

***WEYERHAEUSER FOREST ADVISORY COMMITTEE***  
***ANNUAL REPORT***  
***JULY 1, 2000 TO JUNE 30, 2001***

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>LIST OF APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2 SCHEDULED MEETINGS .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3 PRESENTATIONS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4 WEYFAC RECOMMENDATIONS AND WEYERHAEUSER RESPONSES .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>FIRE MANAGEMENT .....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>RIPARIAN MANAGEMENT .....</i>	<i>6</i>
<b>5 WEYFAC IMPACTS ON WEYERHAEUSER OPERATIONS.....</b>	<b>9</b>
5.1 WATERSHED CONCERNS .....	9
<b>6 CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>10</b>

## **LIST OF APPENDICES**

1. Member List
2. WeyFAC Terms of Reference – revised September 2000

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The Weyerhaeuser Forest Advisory Committee (WeyFAC) was established in March of 1998. The Committee is an integral part of Weyerhaeuser's public involvement process, as outlined in the approved Public Involvement Plan (revised January 17, 2001).

The Committee members are selected one of several ways:

1. Representative organizations are approached to join the Weyerhaeuser Forest Advisory Committee. Interested organizations are asked to nominate individuals that would attend meetings on a regular basis to represent the views of the organization.
2. Individuals (Members-at-Large) from the community are approached by Weyerhaeuser to be on the Committee.
3. Interested individuals can approach Weyerhaeuser, who will forward their names to the current Committee for acceptance.

The Committee has both voting and non-voting members. Voting members are those individuals that represent an organization or are Member's-at-Large. Non-voting members include the facilitator, Weyerhaeuser Forestlands Staff, and the Management Planning Forester of Sustainable Resource Development.

Meetings were held on the second Wednesday of each month (excluding July and August), at the Edson and District Recreation Complex, from 6:30 to 9:30 p.m. A professional facilitator chaired the meetings with dinner being served prior to the meeting.

The Committee reviewed and approved the Terms of Reference for WeyFAC in September, 2000. They also reviewed the 1999-2000 annual report, and the Public Involvement Plan prior to approval by the Regional Director of Sustainable Resource Development.

## 2 SCHEDULED MEETINGS

WeyFAC met 10 times, starting in September 2000. Meetings took place on the second Wednesday of each month.

Table 1 summarizes meeting dates and attendance of voting members during the reporting period.

Table 1: Meeting dates and attendance records for the past reporting period (voting members only)

MEETING DATE	ATTENDANCE
September 13, 2000	7/12
October 11, 2000	8/12
November 8, 2000	7/12
December 13, 2000	8/12
January 10, 2001	8/12
February 14, 2001	7/12
March 14, 2001	5/12
April 11, 2001	9/12
May 9, 2001	10/14
June 13, 2001	10/14

The average attendance figure for voting members was 63%, with a range of 42% to 75%.

Lyle Benson of Benson Training Inc. from Hinton, Alberta facilitated meetings. Michelle Andersen and Laurie Schneider of The Tree Tracker Ltd. recorded the minutes of the meetings.

### **3 PRESENTATIONS**

Many issues have been identified and prioritized over the years. The following list of presentations has addressed some of the issues. Weyerhaeuser has also presented portions of the proposed Detailed Forest Management Plan (DFMP) to the group.

#### **March 1998 to June 1998**

- Preliminary forest management plan review: Paul Scott (APRIL 98)
- Information about the FMA: Paul Scott and Andre Bachman (APRIL 98)
- Sustainable yearly harvest: Neil Stevens (MAY 98)

#### **September 1998 to June 1999**

- Grazing dispositions: Cam Lane (OCT. 98)
- Forest Resource Enhancement: Dave Kent (NOV 98)
- Municipal Infrastructure: Steve Lamaroux (DEC 98)
- Integration of timber operators: Paul Scott (JAN 99)
- Exceptions - Provincial Ground Rules: Paul Scott and John Witham (FEB 99)
- Goals, values and issues for the Detailed Forest Management Plan: Paul Scott (MARCH-MAY 99)
- Field Trip: Tom Varty and Paul Scott (JUNE 99)

#### **September 1999 to June 2000**

- Presentation on Watershed Analysis: Richard Rothwell (SEPT. 99)
- Presentation on Mixedwood Management: Bruce MacMillan (OCT 99)
- Review of the 1999 ForestCare Audit: Don Carr (NOV. 99)
- Review of the Public Involvement Plan: Paul Scott (DEC. 99)
- Wildlife: Luigi Morgantini (JAN. 2000)
- Goals, objectives and strategies: Paul Scott (FEB. 2000)
- Overview of ISO, CSA and FSC: Don Carr (MAR. 2000)
- Fire History: Peter Murphy (APRIL 2000)
- Riparian management: Lorne Fitch (APRIL 2000)
- Fire Management: Ray Olsson (MAY 2000)
- Field trip: Electro-fishing and mill tour (JUNE 2000)

#### **September 2000 to June 2001**

- Ecosite Classification System - John Beckingham, Geographic Dynamic Corp.(SEPT. 2000)
- Timber Supply Protocols – Mark Messmer, Weyerhaeuser (OCT. 2000)
- Regenerated Stand Analysis – Paul Scott, Weyerhaeuser (OCT. 2000)
- Riparian Management/ Old growth – Luigi Morgantini, Weyerhaeuser (NOV. 2000)
- Status of the Timber supply analysis – Paul Scott, Weyerhaeuser (DEC. 2000)
- Detailed Forest Management Plan – Paul Scott, Weyerhaeuser (JAN. 2001)
- Chip Lake Bird Study – Dave Stepniski, Masters student, University of Alberta (FEB. 2001)
- Environmental damage on Private Land – Mark Chileen, Weyerhaeuser (MARCH 2001)
- Advanced fire planning – Herman Stegahouse, Dennis Cox, LFS (APRIL 2001)

- Independent Sustainability critic – Jim Schleck, Natural Resource Services ( MAY, 2001)
- Alberta Conservation Association – 2000 Fisheries Study – Rich Rudolf (MAY, 2001)
- Field trip – flight to Deer Hill, Pioneer Site, Whitecourt Mountain, Tom Hill Tower (JUNE 2001)

There are a number of outstanding issues that have not been dealt with, that were identified at the start of the year. These issues will be revisited in September 2001, where they will be prioritized for the upcoming year. The following list outlines those issues still to be discussed.

- Cutblock sizes and their effect on furbearers
- Compensating trappers
- Oil and Gas activity
- Field trip to block 162 at Tom Hill Tower
- Alternate wood products
- Debris management
- Resource roads
- Public involvement process
- Global warming and integration into the FMP
- Residuals from the mill
- Maintain location of MTU
- Top utilization and waste minimization
- Yellowstone to Yukon (Y2Y)
- Conifer landbase expert vs. mixedwood or deciduous management

#### 4 WeyFAC Recommendations and Weyerhaeuser Responses

*Fire Management*  
September 13, 2000

**Recommendation 1.1** Weyerhaeuser needs to have someone on staff who is very familiar with local roads and topography, or, failing that, should create a list of local people with intimate knowledge of local access and topography.

**Weyerhaeuser Response:** *Weyerhaeuser currently has 13 staff members that have varying degrees of familiarity regarding access and topography across the FMA. Our newest employees have been in place for over two years, with others having a lifetime of experience in the area. As well, our main contractors, who most likely would be involved in fire suppression activity, are familiar with ground conditions in selected parts of the FMA.*

**Recommendation 1.2** Weyerhaeuser needs to use prescribed burning in cutovers to reduce fuels and disease.

**Weyerhaeuser Response:** *Weyerhaeuser will use prescribed burning as one of an assortment of tools that are available during reforestation activities.*

**Recommendation 1.3** Weyerhaeuser needs to develop logging plans and strategies that will mimic or replicate some of the effects of fire, before the days of fire suppression, on our forest ecosystems.

**Weyerhaeuser Response:** *Weyerhaeuser agrees with this statement, and is actively pursuing this direction in the current development of the Detailed Forest Management Plan.*



*Riparian Management*

**(Revised)**

December 13, 2000

**Recommendation 1.1** - Riparian zones should be defined as described by Lorne Fitch: areas which extend beyond the ground rule's buffer zone, and which include intermittent stream drainage's. Use a functional definition, not the number of metres.

**Weyerhaeuser Response:** *Weyerhaeuser currently follows Provincial ground rules in determining buffer size. Weyerhaeuser will work closely with Provincial authorities in attempts to develop a new, more precise classification system that would offer adequate protection to watercourses and riparian areas.*

**Recommendation 1.2** - Riparian zones should be managed carefully, as critical wildlife and fisheries habitat. No logging should take place in them unless it can be conclusively demonstrated that no damage will be done.

**Weyerhaeuser Response:** *Weyerhaeuser agrees that riparian zones represent critical wildlife and fisheries habitat, and require special management. Weyerhaeuser currently follows provincial groundrules in managing these areas.*

**Recommendation 1.3.** - Monitor impact of logging on stream flow, water temperature and sediment loads.

**Weyerhaeuser Response:** *Weyerhaeuser will assess the use of a monitoring system on a site-specific basis.*

**Recommendation 1.4** - Categorise riparian zones according to amount of water flow.

**Weyerhaeuser Response:** *Weyerhaeuser currently follows Provincial ground rules in determining buffer size. Weyerhaeuser will work closely with Provincial authorities in attempts to develop a new, more precise classification system that would offer adequate protection to watercourses and riparian areas.*

**Recommendation 1.5** - Design buffer zones according to categories

**Weyerhaeuser Response:** *Weyerhaeuser currently follows Provincial ground rules in determining buffer size. Weyerhaeuser will work closely with Provincial authorities in attempts to develop a new, more precise classification system that would offer adequate protection to watercourses and riparian areas.*

**Recommendation 1.6** - Design logging practices to log riparian zones.

**Weyerhaeuser Response:** *Currently, Weyerhaeuser is staying out of riparian buffered areas. If buffer sizes increase in the future under different FMA or Zonal Groundrules, then Weyerhaeuser would have to re-evaluate this position.*

**Recommendation 1.7** - Gather as much data e.g. Shining Bank, regardless of baseline information, using a combination of streams having large and small flows.

**Weyerhaeuser Response:** *Weyerhaeuser will assess the use of a monitoring system on a site-specific basis.*

**Recommendation 1.8** - Larger buffers: legislation versus specific areas

**Weyerhaeuser Response:** *Weyerhaeuser currently follows Provincial ground rules in determining buffer size. Weyerhaeuser will work closely with Provincial authorities in attempts to develop a new, more precise classification system that would offer adequate protection to watercourses and riparian areas.*

**Recommendation 1.9**- Look at protecting ephemeral draws with better buffers.

**Weyerhaeuser Response:** *Currently, these areas receive attention through retention of structure left in the cutovers, and other tactics such as retention of lesser vegetation such as alder and willow. Weyerhaeuser will also work closely with Provincial authorities to develop a new, more precise classification system that would offer adequate protection to watercourses and riparian areas.*

**Recommendation 1.10** - - Look at more projects monitoring water quality and riparian areas - pre and post logging.

**Weyerhaeuser Response:** *Weyerhaeuser will assess the use of a monitoring system on a site-specific basis.*



## **5 WeyFAC Impacts on Weyerhaeuser operations**

### **5.1 Watershed concerns**

During the summer of 2000, and again in 2001, Weyerhaeuser supported the Alberta Conservation Association in assessing fisheries and their habitats in the following waterways: Trout Creek, Bigoray River and Rodney Creek in 2000, and Groat, Rat and Wolf Creeks in 2001. This information will be used as baseline data for future reference. It can also be compared to previously collected Provincial data.

Weyerhaeuser has also committed to an ongoing inventory of all watercourse-crossing structures. Sites will be visited annually until Weyerhaeuser has received final clearance from the Land and Forest Service.

The Detailed Forest Management Plan has now been submitted. Members had opportunities to review, in detail, the proposed goals, objectives and strategies that will guide forest management upon the FMA in the current decade.

## **6 CONCLUSIONS**

WeyFAC held a total of 10 meetings in this reporting period (September 2000 to June 2001). The following issues were discussed:

- Ecosite classification system
- Timber supply protocols
- Riparian management
- Chip Lake Bird Study area
- Environmental damage to Private Land
- Advanced Fire Planning, and
- Sustainability

Presentations were made to the group, outlining previously submitted questions. Upon completion of presentations, WeyFAC made specific recommendations to Weyerhaeuser. Weyerhaeuser responded to the recommendations at the next scheduled meeting.

Weyerhaeuser also made presentations to the group outlining the goals, objectives and strategies for the Detailed Forest Management Plan. Discussions occurred and slight modifications were made.

The last scheduled meeting for the year included a field trip involving a helicopter flight. The flight-line included Deer Hill, the Pioneer Site, House (Whitecourt) Mountain, and several large cutblocks near Tom Hill Tower.

## APPENDIX 1

## APPENDIX 2

## Minutes for the Weyerhaeuser Forest Advisory Committee Meeting

Wednesday, February 9, 2000  
Edson & District Recreation Complex, Edson, Alberta

Meeting opened at 6:30 p.m. by Lyle Benson.

Present: John Witham, Paul Scott, Jerry de Winter, Carl Hunt, Rick Gardiner, Andy Stanton, Margaret Kidner, Arlan Delisle, Ron Christie, Rob Jolly, John Nyssen, Wyatt Foisy, and Lyle Benson.

Absent: Laurie Camps, Jeannette & Wim Visser, Marsh Hoke, Tom Varty, Dave Chaluk, Dan Berry, and Lee Davis.

Minutes taken by Michelle Andersen.

### Goals, Objectives and Strategies

Paul presented section 5 of the Detailed Forest Management Plan, the Resource Management Goals. The DFMP will guide the management of the FMA through 2007.

Paul presented an overview of the first few pages regarding the values. Lyle asked if WeyFAC hadn't already approved these. Paul said that no they hadn't.

Rob asked if the values were arranged in terms of frequency of response in the surveys. Paul said no, there is no weighting at all.

John N asked if the issues should be concerns? Paul said that the definition of an issue is a wide public concern. These are issues of people, the public, not of the company.

Andy asked how poaching would tie in with forest management as seen in the societal values page. Paul said it would tie in with access issues.

Carl asked if the objectives would include measurable criteria? Paul said that the Lead Team is figuring out what the indicator is that will decide if the objective is being met. All the indicators will be presented to WeyFAC.

### Goal 1

The lead team met on Tuesday. Some of the goals and strategies have been changed. "while recognizing the rights and needs of other operators" was added to the end of Goal 1.

Rick said that the public interest should be first. It is their FMA. He asked if there shouldn't be something going the other way.

Rob asked if this was a global statement.

Carl said that Rick's comment was good, but may fit better under 2. He said that it doesn't matter if Weyerhaeuser makes a lot of money as long as other values are respected.

Paul said that they will reforest with X months. The Provincial Ground Rules say that reforestation will be done within 24 months. Paul expects that Weyerhaeuser's limit will



be less. It will be based on a weighted average. The deciduous cutblocks will be reforested sooner and the coniferous blocks later. The indicator will be X% of plots with X number of months.

Weyerhaeuser is setting up permanent sample plots (PSPs). Rob asked if this was NIVMA (Northern Interior Vegetation Management Association)? The 90 metre by 90 metre plots where all the vegetation is recorded? Paul said no, it's a different program. NIVMA is seen in one of the later goals.

1.1.6 was taken out. It was replaced with 1.1.6 - Maintain a vegetation inventory. 1.1.7 was added. 1.1.7 - Develop management strategies for incidental timber.

Paul said that they aren't sure how 1.1.7 will work out. John N said that he thought that Weyerhaeuser was getting rid of the incidental. Paul said that they just want to make sure that the concerns of the quota holders in regards to the incidental are in the document somewhere.

Carl asked if Weyerhaeuser is measuring the loss of productive landbase per year. Paul said that they figured out that it is approximately one-half percent per year that they are losing. They are collecting timber damages to replace the landbase. This money could be used to enhance the remaining landbase. Carl said that some of the land is taken out for a much longer period than other parts. Weyerhaeuser should be checking to see how much land is lost for short periods versus longer periods.

Paul said that Weyerhaeuser has to wait until the oil and gas companies have reclaimed the land. Sundance has a new program working with the oil and gas industry, where they are sowing a clover mix instead of grass and are planting trees on the sites. Ron said that the oil and gas industry has to reclaim the areas according to legislation. There are a certain number of stems per hectare that must be growing.

Paul said that there are approximately 15,000 new wells each year. The area that they take up takes up almost 2 townships per year.

John N asked if Weyerhaeuser could approach the oil and gas companies and ask them to do a plant along half of the pipeline. The other half of the pipeline right of way could be left so the company can do their maintenance. That way at least half of the right of way could be reclaimed right away.

Carl said that he is dealing with a company currently. Sometimes they just let the area regrow. It is a good idea to plant.

Ron said that the right of way is 15 metres. Rollback is done.

John N asked if they could reforest the right of way right away, instead of waiting for it to happen.

Paul said that it might be something to look into.

1.2.4 was changed to older and slower growing trees.

1.2.5 was changed to integrate logging operations with other timber operators.

1.2.10 was added. 1.2.10 - Pursue private land purchases. This was 1.1.6 previously.

1.2.11 - Prompt utilization of harvested wood.

Rick said that the mill is designed to use fresh wood. The mill makes much better money with fresh. They notice a difference after the wood is about 8 weeks old.

Carl said that the goal should be for utilization of wood for its greatest benefit. This benefit might not be for chipboard, maybe it would make great hardwood floor.

Paul said that they would lean towards OSB in the document, because the FMA is to supply the fibre for the OSB mill.

John N said that there is the opportunity for making new markets. No one has done it yet.

Carl said that the best utilization for wood is a goal for Albertans. Rick said that it could be a goal if economics wasn't number one.

John N said that is goal 1 was made more general, the strategies would have to be made more generalized.

John W said that it is a Weyerhaeuser document. WeyFAC has to realize that some of these will be Weyerhaeuser specific.

Paul said that they would have a goal and then divide the strategies. The strategies will be divided into everyone's, Weyerhaeuser's and MTU/quota holders'.

"When economically feasible" was struck from 1.3.6.

Lyle said that in Hinton, the town has a policy that as long as the quality of the work is equal, if local contractors bid within a certain range, the town would go locally. This is a way of helping keep local people employed. He asked if Weyerhaeuser would be looking at something like this.

Paul said that they haven't thought about it. Most of their contractors are from the area. He said that if the price is fair and the quality is good, Weyerhaeuser would use the service.

## Goal 2

Lyle said that Weldwood is using a historical basis. They are not using a specific number. They are looking for natural variability.

Carl asked if Weyerhaeuser would be defining "late seral stages". Will it be specific for each different species?

Paul said that it would be.

Carl said that the late seral stages are different for different animal species too. Woodpeckers require large diameter trees for their habitat. This can't be defined by age.

2.2.1 - Varied the harvest events.

Lyle asked if patch size indicates that a checkerboard pattern would be used.

Paul said no. It just indicates an event. Maybe it is a bad choice for the name.

2.3.2 - the numbers were removed. "single tree and small clump retention"

Margaret asked if Weyerhaeuser is leaving any bush piles unburned. Paul said that this is found in 2.3.4. Leaving a certain number of piles per block will be a tactic for 2.3.4. Margaret said that many small rodents and other animals use these piles as habitat.

Section 2.4 deals with riparian zones. Paul said that Luigi is still working on the management strategies for the riparian zones. These strategies will likely not be finished in time for the DFMP. They will be completed in the foreseeable future.

John N asked how Weyerhaeuser could develop a document without the background. Paul said that the management plan just requires that Weyerhaeuser develop it.

Carl said that a lot of research has been done. It may not have been done in the exact area, but there is a lot of applicable data. Weyerhaeuser may not have to do a lot of other research. They could use what is available to make general management strategies.

Paul said that the tactics would be much more specific. Any tactics or indicators that anyone thinks of would be appreciated.

John N said that this is the Detailed Forest Management Plan, where is the detail? This is supposed to be the bible for the FMA for years.

Paul said that if they don't have a strategy, they don't go in. They use buffers. They will use the Provincial Ground Rules in regards to riparian areas until they have their own management strategies. Paul said that Luigi would look at all the creeks, both intermittent and permanent.

Carl said that both fish habitat and water quality are important.

John N asked that numbers be put in 2.5.2. Paul said that that is difficult because analysis is a snapshot. Weyerhaeuser may look at putting a range in. Paul doubted that they would put a specific number in. They will make assumptions based on past history.

2.6.2 - Train in the identification of rare and endangered species (remove "staff and contractors"). This means that ANC will train their people, Blue Ridge will train theirs, etc.

2.7.1 - remove "staff members" to make it more general.

John W said that Rob's question about NIVMA fits in 2.7.4.

### Goal 3

Lyle asked if there was a point where too much woody debris would be detrimental to growing trees? Paul said yes there was, but he wasn't sure what that point was. They have to balance each thing with something else.

John W said that ANC did a study. They chipped all their debris and spread it out over the cutblocks. It was about 6 inches thick. In July, there was still frost in the ground. This was awful for the trees. Nothing would grow. He said that Weldwood is trying the same kind of study. They are using debris from the mill. They are mixing it into the soil and seeing what happens.

Lyle said that they are adding some soil to it too, not just mixing it in.

Wyatt said that Weyerhaeuser might have to look at planting conifer in areas that are shaded, like the south side of cutblocks. John W said that they would have to look at the species and their shade tolerance, as well as other factors.

Carl asked how long it would take for the chips to break down. Lyle said that it would take a long time. This is one reason that Weldwood is mixing soil with it. They hope that will increase the decay. They are trying to find the best soil to use.

Rob said that it might be a good chance to try it when decompacting the roads, mixing woody debris into that soil.

### Goal 4

Paul said that the Alberta Conservation Authority would be doing research this summer.

John N asked if Weyerhaeuser found an area that was erosion-prone, would they share that information with other users - both industrial and otherwise? Would all timber operators working within the FMA do this?

Lyle said that it is part of the process now. Paul said that if Weyerhaeuser had the information, they would share it with oil and gas. They might do a soil map, showing soil sensitivity.

Paul will continue to go through the last 4 goals at the next meeting.

Please go through the rest of the goals. Paul may send out a revised copy. Any suggestions for tactics or indicators would be appreciated.

The next meeting will be on Wednesday, March 8, 2000.

The meeting closed at 9:00 p.m.

## Minutes of the Weyerhaeuser Forest Advisory Committee

Supper was at 6 p.m.

Present: Tom Varty, Mitch Yaremko, Carl Hunt, Marsh Hoke, Jerry de Winter, Dan Berry, Don Carr, Margaret Kidner, Arlan Delisle, Rob Jolly, Lee Davis, Laurie Camps, Paul Scott, and Lyle Benson

Absent: Ron Christie, John Nyssen, John Witham, Dave Chaluk, and Andy Stanton  
Minutes taken by Michelle Andersen.

Lyle Benson opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

### 5. Resource Management Goals, Objectives and Strategies

Rob said that he thought that goals 2, 3, and 4 should be listed first, with goal 1 afterwards. The number one value in the surveys of the public was biodiversity.

Paul said that the goals aren't listed in any particular order.

Rob said that he realizes that, but it looks bad. He knows that economics are important to Weyerhaeuser, but it would look better to have biodiversity first.

Paul said that economics were low on the list, so maybe goal 1 should have been number 8. He thought that people might have thought that they were putting "fluff" before importance. Weyerhaeuser is a business.

Arlan suggested one piece of "fluff" first. Maybe the goals should be prioritized.

Carl said that strong goals with good parameters are what is important. The public needs strong controls over what Weyerhaeuser is doing. The standards should be independent and community based.

Paul said that this is the primary document that WeyFAC should be concerned about. This is the document that will drive the DFMP. Some changes have been made to the document based on further meetings with the Lead Team and the Quota Holders subgroup. WeyFAC is still looking at the initial document. They will see the final version with all the changes at a later date.

### Goal 5

5.2.3 is to educate all users on the FMA, not just the staff and contractors. Paul said that all quota holders would be held to this document, not just Weyerhaeuser.

Marsh said that Goal 5 reverses what one thinks would flow from the values. Goal 5 states "improve public acceptance of Weyerhaeuser's Edson forest management activities." Marsh said that it sounds like the problem to be improved is not Weyerhaeuser's management or activities, but the public's acceptance of their activities. Non-corporate goals are number one.

Marsh suggested that it be changed to "improve public acceptability of Weyerhaeuser's management and activities". This would indicate a mutual working process.

Arlan said that "awareness" might work.

Tom said that it is a semantic problem. The meaning is correct.

Marsh said that it seems like Weyerhaeuser's goal is to strive for acceptability. They are willing to listen to well-thought out arguments.

Carl said that there was an educational aspect. The public may not like what Weyerhaeuser is doing, but they may not have a good reason for disliking it. Weyerhaeuser needs to educate them.

Lyle asked if intent 1, to "obtain input and advice from the public on our forest management activities" covered the entire issue.

Tom said no. Weyerhaeuser would have a problem if all the input were negative.

Marsh asked why recreational users are not mentioned in 5.1.3.

#### Goal 6

Marsh also wondered if intent 3 should be changed to "minimize negative impacts".

Paul said that impacts are inherently negative.

Lyle questioned Weyerhaeuser's ability to manage access. This is under provincial authority. Would "influence" be a better word?

Paul suggested "co-operate on access issues related to Weyerhaeuser's forest management activities" (intent 1). Paul said that they discussed putting some kind of arbitration process in place at the EDILA meeting yesterday.

Marsh said that WeyFAC's main interest recently has been oil and gas integration. There is nothing in this section regarding how Weyerhaeuser will integrate improved planning with the oil and gas industry.

Paul said that Weyerhaeuser was asked to lobby the government to get more power over oil and gas at yesterday's meeting. It is a tactic to get a bigger say in access management.

Marsh said that it is an area that Weyerhaeuser needs more influence in. They don't have any control over it.

Carl thought that "forest resource users" would be better in intent 2.

Lyle said that it says "other resource users" in the goal statement. Most of the strategies are about timber users.

Marsh said that maybe it fits in 8.5.3, corridor management.

### Goal 7

Paul said that they have approximately 18 known archaeological sites on the FMA.

Millar Western did modelling in their FMA. They found that most of the potential sites were along waterways.

Carl asked if there would be a quota of ecological sites. Paul said that the sites don't have to be of a certain size. They will be looking at unique versus significant.

Lyle asked about berry-picking sites. Would they be covered? Lyle said that he thought the criteria were broad enough to include whatever needs to be included.

### Goal 8

Rob asked what EFM includes.

Paul said that they would include doing things above and beyond what the provincial ground rules require companies to do.

Rob asked for examples.

Paul said that when a block is logged, it has to be reforested. After 8 years, it has to be "free-to-grow". The company's obligation ends. Anything that the company does after that is EFM.

Tom said that they use genetically improved stock, not hybrids. They also do stand tending, understory planting, thinning and other activities.

8.3.1 - Weyerhaeuser has done even-flow analysis over two rotations. They are looking at alternatives.

Lyle said that Weyerhaeuser would be trying to maintain seral diversity across the landscape.

Marsh asked if 8.3 was a restatement of 8.2 and 8.1. Paul said that it wasn't.

Marsh said that it sounds like Weyerhaeuser is going to try and increase the AAC simply by convincing the LFS to let them. Weyerhaeuser just has to persuade the LFS, not do anything to increase the wood supply. There is nothing in the statement saying what Weyerhaeuser is going to do.

Laurie said that they are going to do things in 8.1 and 8.2 and get the results in 8.3.

8.3 could be "capturing" or "realizing the increased AAC". It might be more of a strategy for under 8.1 (8.1.9).

Laurie asked if it was going to be difficult to increase the AAC with all the land base loss.

Tom said that they might just have to try to hold their own.



Marsh said that from the discussions here, this area is the biggest threat to sustainability. Marsh was not sure that it is being given the priority it deserves. He also wasn't sure that the practices are forest management activities.

Lyle asked if improving timber salvage should be under 8.1.

Paul said that it is in goal 1 (1.2.8).

Carl returned to goal 5, public acceptability, and the methods of doing it. He said that open houses are not very productive.

Paul said that the Fulham open house was productive. They had 40 people attend.

Carl suggested that workshops, or forums where there are speakers with divergent views might be a better way to get the public involved. He thought that this would get a lot of support for sustainability from other land users - hunters, fishermen, etc.

Paul said that they did talk about sponsoring other events to diversify public education.

Tom said that holding open houses is due diligence. It gives the public the opportunity to suggest other options or to bring a problem forward. He agrees that it doesn't always work. It is good for visibility, but they don't reach all affected people. Tom said that Weyerhaeuser is interested in looking at alternatives to open houses.

Marsh asked Carl if he was suggesting a new strategy 5.1.5, to seek out new processes for increasing public awareness. To keep on working on finding these new processes.

Carl said that they need debates where alternatives are given.

Tom said that he thought having many foresters at the open houses was a good idea, so there would be many people to answer questions. However, he was told that there were too many foresters at the open house and some of the public was intimidated.

Paul said that the next version of section 5 would have the input from all of the other groups. He said that he would present the final version once it was done. (This will not be next month.)

The next meeting will be on April 12<sup>th</sup>.

The meeting closed at 9:35 p.m.

## Minutes of the Weyerhaeuser Forest Advisory Committee Meeting

Wednesday, November 8, 2000

Sundance Room, Edson & District Recreation Complex, Edson Alberta

Present: John Witham, Luigi Morgantini, Rob Jolly, Margaret Kidner, Ron Christie, Mal Goldie, Jan Ficht, Andy Stanton, Marsh Hoke, Carl Hunt, Paul Scott, Lyle Benson

Absent: Dan Berry, Rick Gardiner, Tom Varty, Kelly Fluet, Lee Davis, John Nyssen, Dave Chaluk, Laurie Camps, Wyatt Foisy

Minutes taken by Michelle Andersen and Laurie Schneider, The Tree Tracker Ltd.

Lyle Benson opened the meeting at 6:45 p.m.

### Landscape Analysis

Luigi discussed the management goal of maintaining the habitat of all existing plant and wildlife species in quantity and quality as well as the hierarchical spatial scales. Luigi said that the guiding principle is to maintain the diversity at the landscape and at the stand levels. He said that they use structure at the stand level to protect values. They want diversity. The challenge is how to maintain it at the landscape level.

Luigi showed some maps of the distribution of the ecosites across the FMA. He showed how the FMA has been divided up into 6 Land Management Units (LMUs). The units are different and can be managed differently depending on various factors, such as what was found there and what is happening in the region.

Luigi said that the next question was how do we quantify the landscape. He then showed ecosite landscape maps and discussed their analyses. The human impact is very large in some LMUs and not so large in others. Cynthia, for instance, has a large amount of linear disturbance. This has a huge impact on other values. There is a big impact on water quality. Weyerhaeuser can't do anything about this.

Luigi also said that sometimes the public is concerned the opposite way. If Weyerhaeuser plants trees in blocks and roads that used to be clear, the public is upset that their trails are disappearing. They don't want reduced access. He said that they are looking at recreating landscapes, as they would be without any human impact. Luigi showed maps comparing 1950-60 and 1999.

Luigi said that they learned that Moose Creek and Wolf Lake had much more variation in their patch sizes. There is not as much variation in the other four units. This type of data can be used to develop strategies.

Luigi said that no one else in the province is doing this. It will be incorporated into the DFMP. The challenge will be incorporating this into the strategies. They want strategies for all species, not just the ungulates. He said that Weyerhaeuser could just use the PGR, but they want to address the habitat issues for all species including the small furbearers.

Marsh asked what the baseline was. In the 1950s there may not have been a lot of industry, but fire suppression was in place. What is Weyerhaeuser aiming towards?

Luigi said that they used two definitions of patches - origin and forest type for assessing the landscape perception. He said that we may have a fire suppression landscape, but the pattern is still there. There are an infinite number of possibilities that could result from fires, what we see is just one.

Luigi said that there is lots of stuff out there - habitat, vegetation, patches, and age class distribution. Their target is to keep something of everything, to maintain it all in quantity and quality. The idea is that if they do this, they will have habitat for all species.

Everything that they do has to be based on monitoring. They need to know if they are meeting their objectives.

Weyerhaeuser is going to assume that all the bird species from 1950 are still out in the FMA now. They are going to assume that none have been lost. For the ungulates, they need to look at population numbers. They know that the furbearers depend on landscape diversity. Weyerhaeuser is going to monitor the birds and the furbearers. They know that they can't recreate 1950, but they are going to use it as a reference point for the patterns. Luigi said that by comparing the distribution in the different LMUs, they could get an idea of where they should be going. Cumulative effects are a big issue.

Carl said that this was an eloquent reason for doing monitoring in riparian areas.

Marsh said that the forest companies are going to be there the longest. They should be monitoring, so that they can see exactly what the effects are.

#### Old Growth Strategy

Luigi said that this is really a part of the landscape analysis already discussed. They need to maintain the diversity that is already found on the FMA. The question is how much should be left "past rotation"?

Luigi said that you need to look at why the old growth is needed. The first approach is to identify the species that need the old growth for habitat. If this is done, you end up managing for a specific species. The second approach asks the amount of late seral stage that would naturally occur on a landscape. This approach requires finding out where the late seral stage forest is and how it is distributed.

Luigi said that in scientific and environmental communities, there is no agreement on what "old growth" means. But for practical terms, forest companies need an age. Forest succession and development is a continuum of changes in structure and composition. This is an ambiguous threshold.

The Edson age-class distribution indicates fire suppression, not a natural cycle. There are not many younger stands in the Edson FMA. This isn't necessarily good for species that are dependent on younger stands.

Luigi said that for Weyerhaeuser, old growth would be anything past rotation. There is a lot of work being done to find out what needs to be in the management plan.

This is a table of the minimum retention required of the varying cover types.

Cover type	Minimum retention	
	LF	UF
Deciduous forest	5%	5%
Deciduous mixedwood	5%	5%
Coniferous mixedwood	5%	5%
Pine dominant	1%	2%
Spruce dominant	10%	20%
Pine/spruce complex	5%	10%

Luigi said that they need to look at where the old growth is, its distribution and the patch size. They need to ensure that there is a continuous landscape of late seral stages. The area has to be of use. There are species that are dependent on late seral stage forest.

Luigi said that they did a study in the summer of 2000 to define what old growth is. They need to be able to assess the effectiveness of the strategy in meeting the biodiversity objectives. They also want to be able to understand the differences in structure and composition of the old stands of different ages. The study should help Weyerhaeuser identify the species that depend on the late seral stages and maintain their habitat in amounts sufficient to support viable populations. They also want to identify and protect a representation of very old stands that may be ecologically unique. He said that they found a 200-year-old pine stand in the Drayton Valley FMA. It will be maintained.

Luigi said that the impact of old growth on the AAC is minor, because there is lots of it in the Edson FMA.

Marsh asked for a definition of seral.

Luigi said that a seral stage is a clearly identifiable stage in a successional trajectory of a plant community. It is one of the stages of development of a stand.

Jan said that seral relates to time.

Luigi said that "old growth" has personal values associated with it. That is why they try to use "late seral stages".

Lyle thanked Luigi for a very informative presentation.

The meeting closed at 9:45 p.m.

## Minutes of the Weyerhaeuser Forest Advisory Committee

Wednesday, December 13, 2000

Sundance Room, Edson & District Recreation Complex, Edson, Alberta

Present: Lyle Benson, John Witham, Jan Ficht, Carl Hunt, Tom Varty, Margaret Kidner, Andy Stanton, Mal Goldie, Marsh Hoke, Mitch Yaremko, Paul Scott, Kelly Fluet, Rob Jolly, Lee Davis and John Nyssen.

Absent: Dave Chaluk, Dan Berry, Ron Christie and Laurie Camps.

Minutes taken by Michelle Andersen, The Tree Tracker Ltd.

### **Timber Supply Analysis**

Paul presented the alternative scenarios that were presented on December 12<sup>th</sup> to the Quota Holders. 2.3 is lighter and easier to read than 1.1 although it is the same text.

Paul explained that ANC, Blue Ridge Lumber, Millar Western, Edson Timber Products and representatives of both MTU groups attend the quota holder meetings.

Marsh asked what the difference was between Woodstock and Stanley.

Paul said that Woodstock is an aspatial model that it used to determine AAC. Stanley physically puts the blocks across the landscape. It applies the AAC on a spatial basis. Paul explained that these runs include moderate and marginal land. Some companies think that they can work on these lands. Paul said that they also are looking at alternative flows. The AAC used to be based on an evenflow over two rotations.

John N asked about piece size. Are they going to harvest when the trees are a certain size, not necessarily a certain age?

Paul said that this is a way to make sure that the trees are a certain size. Age is not necessarily an indicator of appropriate size.

John N asked if this is a way to determine AAC.

Tom said no. It's just another constraint on the AAC.

Paul explained the table. An "A" density stand has between 6 and 30% crown closure. A "B" density stand has between 31 and 50% crown closure. Paul explained the regeneration models. They are based on a 5-year block. Using 20% represents a one-year regeneration lag for all trees. (20% of the trees are said to take 5 years to regenerate, while the other 80% have instant regeneration.)

Paul said that they have represented death in deciduous as a straight line. If a conifer stand reaches 300 years, the volume drops to zero while the composition and density remain the same. The model is based on a best guess, because they only have current information.

Weyerhaeuser will be able to see if this is correct in the next 60 years.

Rob said that it looks like the deciduous dies a slow death, while the conifer has a heart attack.

Paul said that they didn't break the conifer down into spruce and pine. He then explained adjacency. If two blocks are less than 30 metres apart, they will be joined (for instance when a 25 metre wide road is in-between.) If the space is greater than 30 metres, they are not joined.

Tom explained the affects of adjacency on the second and third pass. The effect extends into the future.

Paul explained the green-up constraints. If two stands are less than 60 metres apart, there must be at least 15 years before the second one is logged. If they are greater than 60 metres apart, they can be logged at the same time.

Paul said that there is no minimum or maximum block size. In the run, the largest block was 350 hectares and the average block size was 12 hectares. Paul said that they are going to add a one, five and ten-hectare minimum block size for merchantability purposes and see what happens to the average block sizes and the AAC.

Tom said that Woodstock gives the numbers, and Stanley looks at if it can be done.

Paul said that Woodstock gives the best number that they can get. Stanley cuts the maximum AAC by 8 to 12%, on average.

Rob asked how the ecosite classification fits in.

Paul explained that the net landbase is determined by the ecosite classification, as are the yield curves. Run F02 has old growth constraints.

Jan explained the old growth constraints. There are two tiers, older than 110 and older than 140 years old. This constraint is added to the gross harvestable landbase.

Paul said that there was very little impact when it was implemented.

Jan said that they would start to see some effects at the end of the second rotation.

Paul said that there would be a gap in the old growth deciduous later, due to lack of fires in the Upper Foothills in the last 50 years.

Jan said that the gap does show up in the Lower Foothills. It will be seen as a middle-aged forest gap as well.

Paul said that they have forest that is 0 to 20 years old, then a gap of 30 years. Then they have forest that is 50 to 180 years old.

Jan said that a gap is hard to fill.

John N said that they wouldn't want to stick a minimum age of 90 years. The gap will come up.

Lee asked if the Virginia Hills fire would cause the same sort of situation.

Paul said it would, even worse. They lost a lot of their younger growing stock as well. They have a very large gap.

Paul said that all the forest companies have to explain to the oil and gas the importance of putting wells in forested areas, not in reforested areas. The reforested cutblocks are the future.

Lee asked if the oil and gas companies co-operate?

Tom said that they are pretty good, once it is explained.

John N asked if the TDA is higher on cutblocks, than on standing timber.

Tom said that he didn't think so. TDA recognizes the cost of the reforestation only.

John N said that he thought that it recognizes the future value.

Paul explained moderate and marginal stands and reduced utilization (13/7 as opposed to 15/11).

John N explained that the Quota holders were trying to recover from a 30-40% loss in the conifer AAC in W6.

Paul explained the alternate flow of a ten-percent drop. He explained that the figures refer to an average first ten-year period and then the AAC will drop. This flow is trying to capture the loss at death. Paul said that runs 5 and 6 are like evenflow, but allow for fluctuation within a zone.

Marsh said that the long-term effect is to increase the distribution of age classes across the landscape. It doesn't tell you what is sustainable.

Jan said that it does.

Paul said that these numbers would be sustainable to 180 years, if they stayed within the maximum fluctuation.

Marsh said that he would think that the shareholders would like to cut all the forest before major renovations are required at the mill. Then they could just pull up and go somewhere else.

Tom said that that was probably true from an economic standpoint. But the Alberta government states that the mill must manage the forests sustainably.

Andy asked what would happen if there was an economic downturn.

Tom said that if they don't use the FMA for 2 years (if the mill closed), the government can take the whole FMA away.

John N said that the biggest drawback with FMAs is that they still have to cut even if the market is not there.

Paul explained how the allocations and volumes applied to the AAC work. Salvage is applied to the AAC. This is why Weyerhaeuser aggressively seeks out the salvage.

Marsh asked which scenario Weyerhaeuser was going to use.

Tom said that they haven't decided yet.

Paul said that they are still looking at numbers for the single landbase scenario. They are also looking at the minimum block size. In E1, they are going to take out the green-up constraint, adding in more structure on the landbase (increasing to 8% merchantable).

Mitch asked if they would look at doing this in W6.

Jan said no; there are too many players.

Jan said that their aim was to stop fragmenting the landscape. This is an attempt to get the blocks bigger and concentrate logging.

Lee clarified that there would not be green-up.

Paul said that there would still be regeneration standards to meet, but no green-up numbers. This is only in E1.

Jan said that the decisions should be made on what makes the most sense for the block. There should be flexibility. She would like to see 200-250 hectare blocks. They should go back into previously logged areas. There would be both large and small blocks.

John N said that there didn't seem to be an effect on the AAC.

Marsh said that it should be very effective in reducing fragmentation. It should also be good for access. This is also something that WeyFAC has discussed.

Jan said that they need to do a couple runs to see if it will work. It may not. Monitoring will need to be done too. Over time you will have a large area of disturbance.

Margaret asked what is that going to do to the furbearers?

Jan said that's why they will need to monitor. They will still need to have the old growth patches.

Marsh clarified that large blocks will be left in 100 years, i.e. larger patches than if they look at traditionally.

Andy said that they are going to lose old wood. The trappers won't like it if the loggers move into their area for 20 years.

Paul said that they are recognizing that they will lose some of the old wood to death.



Jan said that this model involves not chasing the old wood.

Paul said that in 2007, it would all be reassessed. They will know more then. At that point, they may apply it across the FMA, or they may pull it all.

Jan said that all the other FMUs are too fragmented already. They will be doing monitoring.

Margaret asked if they would be looking at furbearers.

Jan said definitely. Luigi is already looking at baselines. The furbearers will be good indicators.

Margaret said that they would be interested in seeing the results.

Paul said that the graphs are for information.

Mal said that he heard that the volume of wood that forest companies take out each year is less than the growth.

Carl asked if this was true, why are some companies against taking off 1.5% of their landbases to Special Places.

Paul said that if they give it all away, there would be nothing left to grow.

John N said that they are not taking into account other users, like oil and gas.

Tom said that the vast majority of wood that is taken out by oil and gas is used.

Lyle asked that members think about issues for 2001. The DFMP and ground rules are also on the agenda for January.

The meeting closed at 9:50 p.m.

## Minutes of the Weyerhaeuser Forest Advisory Committee

Wednesday, January 10, 2001

Sundance Room, Edson and District Recreation Complex, Edson, Alberta

Present: Tom Varty, Marsh Hoke, Jan Ficht, Lyle Benson, Margaret Kidner, Brent Schleppe, Carl Hunt, Paul Scott, Stephan Burnett, Andy Stanton, Lee Davis, Ron Christie, Dan Berry, and Rob Jolly

Absent: Dave Chaluk, Laurie Camps, John Witham, John Nyssen, and Mal Goldie  
Minutes taken by Laurie Schneider, The Tree Tracker Ltd.

The meeting opened at 6:35 p.m. by Lyle Benson.

### **Detailed Forest Management Plan**

Paul - (handed out a summary of W6 exploratory.) Before I start, I wanted to let everyone know that Diana Bainbridge has resigned and withdrawn from this group. I hope Rob continues.

- On the middle graph, the left line is conifer and the right is deciduous.

- As discussed at the last Quota Holders meeting, the average block size is around 10 1/2 to 12 hectares so we need to try and elevate the size of the cut block. Parameters were put in to see what happens with the AAC and block size.

Tom - Stanley is a spatial run.

Paul - So when Woodstock puts out a number, it is 100% of the anticipated AAC. When a target block size is set at 30, 50, 75, and 100 hectares. The average still comes out similar (R1-R4). We're trying to test the sensitivity to changing the target block size.

Tom - If this doesn't seem very clear then just know that the constraints are in relative terms. They're just something to give the computer, some rules to work with.

Carl - Could you explain what the consequences would be with the differences (i.e.: is 1% not a big deal or is 10% not a big deal?).

Tom - There's no correct answer to that. 1% may not be a big deal. We leave 3% as a result of patch retention. 10% is a concern to us.

Paul - A typical range falls between 8-12% no matter what constraint is put in.

Andy - Do you get enough information for the computer numbers?

Paul - The numbers are taken from the inventory, which define a multitude of conditions or themes.

Tom - FMA has been inventoried to AVI standards, which is not done once, but several times over a span. Paul has also collected data.

Andy - The job just seems overwhelming!

Paul - Impossible area are areas that could not be scheduled (zero for any runs with "none" as the minimal block size).

Stephan - What's the time line here?

Paul - Conifer is over 180 years and deciduous is 140.

Dan - In the "impossible areas" is that strictly merchantable timber?

Paul- Yes, merchantable land base only. There are very tiny stands being left behind.

Marsh - We can't block it in those areas.

Tom - Spatially we can't make it into block size.

Rob - Directly related to minimum block size?

Paul - It will force some areas up. Increasing proximal distance doesn't show an increase. Using adjacency distance also doesn't increase. The only increase would happen if a minimum block size were used.

Marsh - So looking at a number of blocks should create more fragmentation?

Paul - Yes. The bottom figure shows the increase in average block size as you change the rule set.

Rob - These are being done strictly as a reference?

Paul - Tested the minimum block size then you increase the block area. In R18, the blocks average increases but decreases the conifer landbase and really decreases the cut.

Lyle - So basically the company doesn't want large cut blocks.

Paul - Yes, on average. When we broaden the deviation period, there is also an increase in average block size. Deviation period is the number of age classes a stand can deviate when blocks are being built by Stanley.

Jan - Timber values?

Paul - Yes. Big percent is achieved when including the deviations but not the average.

Rob - Are these deviations feasible?

Paul - There is a minimum harvest age of 60 and it won't go beyond.

Rob - If the deviation is increased then will it grab growth that is too young? And what else would happen?

Jan - There's special affects of where old growth is.

Paul - So it looks like we will use the minimum block size of 2. It tries very hard to gather up the "slivers".

Stephan - What is the maximum block size allowable under current ground rules?

Paul - Maximum on pine is 100 hectares with the average being 60.

Jan - We are looking at getting new ground rules with industry and public input.

Paul - So why would we have large block sizes out there? For managing timber, wildlife, etc.

Carl - We can't make assumptions that big fires are good for wildlife.

Jan - We also can't assume that salvaging a burned forest is not necessarily good for wildlife. Wildlife has adapted to fires happening. Some species need large patch sizes.

Lyle - Examples?

Jan - Goshawks are an interior species that want the inner portion of trees and not just outside edges. There are other birds, bats and some furbearers. Not everything should be 200-250 hectare size but we should use some areas for these species. We need to get away from the "straight lines". Could take a big patch and then leave a big patch. We need some of the disturbance patches from forestry and fire to be larger.

Margaret - What furbearers?

Jan - Fishers. We want to monitor how these large areas are used. Would like to see as much understory left in these larger blocks and is a large block is taken then a large block can be left.

Andy - Do you have any studies where fires have happened?

Jan - Yes, at Chip Lake.

Ron - Will a watershed study be done before the large cut is done? Is monitoring done?

Tom - (Clarifying Ron's question) Will a large cut affect waterflow as opposed to small cuts? The answer would be that monitoring may be required if the need arises.

Margaret - Will there be compensation to trappers over these large block sizes?

Paul - No.

Margaret - It must be considered, as lines would be wiped out.

Tom - If a large cut block wipes out a trap line then it is too small to be economical.

Margaret - Furbearers won't cross large cut blocks.

Lyle - I think what Margaret is talking about is from season to season. Weyerhaeuser needs to be talking to the trappers individually in each area.

Ron - There must be some dollar compensation for the trappers when the block size is increased.

Lyle – If Weyerhaeuser could be in contact with the trappers before cutting that would be appreciated.

Paul –Yes, the sooner the better.

Dan – What about fires (i.e.: Chip Lake)? They do damage to trappers as well.

Margaret – Yes, they are devastating but are a natural occurrence.

Carl – Part of the problem is that if we want to leave large strips then must have large cuts so the planning needs to be observed closely. I had some concern about the huge cut on Trout Creek but the final product has been okay.

Margaret – If you guys are out to change the ground rules then the trappers need to have some input.

Tom – We are doing the minimum requirement to notify trappers but we need to notify trappers in a more involved level.

Paul – There needs to be clarification on the 960 hectares being cut. That means that there is one cut block of that size sometime in the next 60 years.

Ron – Could we bring the map of Tom Hill Tower back in for Margaret to review?

Tom – We'll get you out to Tom Hill Tower is anyone wants.

**Action Item** – Paul offered a field trip and Tom offered a helicopter ride to view The Tom Hill Tower area. Paul also offered a slide show of the area.

Stephan – (to Jan or Tom) When will new rules become reality and will the plan create an “equilibrium”?

Paul – The monitoring report is completed annually with a stewardship report occurring every 5 years.

Tom – We will sit down with Jan and the maps to see that the ground rules are being met.

Jan – Yes, I will monitor Weyerhaeuser and make sure they are doing what they said.

Stephan – Will that set the equilibrium with no change?

Jan – Change happens. The Chip Lake fire changed a lot. We want to be changing toward something better.

Tom – GPS has been introduced, maps are better, and people laying out cut blocks tend to be better trained.

Paul – Analytical planning has been greatly improved. We want to have the ground rules set by March 29, 2001 and the DFMP in by the next two months (projecting it up and running by May 1<sup>st</sup>).

Rob – Trying to mimic the occurrence of fire but on a “micro” level. We still don’t know what’s happening over the long term.

Tom – We are attempting to look at the affects of logging.

Margaret – When looking at the blocks are “calving areas” being taken into account?

Paul – We take into account the obvious areas such as licks, etc.

Margaret – The Forest Service has maps with these specific areas on them.

Jan – I will bring these maps (**Action Item**).

Paul – We haven’t decided on a run yet. We are still looking at scenarios for a preferred scenario on the whole DFMP.

Lyle – Would the group like to see it when completed?

Paul – We’ll bring it in for the group. Nothing has been finalised for the zonal ground rules. Debris management was to be simple but still needs more investigation.

Jan – Do you mean the debris on the block before or after harvesting?

Paul – We need to see about removing downed structure from cut blocks or leave slash or piles. Need to look at a variety of slash conditions, taking into consideration other values, such as fire, aesthetics, etc.

Carl – Is anyone talking about burning or loss of organic matter?

Paul – There’s no talk of smoke management.

Dan – Negative to fire?

Paul – There’s two considerations 1) smoke management and 2) reduction of downed woody debris.

Jan – It’s a compromise of many values.

Paul – The primary value is to increase biodiversity for species. The final part of the meeting is to let everyone know about the seminar at 9:30 a.m. February 8, 2001 at the Best Western Inn. We are putting in research plots in the Chip Lake fire area both in the unsalvaged burnt timber areas as well as in the salvaged burnt areas.

The meeting was closed at 9:20 p.m.

## Minutes of the Weyerhaeuser Forestry Advisory Committee

Wednesday, March 14, 2001

Sundance Room, Edson and District Recreation Complex, Edson, Alberta

Present: Paul Scott, Mal Goldie, Tom Varty, Andy Stanton, Jan Ficht, Ron Christie, Carl Hunt, Margaret Kidner, Michelle Andersen, Mark Chileen, Jason Stafford, and Laurie Schneider.

Absent: Dave Chaluk, John Nyssen, Dan Berry, Laurie Camps, Lee Davis, John Witham, Marsh Hoke, and Rob Jolly

Minutes taken by Laurie Schneider, The Tree Tracker Ltd.

The meeting opened at 6:30 PM by Michelle Andersen.

### **Detailed Forest Management Plan**

Paul – On February 23<sup>rd</sup>, I received a letter from Cliff Henderson (Assistant Deputy Minister). It is his view that more research needs to be done. Through the Quota Holders meetings, we have come up with some understanding of which scenario to use. Unfortunately, there is still some conflict on ideas so more testing will be done on the scenarios.

Jan – Is this binding arbitration?

Tom – Mr. Henderson has said that new cuts will be explored and will happen May 1<sup>st</sup>.

Mal – It will be their scenario and not yours.

Paul – We'll see where it ends up.

Mal – Whatever numbers they come up with, they'll go with them and not yours.

Paul – The completion target is May 1<sup>st</sup>.

Carl – It's a healthy process to see where we are in sustainable forestry. I'm glad that the government is independently auditing this.

Paul – It's not an audit. They can take it two ways.

Tom – The government will have a direct role in the timber analysis. And, yes, the government should have input but they are suggesting things for the wrong reasons. They want the AAC high but we need to look at the whole picture and not just the AAC.

Paul – And the first thing to suffer will be green tree retention.

Tom – It became clear to us that the wood is not there and others need to own-up to that.

Mal – We need to put pressure on the government (MLAs), as we cannot make the same mistakes that we have made in the past. We also need to know why the ministers are ignoring it.

Jan – At least some clarity would be nice.

Tom – We need to let Mr. Henderson know that if there's been some error that we've made then we will rectify it. We want to give the truth.

Carl – Is there some way that we can support you on this? We have cut a tremendous amount of land. Is this sustainable?

Tom – It's a transparent process. We have nothing to hide so I'm frustrated, as we've been told that the numbers don't fit and that the government will do their own. We need to look at some stringent analysis.

Michelle – Should WeyFAC be writing a letter?

Paul – I think we have to wait and see the outcome first. Let the government pursue their numbers and we'll see.

Tom – We've spent a lot of time and money so I feel we have covered all the bases.

Paul – We'll continue on our path so our deadline won't be missed.

Michele – Weyerhaeuser needs to know that WeyFAC supports them.

Meeting was close at 9:00 pm. Next meeting Wednesday, April 11, 2001.