

Participation in Sustainable Forest Management, Conservation and Protection Areas Public meeting at the Cochrane Ranch house - April 4th 2013 Meeting Notes

Gord Lehn

Gord – Opening Remarks

Welcome and thank you for coming. Request to fill in “sign-in” sheet (with email addresses). Are people OK with having this session filmed?

- Why are we here? **Outline of bigger vision:** Working towards a new paradigm of forest management which includes Managing the forest for a broader suit of ecological goods and services.
 - We want to do more than just “minimizing impact” on other resource values.
 - We want to manage “for” other resource values we want to manage our tenure for more than a supply of logs for the mill.
 - We want to work towards a “value added” ecological goods and services business model for managing our FMA.
 - We want to integrate various resource values and uses into one planning process and move away from the model of silo planning currently in place.
- How do we get there? One step at a time.
 - Influence the SSRP outcome/direction.
 - Define new planning process/objectives/outcomes.
 - Gain public support – Social licence to operate
 - Obtaining the Gold Standard in third party certification is a key step in maintaining public support/social licence to operate.
 - Obtaining certification is not the end goal. It is one more step along the pathway.
- What are our objectives for tonight?
 - Ensure we are on the same page with stakeholders with respect to the work we have been doing to prepare for an upcoming certification assessment.
 - In particular we want to focus on: Conversation on “Protected Areas Gap Analysis”
Conversation on “High Conservation Value Forest Assessment”.
 - Develop new stakeholder relationships and re-establish old relationships.
 - We hope to achieve this by being: approachable, open, and transparent and providing a meaningful opportunity for stakeholders to engage with SLS on forest management activities within the FMA.
- We are using a facilitated process to help guide us through the discussion and documenting the outcomes.
- Turn the floor over to Doug Marteinson

Doug Marteinson

Describe outline for the night, what the intent is and introduced 3 questions that we will be answering after the presentations are completed. He also asked what the participants expectations were for the night.

Participant Expectations

(Note: Asterisks indicate number of people)

- ***** ● Information gathering, what has happened before, issues of forest management
- ***** ● Hear what people have to say, increase my understanding, learn about what is going on, who is here
- *** ● Watershed watching, maintaining watershed integrity, riparian health
- *** ● Better public process, meaningful consultation with stakeholders
- ** ● Learning more about documents
- * ● See the functionality of the whole system
- * ● Get answers to the questions I have
- * ● Protecting biodiversity in the current and future
- * ● See healthy grassland as well as forest

Jason Mogilefsky

- Provide a brief recap of March 13th session
- SLS is continuing its pursuit of certification.
- Provided a brief explanation of the certification system.
- Explained SLS had 4 major NCRS preventing certification-explained the four majors and what SLS has been working on to correct them.
- Provided a description of the certification process and why we are discussing the HCVF and Protected Area Gap analysis.
- Briefly explained the SLS's sustainable forestry conservation strategy.

John Kansas

- Described two reports he has completed for SLS and how they fit into the certification process
 - First was the HCVF and attributes, described process and the findings
 - Second was the Protected Areas gap Analysis to help determine areas for protection.
- Both reports are available to the public on the website.

Moved on to 3 questions (completed as one group)

Question 1 – What are the most important conservation values you place on the FMA forest and what are your thoughts on Spray Lake Sawmills proposed strategies? What, if anything, is missing?

Responses:

- Water storage, water quality, water production, maintain seasonal flows
- Wildlife habitat
- Bio-diversity
- Emulating natural disturbances
- Wilderness & wilderness as recreation
- Recreational values
- Spiritual values
- Aesthetically pleasing forests (i.e. feels like a forest)
- Resilience & adaption to climate change
- Non-disruptive recreation
- Meeting the human need to be with nature “need nature for health”
- Species at risk
- Biodiversity on the landscape level, -Wilderness, separate from human interaction as well as areas for recreation and human enjoyment.
- Other forest values like existence, aesthetic. Having a forest that looks and feels like what we think a forest should be like.
- Forest with fire, disease and insect outbreaks allowed to occur in the landscape, looking at logging that emulates natural disturbance.
- Air quality
- Mixedwood forest Retention
- Ground water filtration; water temperature and tributaries and their effect on downstream water courses.
- Desire for spray lakes to go above and beyond provincial standards, on issues such as grizzly bear recovery plan, protected area targets.
- Desire to see FSC style strategies, practices and management philosophies in C5 area as well.
- Need Better definitions of terminology that is used to describe actions and standards in FSC, the reports to date and management practices and objectives.
- Include fish with species richness maps.
- Ask more questions, more research on stream buffers and how far from stream bed that actions can affect the stream bed.
- Protect landscape instead of specific areas.
- The protected areas are too small, are somewhat like “token” areas.
- Protect areas through management that consider different values of different areas.

Question 2 – If stakeholders and SLS were to work together to assess additional protected areas, what would the relationship with SLS need to look like?

Responses:

- Move above and beyond provincial requirements
- Apply the FSC standards to all areas that SLS manages (i.e. include the C5 area to the south)
- Provide a clarification of terminology for protected areas (i.e. what is an outstanding area defined as)

- Including more values in forest management, more than just traditional timber production
- Better monitoring of upstream water quality and quantity
- Improve ability to enforce access management issues (e.g. prevent recreationist from accessing old logging roads and turning them into trail)
- Use of a feedback loop; stakeholder want to see that their input is being put into action
- Start including an assessment of cumulative effects on the landbase
- Protection through management
- Public education
- Needs to be a paradigm shift in forestry moving towards a broader focus for forest companies. Looking at more values then just timber and managing for them.
- Need Clarification of interaction with SRD. What the roles of Gov, SLS, stakeholders are so to best achieve the goals and objectives.
- More consideration on cumulative effects of forest management. Eg; Old logging roads being used by ATVs.
- No net increase of roads in land base.

Question 3: - If you were to consider Spray Lake Sawmills to be a sustainable supplier of forest products, what kinds of actions would Spray Lake Sawmills have to take.

Responses:

- Did not discuss question b/c it was 10 p.m. -Work with Gov to change policies for better management of the landscape. Eg; Restricted access on logging roads.
- Demonstrate how stakeholder impute is implemented, this can lead to increase public confidence in SLS.
- Consider Calgary as SLS' community.

Summary of Talking stick Comments by participants:

For public feedback:

- Would like to see the public comments listed and the company response to the comments.
- Would like to have the metrics behind how many participants made the same comments.
- We (the stakeholders) would like to continue building the relationship with SLS to work together.
- We all want change and that will come from working together, continue the dialogue.