		X	X	X	Yes partial	Integration of Other Values & Non-Commercial Uses (Sec 5.11)	<p>need to be made in concert with SRD and Community Development. It is not part of the DFMP.</p> <p>Although trails are not specifically itemized in the issue list, and although trail development is not part of the SLS mandate as a forest company, coordination of trail inventories and working with ACD to explore opportunities are identified as DFMP strategies. The Provincial government has the mandate for managing the trail system including decisions regarding expansion.</p> <p>Spray Lake will do its best to ensure opportunities for recreation trail use are not diminished, however, as previous comments have noted it is a multiple use area.</p>
	No line item in issue list relating to the expansion of infrastructure for non-motorized recreation.		X	X		Yes partial	Integration of Other Values & Non-Commercial Uses (Sec 5.11)	
	Recommend posters at trailheads to provide public information				X		No	
Recreation Destination	The Alberta Government could turn the Jumpingpound Creek area into an international recreational sport destination for mountain biking. The mountain bike community could play a key role in this regard.	X	X		X	Yes partial	Integration of Other Values & Non-Commercial Uses (Sec 5.11)	<p>The area now known as Kananaskis Country has been zoned for multiple use for almost 30 years. Spray Lake has been harvesting in the area since 1954 with other operations in the area before Spray Lake.</p> <p>In part, this can be taken as an indication that multiple use <b>is</b> working and that harvest practices have done a good job in maintaining recreational and aesthetic values.</p>
	Concern over aesthetics following harvesting and potential negative impact on viewscapes and tourism		X			Yes	Aesthetic Values (Sec 5.3)	
	Concern that West Bragg area has been underrated as an important recreational destination		X			Yes	Integration of Other Values & Non-Commercial Uses (Sec 5.11) Aesthetic Values (Sec 5.3)	
	Generally opposed to logging in K-Country	X				No		
General	Question the overall process for how the FMA was established	X				No		<p>The FMA is a conversion of several coniferous timber quotas previously held by Spray Lake Sawmills. It is not a new allocation. It has been set up in keeping with the areas IRP's and multiple use zoning.</p>

Public Involvement Comments – Final Six Week Review Period

Category	Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
		IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
	Concern the DFMP gives the company the right to harvest "everywhere and all the time".	X	X	X		Yes	Integration of Other Values & Non-Commercial Uses (Sec 5.11) Biodiversity and wildlife habitat supply (Sec 5.4) Historical Resources and Unique Areas (Sec 5.10) Sustainable Timber Supply (Sec 5.16) Water Quality/Quantity and Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17)	The IRPs and subsequent processes set aside large areas in the Eastern Slopes where timber harvest is not permissible. Through the DFMP, 34% of the FMA is not within the timber harvesting land base. Further consideration and possible protection occurs during the operational planning process.
	Industrial scale logging should be phased out south of the Trans Canada highway	X				No		The DFMP assumes this as a given within its terms of reference and does not revisit the overall land use allocation issue.
Wildlife	Concern that vast clear cutting will eliminate virgin habitat in West Bragg Creek and Elbow Valley		X			Yes	Biodiversity & W/L Habitat (Sec 5.4)	Habitat values for various guilds of wildlife have been modeled against Spray Lake's preferred forest management scenario. This was done to ensure a full range of habitat values would be maintained over time.
	Wildlife's place is uncertain and based on computer simulations and these do not factor in climate change and human demographics		X			Yes partial	Biodiversity & W/L Habitat (Sec 5.4)	There are a number of land use activities and management practices beyond Spray Lake's control or which there are data bases available to incorporate. The DFMP modeling exercise only looks at habitat values as impacted by our activities.
	Questions related to the integration of the Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan and the DFMP.		X	X	X	Yes partial	Access Management (Sec 5.1)	SLS is committed to working with the Government in implementing the GBRP within the FMA once approved. Many of the questions were detailed, operational; the answers to which are undetermined at this time.
	What strategies are in place to address habitat needs		X	X		Yes	Biodiversity & W/L Habitat (Sec 5.4)	Strategies for addressing site specific habitat needs are also dealt with as part of the annual operating plan process.
Mountain Pine Beetle	Concern over the possibility of accelerated cutting as a consequence of mountain pine beetle		X			Yes	Forest Health (Sec 5.7) Sustainable Timber Supply (Sec 5.16)	The mountain pine beetle is a very large resource management challenge. This includes BC and large portions of Alberta of which Spray Lake's FMA is part. SRD is currently monitoring/surveying beetle advances and conducting individual infected tree eradication programs. Pheromone baiting is also a strategy currently in use based on the details of the situation.
	The aim should be to diversify the forest and allow natural control mechanism to re-establish (reference being made to the current mountain pine beetle infestation)		X		X	Yes partial	Sustainable Timber Supply (Sec 5.16)	The province is also finalizing a MPB action plan and set of operating ground rules specific to dealing with beetle infected areas.

Public Involvement Comments – Final Six Week Review Period

Category	Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
		IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
	Use pheromone bait trees and to take out only trees that are already infested (referring to mountain pine beetle). Alternative tree species, suitable for the location and growing conditions shall be promoted in pine beetle strategy)		X	X	X	Yes partial	Forest Health (Sec 5.7) Reforestation (Sec 5.15)	As part of Spray Lake's DFMP various management scenarios are being examined to determine how best to deal with the issue. Re-sequencing harvesting into high priority beetle susceptible areas and the possibility of accelerated harvesting in advance of the beetle are two of the options. These options are being evaluated and modeled in conjunction with potential impacts on other resource values and sustainability of the timber supply. Directions taken within the DFMP will be weighted towards strategies to combat the beetle but <b>not</b> without due regard for other resource values.
	Potential adverse effects of beetle control strategies; advocate alternate species planting		X	X	X	Yes	Forest Health (Sec 5.7) Reforestation (Sec 5.15) Monitoring Program	The severity of the beetle infestation is not within the realm of normal historically recorded outbreaks. Experience in BC has shown devastating effects. Natural control mechanisms are not considered an expectable option at this point. Part of the problem may be attributable to large tracks of an aging pine forest which is now of a prime age size and condition for beetle attack. This is being considered as part of the preferred forest management scenario in how we develop a more diverse forest structure and composition to withstand future attacks.
Ground Rules	New ground rules are still not available to be applied, but should be. Current ground rules are outdated				X	N/A		The normal sequence of events is to identify the issues, objectives targets and strategies within the DFMP. Operating ground rules flow out of the DFMP as a guideline for how the DFMP will be implemented. In keeping with this the ground rules will be developed after the DFMP has been completed (FMA sets timing). The current set of provincial ground rules are used as an interim tool until the FMA specific ground rules have been completed. The FMA specific ground rules will follow the most current provincial template. Ground rules are available to the public. Provincial and FMA specific ground rules are posted on the SRD web-site.  The provincial ground rule template has already undergone a public input process, as has the DFMP. Spray Lake will consult with the Public Advisory Group for further public involvement in ground rule development
	Concern over the timing of new ground rule development.				X	N/A		
	Question if ground rules will be available to the public.				X	N/A		
	Want to see a public involvement process included for ground rule development and plan implementation				X	N/A		

Public Involvement Comments – Final Six Week Review Period

Category	Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion	
		IRP	DFMP	Op	Other				
Access	Want new access limited and coordinated with other industry users. The DFMP implies massive new road building		X	X	X	Yes	Access Management (Sec 5.1)	<p>The DFMP has included the results of a road modeling exercise. The intent of the model was not to determine the exact location of every road but to ensure that are areas within the FMA would be accessible. Roads will be built and reclaimed progressively throughout the long term planning horizon of the forests rotation age.</p> <p>Coordination with other industrial user groups to minimize the roading footprint on the landscape is addressed within the DFMP</p> <p>Details surrounding the road program will still need to be sorted out together with SRD to ensure an appropriate blend of values/needs are met between such things as the need to minimize open access as part of the grizzly bear recovery plan and the need to develop more roads to access areas hit with the mountain pine beetle.</p>	
	Concern regarding implementation of effective access controls following harvesting		X	X	X	Yes	Access Management (Sec 5.1)		
	Concern that SLS road models ignore existing access		X	X	X	Yes	Access Management (Sec 5.1)		
Not Categorized	The value of the area as a film location should not be forgotten				X	N/A		This is not specifically addressed as part of the DFMP but should be accommodated through "Aesthetic Values" (Sec 5.3).	
	The plan virtually ignores demographics and demographic projections				X	N/A		Outside of the terms of reference for the DFMP	
	Timber harvest will not be acceptable to the public as the primary use. Watershed, wildlife habitat retention, access limitation, climate change and an ever growing human population with its growing demands for water and recreation are all virtually left out of this plan	X	X				Yes	FMA document Access Management (Sec 5.1) Aesthetic Values (Sec 5.3) Biodiversity & W/L Habitat (Sec 5.4) Integration of Other Values & Non-Commercial Uses (Sec 5.11) Water Quality/Quantity & Fisheries Resources (Sec 5.17)	Addressed in previous comments within this section
	FSC or CSA certification should be a minimum provision of this DFMP				X	No		Certification is outside of the scope of the DFMP. Spray Lake is currently ForestCare certified.	

Public Involvement Comments – Final Six Week Review Period

Category	Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
		IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
	Concern over availability of DFMP information and lack of application of science to effects of clear cutting		X			Yes	Chapter 4 Requirement for Public Involvement	Opportunities for input and availability of the DFMP has been considerable. Chapter 4 of the DFMP itemizes all of the various details surrounding the public involvement program. Spray Lake disagrees with the comment about the lack of science. The entire DFMP is science based.
	Concern of impacts of logging traffic on roads			X	X	N/A		While not addressed as part of the DFMP there is a provincially based program which requires forest products companies to acquire road specific approvals and permits to conduct their log haul. Log haul impacts on roads are dealt with on a road specific basis together with Motor Transport and the respective MDs.
	Concern that not all residential subdivisions are indicated on the planning maps				X	N/A		Lands which fall outside of the FMA have not been included within the DFMP planning process.
	Concern over lack of aboriginal consultation and consideration of traditional uses		X			Yes	Chapter 4 Requirement for Public Involvement	Activities related to stakeholder involvement including aboriginal consultation have been itemized within Chapter 4 of the DFMP.
	Concern over increased potential for dangerous human/animal encounters as wildlife is pushed into populated areas				X	N/A		The abundance of W/L habitat values have been addressed within Sec 5.4, Biodiversity & W/L Habitat. Human/wildlife encounters are also a function of increased human presence in the wildlife's habitat. It is outside of Spray Lake's mandate to restrict access for recreational purposes.
	Concern over lack of topographical detail on maps		X	X		N/A		The Governments DEM layer has been used as a foundation dataset in several of the modeling exercises within the DFMP although there is not a specific topographic map included for its own sake.
	Comments provided on DFMP structure and improvements recommended.		X			Yes		Changes made to DFMP based on recommendations e.g. References to ECA results in Ch 8 (Sec 8.4) included in Ch 2 and Ch 5. e.g. Text added to CH 2 on history of timber harvesting. e.g. Tourism references moved to Sec 5.12 from 5.11.
	Concern over the back-dating of the DFMP to 2001		X			Yes	Sustainable Timber Supply (Sec 5.16)	Synchronize DFMP with the start date of the FMA. Baseline of 2001 set for data, primarily the cutblock update data.
	Concern over influx of non-native vegetation (weeds)			X	X	Yes partial	Forest Health (Sec 5.7)	Addressed within the Forest Health section of the DFMP. Further details beyond this are more of an ongoing operational issue.

Public Involvement Comments – Final Six Week Review Period

Category	Identified Issues	Scale of Issue				Addressed Within DFMP Objectives (Yes, No, N/A)	If Yes, Which Objective	Strategy and/or Rationale for Non-Inclusion
		IRP	DFMP	Op	Other			
	Activities related to Integration should be monitored and reported annually		X			N/A		Addressed in Chapter 10. Monitoring changed to annual. Reporting, however, will remain at five years as part of the Stewardship Report.
	Water quality, wildlife and recreational areas will be lost irreversibly (referring to West Bragg Creek area)		X	X	X	Yes	See previous comments	
Overarching Principles	New science and research need to be incorporated		X	X		Yes	Adaptive Management & Research (Sec 5.2)	Addressed within the DFMP
	FMA holder should be required by SRD to change practices at any time if they do not address reasonable concerns		X	X	X	Yes	Adaptive Management & Research (Sec 5.2) Monitoring Program	In addition to the “Adaptive Management & Research section of the DFMP Spray Lake will be conducting a monitoring and reporting program. These two sections will be used in combination to help direct changes to operating practices as required.
	Advocate applying the precautionary principle		X			Yes	Overall structure of planning process	The precautionary principle is akin to the concept of risk management. Planning processes which drive the DFMP have been rigorous enough to help provide some comfort in thisard. The DFMP will also be updated every ten years, about 10% of the life span of the forest rotation age. Each DFMP update will provide a re-alignment of forest management activities based on new information and technologies

NOTE: many of the comments listed above have been paraphrased for the sake of brevity. Where comments from different sources were the same in nature and intent they were only listed once. A number of the emails/letters received elaborated on generalized thoughts around land use practices, planning processes, etc. Comments which didn't appear to have a direct linkage or connection to the DFMP were not itemized above.

**Spray Lake Sawmills  
Development of a Detailed Forest Management Plan  
Aboriginal Public Involvement Process**

**May 2006**

DATE	EVENT	ABSTRACT (if any)
		•
<b>Piikani</b>		
Fall of 2005 and winter 2006	meetings	Several meetings were held between SLS and the Piikani. The primary purpose was general relationship building. Inquiries were made as to their level of interest in the FMA DFMP. Their area of interest was stated as the C5 management unit. This was taken as, no further requirement to consult on SLS DFMP.
<b>Siksika</b>		
October 25/05	Presentation and meeting	Gord L and Ed K gave a DFMP presentation to the Siksika. They did not feel they had the capacity to do an adequate review. No specific comments or feedback received. Rick Blackwood was also in attendance. Several other meetings were held with the Siksika but were related more to relationship building rather than the DFMP.
unknown	Meetings with SRD	SRD, Rick Blackwood, advised that his office has had meetings with the Siksika and have further meetings slated. SLS has not received any specific DFMP comments as an outcome of these meetings.
Mar 2/06	Email exchange	Clayton Leonard, legal council for the Siksika, advised that they were still persuing funding from SRD to assist in their capacity to review and comment on the DFMP. It was left in their court if they wished to persue any further DFMP involvement with SLS. SLS mailed the Siksika a CD version of the DFMP in its entirety.
Mar 28/06	letter	Clayton Leonard advised that they were in the process of setting up a series of meetings with Rick Blackwood and that SLS involvement may be requested from time to time as needed to provide explanation. No further contact to date. Further consultation was left in their court to request.
<b>Tsuu T'ina</b>		
July 19/06	Presentation and meeting	Gord L and Ed K gave a DFMP presentation to the Tsuu T'ina. A CD version of the DFMP and a hard copy of the presentation material were given with them. A copy of a letter dated June 14/06 to Rick Blackwood was provided to SLS at the end of the meeting (SLS had been listed as a CC in the letter but it had never been received). Like the Siksika the Tsuu T'ina were requesting funding to aid in their capacity to conduct a review. The meeting concluded with further contact for DFMP review to be at their request. No further contact has been received.

DATE	EVENT	ABSTRACT (if any)
<b>Stony</b>		
Unknown	Registered letters/meeting	SRD has sent two registered letters to the Stony requesting a statement of interest in DFMP consultation. It is SLS's understanding that some form of meeting has occurred between SRD and the Stony but it has not included SLS and no DFMP feedback has been received.
May 11/06	Open House	A member of the Snow family, from the Stony, attended an SLS open house and spent some time reviewing a hard copy of the DFMP but has not provided any comment and did not sign-in as an open house participant.

**Spray Lake Sawmills (1980) Ltd**

**Proposal for a Public Involvement Process**

**For Development of a**

**Detailed Forest Management Plan**

## Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	2
Background	2-3
Objectives	3-4
Alternatives	4
Proposed Structure	4-6
Participants	6-7
Terms-of-Reference & Operating Guidelines	7-10
Public Involvement Process Performance Monitoring	10
Figure 1	11-12
FMA Stakeholder Advisory Process Discussions for Designing a Process Terms-of-Reference	
Figure 2	13
Spray Lake Sawmills (1980) Ltd Mechanisms for Stakeholder Input and Involvement Into Development of the Detailed Forest Management Plan	

# **Spray Lake Sawmills Proposal for a Public Involvement Process For Development of a Detailed Forest Management Plan**

## **Introduction**

Spray Lake Sawmills (1980) Ltd's (SLS) Forest Management Agreement (FMA) area is located in the southern east slopes of Alberta. It is the southern most FMA in the province, covering approximately 2800 sq km in a long narrow band from Sundre to the southern end of Kananaskis Country. This places it between Calgary, the provinces largest urban centre, and a heavily used parks system to the west. The FMA is dissected by the Trans-Canada Highway and has a number of smaller towns dotting its perimeter. The area has a long-standing history of timber harvesting, ranching, recreation and oil and gas activity. Combined, these characteristics provide the FMA with a high profile and a corresponding need for a meaningful public involvement process.

This submission details the background and proposed structure for a public involvement process for the development of a Detailed Forest Management Plan for the FMA.

## **Background**

Sections 10. (1) and (2) of the Forest Management Agreement outline the requirement for Spray Lake Sawmills(1980) Ltd to conduct public reviews of their proposed Detailed Forest Management Plan prior to submission to the Crown. The Agreement does not specify the process or structure for these reviews. It has been left to the company's discretion to propose a system for public involvement.

Over the past five years SLS has conducted several public involvement processes and used a variety of tools to maintain an on-going liaison with stakeholders and interested members of the public. The most prominent of these were the McLean Creek Advisory Committee, the RanFor Committee, and on-going open houses, newsletters, mailouts and newspaper articles. While these have not been government mandated or directed processes, they have provided valuable insight into the application of various public involvement strategies.

A meaningful public involvement process needs to be more than a minimal fulfillment of a regulatory obligation. It needs to be a process for the people; one which meets stakeholders needs as well as the company's. A meaningful process is one that will provide an opportunity for input for anyone who has an interest through one of several mechanisms. Not all

recommendations will necessarily be accepted but they will be given due consideration.

In keeping with this philosophy SLS conducted a series of informal interviews with a select representative group of cross-sectional stakeholders. A list of individuals/groups and their affiliations that contributed to this survey is attached as figure 1. The survey was not intended to be all inclusive of all possible stakeholders; rather a selective sampling of a range of opinions/attitudes which might be expected from the broader public. Selected people and organizations had previous involvement with a variety of input processes.

These interviews were fundamental to the development of the final structure and terms-of-reference. Some of the more critical recommendations which came out of the survey included the desire to broaden the opportunity for issue specific involvement through working groups, to keep the public advisory committee small and of a manageable size, to provide a range of input mechanisms and to keep the process moving along in a timely fashion.

### **Objectives**

The terms-of-reference for public involvement are focused on a five-year window for development of a Detailed Forest Management Plan for the combined area made up of the FMA and B9 Quota.

Aside from fulfilling the regulatory obligations defined in the FMA Spray Lake Sawmills has a number of secondary objectives that will hopefully flow out of the public involvement process.

- There will be an improved public awareness of Spray Lake Sawmills and the science behind forest management practices. With a heightened awareness we are confident of an increase in public support and improved community relations.
- It will ensure that pertinent issues have been identified and addressed as part of the management plan. This will improve the plans ability to integrate forest management activities with other resource values.
- Possible conflicts with other user groups will be minimized and will form an integral part of the company's risk management strategy
- It will help expedite DFMP review and approval
- It will aid the company in renewing ForestCare certification and possible future certification programs.

In order for any landscape management strategy to be successful it must contain a blend of social and environmental values. It must be open,

transparent and accessible and must promote dialogue rather than a one-way input of comments.

Members of a public involvement process are not expected to be technical experts but to bring insight to the table on a broad spectrum of societal values and how they may be integrated with natural elements of the landscape.

## **Alternatives**

A variety of methods for accommodating public input were evaluated. Open houses, surveys/questionnaires, focus groups, workshops, newsletters, websites and advisory committees were the most common tools that came up in the stakeholder interviews.

Each tool was assessed for its ability to:

- Be effective and meaningful for the participants
- Be time efficient in meeting strategic planning benchmarks
- Be cost effective
- Provide useful input to aid in DFMP development

Most Forest Management Agreement holders make use of a standing Public Advisory Committee (PAC) as their primary method for garnering public input.

Our experience with the McLean Creek project indicated good value in using several tools during the course of the process. Personality types vary as do their preferred method of communication. A broader range of input opportunities will provide a more complete range of public opinion.

Spray Lake Sawmills' proposed process is a blended package of several of the tools listed above. They have been organized to capitalize on each of their respective strengths and while minimizing their weaknesses.

## **Proposed Structure**

The mechanisms and proposed structure for the Public Involvement Process have been summarized in a one page schematic format, Figure 2. The structure has been designed with the detail required to meet regulatory obligations while providing a degree of flexibility to meet changing planning and input needs as they are identified.

### **Public Advisory Group**

A public advisory group will be formed to work closely with Spray Lake Sawmills at a broad overview level. The group will be kept

small and represent a cross section of backgrounds. The four primary areas of involvement include:

- helping define DFMP objectives
- helping guide and coordinate public involvement activities
- provide linkages between Working Groups and the Public Advisory Group
- develop a plan to monitor performance and effectiveness of the Public Involvement Process
- critique plan development

This group is not expected to be technical experts nor are they expected to be the ones to have to deal “hands on” with all of the various issues. It is a broad-scale, overview, coordination group. For example, this group will recommend where specific working groups should be formed, when and where open houses should be held and ensure that all of the various elements come together as part of a cohesive plan. The Public Advisory Group will be used to help consolidate input received from each of the stakeholder involvement mechanisms. Part of this summary will include a note on their use or disuse within the DFMP.

The Public Advisory Group may act as a point of contact for other members of the public although it is not their mandated responsibility to provide an on-going liaison with their respective constituencies. The Working Groups, as described below, will provide the cross sectional stakeholder representation.

The Public Advisory Group would remain in tact as a standing committee for the duration of the DFMP development.

## Working Groups

A number of Working Groups will be assembled to gather input and generate recommendations on topic areas as defined by the Public Advisory Group. Examples of working group topic areas may include such things as: access management, watershed management, wildlife issues, archeological/aboriginal issues, or integration with other user groups.

The need for various working groups would flow out of the objectives as previously defined for the DFMP. This format will allow for a broader collection of participants and will allow participants to focus on areas where they have specific interest. The exact nature of the linkage between the Public Advisory Group and the Working Groups will be defined by the Public Advisory Group.

The Working Groups are the ones who will deal with the specific issues and concerns and make recommendations back to the Public Advisory Group. The Public Advisory Group gives direction to the process and can be used as a sounding board for areas of conflicting direction from the various Working Groups.

These groups would generally have a short-term mandate. The exact make-up, size, and structure of these groups could vary depending on the issue and recommendations from the Public Advisory Group.

### Open Houses

As critical benchmarks are reached during the planning process open houses will be held to provide opportunities for the general public to review developments, ask questions and provide comment for further consideration.

The exact timing, location and content of these open houses will be determined through discussion with the Public Advisory Group.

### Website

Website technology will be used as a tool to post approved minutes from Public Advisory Group meetings, outcomes from Working Group sessions, periodic progress reports or provide responses to various types of public input. It will be designed together with an on-line comment page that can be used as an alternate communications link for those unable to attend open houses.

The Public Advisory Group will be used to vet website contents prior to posting. The exact format/structure of the Company website and open houses will be determined through the Public Advisory Group.

### **Participants**

The Public Advisory Group is the hub of the overall process. The selection of both sector representation as well as the individual participants must strive for a representative cross-section of backgrounds and interests. Care must be taken to avoid “power imbalances” within the group. The geographic representation of membership is not as important as the balancing of experience and issue based perspectives.

## Public Advisory Group – Proposed Sector Representation

- Environmental
- Guide/outfitters/trappers
- Motorized recreation
- Non-motorized recreation
- Ranching
- Other commercial users (Oil & Gas)
- CTU program
- Elected Official

The organization and individual representation within these sectors will be by invitation. Preferences will be given to individuals which may have multiple affiliations, have some familiarity with the planning area and have had some previous exposure to working in a cooperative, multi-stakeholder process.

Spray Lake Sawmills' Forest Management Agreement specifies a consultation process with the Community Timber Use Program Local Advisory Committee. As such, an invitation will be made to the Chair of the Ghost Local Advisory Committee. The Agreement is silent on any other required participation.

Aside from various Sector representation the Area Manager for the Bow Area of the Land and Forest Division will sit on the Public Advisory Group as a resource person. He will also act as the one-window contact for the Crown within the public involvement process. Other technical resource specialists will be brought in to assist the Advisory Group as necessary.

Working Group participants will vary depending on the nature of the topic. They may include volunteers with degrees of technical expertise, residents, resource users, special interest groups, Advisory Group members or others with a specific interest in the topic.

The Public Advisory Group will advise on the make-up of these groups. Individual topics and the need for respective Working Groups will not be identified until the Public Advisory Group is in place and the DFMP objectives have been established. As with the Public Advisory Group, technical expertise will be brought in as needs are identified.

### **Terms-of-Reference & Operating Guidelines**

The terms-of-reference provide a road map or set of operating guidelines for how the public involvement process will function. A clear terms-of-reference should minimize needless conflict and inefficiencies. It should clarify expectations, reduce tangents and allow for greater focus on achievement of the desired end product.

In this case, the end product is the timely completion of an environmentally friendly and socially acceptable Detailed Forest Management Plan for Spray Lake Sawmills' FMA and B9 Quota area.

The DFMP must abide by higher order planning documents such as A Policy for Resource Management of the Eastern Slopes and the various integrated resource management plans that cover the DFMP planning area. It must also abide by provincial and federal legislation, the terms of the Forest Management Agreement and the April 1998 version of the Interim Forest Management Planning Manual, Guidelines to Plan Development.

It is equally important to clarify what is not under consideration within this process. The company's business plan, manufacturing facilities and financial records do not form part of the public involvement process.

Clauses that make up the Forest Management Agreement and its boundaries are not up for re-negotiation. This will occur under a separate negotiation with the Crown in another 9-10 years. Part of the negotiation process for Spray Lake Sawmills' current FMA included a reduction in the company's historical timber supply to allow for the creation of several new provincial parks and as such, the creation of additional new protected areas is not under consideration. The remaining area within the FMA has a recognized primary use of establishing, growing, harvesting and removing timber. This must be done in keeping with principles of sustainable forest management and in recognition of other resource values and uses. It should be noted, however, that Spray Lake Sawmills does not have the responsibility for cumulative impact assessments nor does it have any control or authority over other land uses.

Until the DFMP is completed and approved by the Crown forest operations will continue under a Preliminary Forest Management Plans for Forest Management Units B9 and B10 as prepared by Spray Lake Sawmills within the first year of having received the FMA. Unless there are specific agreed upon deviations from the provincial ground rules, the 1994 version of the Alberta Timber Harvest Planning and Operating Ground Rules will remain as the operations guidance document until a new set has been established. The new, FMA specific, ground rules will be negotiated within six months of receiving approval on the DFMP.

Operating principles for the Public Advisory Group are tentatively outlined as follows:

#### Keeping a Balance

All Advisory Group members have an equal status and value as part of the team. All will have an equal opportunity to present their views and all views will be given legitimate consideration.

## Decision Making

The Advisory Group will operate by consensus. A recommendation from the Group will proceed where all members of the Group can live with it, although not necessarily support it. Spray Lake Sawmills will endeavor to accept the Groups recommendations where ever possible. Recognizing that the company is still responsible for regulatory compliance, costs and any liabilities that may flow out of the plan Spray Lake Sawmills still retains the final decision on which recommendations to accept. In the event that a recommendation is not accepted it will still be noted within the plan and will be accompanied with rationale for the decision.

## Conflict Resolution

In the event the Advisory Group is unable to reach consensus a facilitator will be brought in to help the Group work through the issue or topic. If consensus is still not reached then the range of positions will be noted in the minutes and Spray Lake Sawmills will make the final decision on which recommendation to implement.

## Communications

In order to maintain the integrity of the process and the cooperative spirit, the Group will be expected to communicate as a team. Issue negotiations should occur within the Group's meetings, not through the media or outside public forums. Summary minutes will be prepared following each meeting. Once the Group has approved the minutes they will be posted on the Company's website and be open to public access.

## Meetings and Attendance

Meeting frequency may vary during the course of the planning process. Meeting frequency, dates and times will be established by the Advisory Group on an on-going basis. It is anticipated that the initial meeting frequency may be from 1-2 times a month, tapering off to 4-6 times a year once the planning process is established and underway. The majority of Group members (minimum of 4) should be in attendance in order to carry on Public Advisory Group business. The Advisory Group may determine further details on attendance policies.

## Alternates

The Advisory Group is fairly small and should maintain a fair degree of flexibility on meeting scheduling. There is therefore no system for alternates. This should also allow for progress in a timely fashion without

the need for as much backtracking. Alternates can be selected should an Advisory Group member need to be absent for an extended period of time or need to withdraw all together.

### Compensation

Membership on the Public Advisory Group is voluntary, with no salary or stipends attached to it. Spray Lake Sawmills will compensate Group members for travel expenses to attend meetings via vehicle mileage claims should they wish.

### Access to Information

Spray Lake Sawmills will provide Advisory Group members access to information and technical expertise and resources as required to fulfill its mandate. Further details on available resources, their use and distribution will be sorted out during the initial meetings with the Group.

### **Public Involvement Process Performance Monitoring**

The Public Advisory Group has been designed as the overall “keeper of the public input process” for development of the DFMP. Spray Lake Sawmills will be reliant on this group for continuous feedback on the effectiveness of the program. Additional tools that will provide a performance feedback mechanism include exit questionnaires from Open Houses, Website comments pages, and outcomes from the various Working Groups. The Lands and Forest Division Bow Area Manager will also act as a “sounding board” for process effectiveness from the Crown’s perspective.

Issue specific comments will vary among stakeholders. Possibly to the point of being totally contradictory. Consensus positions will be sought through the Public Advisory Group on conflicting societal values.

Performance will be gauged on the integrity of the process and whether consensus positions have been reached, not whether all comments have been able to be accommodated within the plan.