

Issue: 1.Trappers Compensation

1. Trappers should be compensated for loss of revenue when harvesting and/or oil/gas has reduced the habitat for furbearers.
2. In order to be fair, compensation should only be paid to trappers who can validate their claims with historical data.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 is addressed in the DFMP under the Canfor's *Trappers Notification Program*. This program was developed as a result of discussion within the Advisory Committee and with the direct help of the Trappers Association and the Sturgeon Lake Band (both who have representation on the Advisory Committee). There is a section dealing with how Canfor will compensate Trappers if 5-year average income can be shown to be negatively impacted.

Issue 2 is also part of the *Trappers Compensation and Notification Program* and will be handled similarly. Claims must be substantiated with historical data.

Ref: may 29/98 pg 1

Issue: 2.Trappers communication

1. An improved system to notify trappers regarding Canfor's activities conducted on individual traplines is required. The Committee recommends that communication with trappers should be person to person.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 is addressed in the DFMP under Canfor's *Trappers Notification Program*, which describes how communication with trappers is now one-on-one. Two people are hired to make personal contact on behalf of Canfor to each trapper affected by our operations.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 2

Issue: 3. Wildlife licks

1. Wildlife licks are important, not only to large animals but smaller animals and birds, and should be protected.
2. There is a need to understand the process that Canfor has developed to identify wildlife licks. The Committee recommends that trappers and hunters be utilized as a resource to identify wildlife licks. A one-time meeting should be held to garner this information.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be included within the section of the DFMP relating to areas of special interest. Canfor agrees with the Committee that wildlife licks are important to many wildlife species. Canfor has developed and implemented strategies (i.e. 100M buffers left untouched surrounding Lick) for the protection of wildlife licks.

Issue 2 will also be included within the section of the DFMP relating to areas of special interest. Licks are currently identified operationally and through one-on-one meetings held with trappers in accordance with the *Trappers Compensation and Notification Program*. A one time meeting with hunters and trappers is not planned for due to the complexities of getting hunters together and their reluctance to share their knowledge of wildlife information.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 10

Issue: 4.Unique Flora/fauna

1. There is a need to compile a species list of unique, rare or endangered flora and fauna within Canfor's FMA.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be addressed by Dr. Joan Snyder's reports entitled, *Preliminary List of Rare Plants in the Grande Prairie Forest Region*, and *Habitat Requirements for Animal Species of Special Interest*. We will be incorporating a summary of rare plant occurrence that has been sampled throughout the FMA. It should be noted that these reports were contracted to be done as a result of committee input regarding the need for the information.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 19

Issue: 5. Areas of Special Interest

1. The FMA contains areas of special interest (importance) that should be identified, and then conserved, protected or managed accordingly e.g., caribou range, parabolic sand dunes, historical/ archaeological sites.
2. A historical/ archaeological resource inventory is recommended by the Committee to verify and identify additional "sites" within the FMA.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be addressed in the DFMP in terms of the management strategies that are in place for specific special areas of interest such as caribou habitat, parabolic sand dune, historical/archaeological sites, etc. Special Places 2000 areas will be addressed later in this document when issues located on page 22 of the *Issues List* (May 29th document) are discussed. Wildlife licks could also be considered as an area of special interest, however, they will be discussed separately in this document (page 10 – May 29th document).

Issue 2 will be discussed in the DFMP in terms of the historical/archaeological inventory that has recently been conducted (Final May/98). The inventory will assist Canfor to verify known historical/archaeological sites and identify additional sites.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 7/8

Issue: 6. Special Places 2000

1. Areas should be set aside within the FMA for Special Places 2000.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be discussed in the DFMP in terms of what sites, within the FMA, have been nominated for Special Places 2000. Canfor has, with the approval of the Committee, nominated two sites including Cactus Hills (84-9-W6M) and Peace Parkland (81-7-W6M). It should be noted that no Special Places 2000 sites, nominated within the FMA, have been ratified by the provincial government.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 22

Issue:**7. Protection of sensitive sites (set asides)**

1. Low productivity sites (i.e. sites that are sensitive to hydrology & soil factors) in the FMA should be evaluated to determine how they should be managed.
2. What trade-offs take place when areas within the FMA are protected and removed from the productive landbase? If specific sites are protected and not considered in the AAC calculation, the Committee recognizes that enhanced forest management may be required in other areas of the FMA.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

***Issue 1** will be addressed in the DFMP in terms of how low-productivity sites are addressed strategically and operationally. It is Canfor's current practice to delineate "no harvest zones" in extreme wet areas/low productivity areas (>1 ha) within cut units that are identified either by site classification or field inspections.

Issue 2 will be addressed in the DFMP as a discussion of landbase withdrawals. Every time land from the FMA is taken out of production for other uses, protected sites, etc. there is less timber available for harvest. Other economically viable methods must be found to replace that lost timber. This may include more enhanced forest management practices elsewhere on the FMA. Enhanced forest management includes the use of genetically improved seedlings, spacing of trees, etc – any practice that will yield more growth (m^3/ha) than the site previously had.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 12

Issue:

8. Triad Concept

1. When companies practice intensive or enhanced forest management on crown land as a means to increase yield, there should be some area set-aside for protection as a balance. The committee likes the "TRIAD" concept that was presented to them at an earlier meeting. Will CANFOR be utilizing the TRIAD concept in their new DFMP?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 is similar to the issue above on Protection of sensitive sites and will be discussed in the DFMP. The concepts around the TRIAD include the use of Basic reforestation practices on parts of the FMA, enhanced reforestation practices on parts of the FMA and a certain amount of area set aside for protection on the FMA. The percentage for each of these concepts is not dictated. Canfor has already identified sites for protection in the FMA such as the Parabolic sand dunes, Cactus Hills and Peace Parkland (see Special Places issue on page 2 of this document). Other areas are being looked at during the preparation of this plan. The FMA has a total landbase of 649 160 ha and is comprised of forested (592 296 ha) and non-forested (56 864 ha) landbase. Currently (Nov 2000) 82 838 ha (12.8%) of the forested landbase will not be harvested by the forest industry. **[SFMP – Table 1 page 7]**

- Enhanced forest management includes the use of genetically improved seedlings, spacing of trees, etc – any practice that will yield more growth (m^3/ha) than the site previously had, but NOT maximize it as in Intensive Forest Management (see below). It is essential to make certain that harvested sites are successfully regenerated and are as productive as they are predicted to be in the DFMP. To meet the regenerated yields outlined in the DFMP, Canfor has committed to a goal of utilizing 70% of the seed grown at the orchard and 30% of the seed collected in bulk from the FMA within the following Natural Subregions: Central Mixedwood, Dry Mixedwood, and Lower Foothills. The timeline to meet this. Goal is within 3 years for pine and 3-5 years for spruce. (as seed orchard seed becomes available). **[SFMP 1C 1.1c.1]**
- Regular scarification and planting techniques, as well as some stand tending practices such as thinning and use of herbicides are considered **basic forestry practices**. Basic forestry practices **maintain** growth on the site (knock back the competition for a time to allow the crop trees to grow) and meet legislative requirements.
- Intensive forest management is "Tree Farming"– this practice would most likely be used only on private land. This practice maximizes the growth potential of the site. (previously the term intensive management was used when extensive management was the more appropriate term to use.

Ref: minutes June 17/98

Issue: 9. Purchase of Private Land

1. Is the purchase of private land a viable option for intensive forest management?
2. What role does private land play in Canfor's operations?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Regarding **Issue 1**: Purchase of private land may be part of the overall strategy for supply of timber to Canfor's mill, however, this role can not be identified until the AAC has been calculated and evaluated. If private land is purchased, intensive forest management will be applied to those lands.

Issue 2 will be discussed in the DFMP in terms of what role private land plays in Canfor's timber supply, and the environmental standards that private landowners must adhere to when selling logs to Canfor. Canfor purchases wood from private landowners to supply a minor portion of our mill requirements. We have developed a *Purchase Wood and Woodlot Management Program* and a booklet entitled, "*Sound Forestry Practices*" will soon be available to provide information to assist private landowners to manage private lands and conduct their forestry operations in an environmentally responsible manner.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 6

Issue: 10. Recreation opportunity concerns

1. Timber harvesting has an impact on opportunities for recreational activities such as camping, hunting and fishing. What are some of the things Canfor is doing to co-exist with these other users?
2. Has provisions for recreation been considered in the DFMP? The committee recommends that a recreational resource inventory be conducted in the FMA.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be discussed in the DFMP. Canfor has taken over the management responsibilities for 4 campgrounds previously operated by the government to ensure recreational opportunities for the public. We have been involved in the enhancement of one to provide fishing opportunities by cost sharing in an aeration project at Swan Lake. Canfor also keeps their roads open for hunters' access to different areas. In relation to exact impacts of harvesting upon recreational activities, we do not have any information at this time.

Issue 2 will be addressed in the DFMP via a discussion of the recreational sites that Canfor operates both inside and outside the FMA. Canfor will be evaluating what is required to conduct a recreational resource inventory. If conducted, the inventory may not be started until after submission of the DFMP.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 3

Issue:**11. Multiple Use – Other users**

1. How will other forest users such as trappers, guides, recreational users, etc. be addressed in the DFMP?
2. The impacts of increased access upon recreational uses, both positive and negative, needs to be clearly understood.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be addressed in the DFMP within the *Public Involvement Plan*. Canfor recognizes that other users are part of the Forest and will make efforts to involve them in our public involvement processes. Within the plan, Canfor maintains a stakeholder list and provides opportunities, i.e. public meetings, etc. for the public to provide input into the DFMP. FMAC also represents stakeholders and provides public input.

***Issue 2.** Increased access provides more recreational opportunities into previously inaccessible areas. This same positive effect can be viewed as a negative effect for those that want pristine opportunities. Access is discussed in the DFMP, but it is difficult to comment on whether the effects are positive or negative because it will depend on what each individual values. The answer is different for everyone.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 5

Issue:**12. Logging- Aesthetics**

1. What can Canfor do to address the public's viewpoint that harvesting is aesthetically unpleasant when viewed from a distance (landscape perspective)?
2. There is a concern regarding the aesthetics of debris left within cutblocks located immediately adjacent to main roads.
3. Committee is concerned about the aesthetics of roads into cutunits. Barrels, oilcans, hoses, etc need to be cleaned up and the roads need to be reclaimed upon completion.
4. Committee feels that the company signs on the main roads indicating year of harvesting and year of successful reforestation are very positive and would like to see this practice continue.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be discussed within the DFMP in terms of how Canfor addresses aesthetic issues: Canfor recognizes that some members of the public feel harvested cutblocks are visually unpleasant when viewing an otherwise unaltered forest landscape. The Company takes steps to make cutblocks as visually appealing as possible such as avoiding straight block boundaries wherever possible and using irregular boundaries that more readily imitates natural forest openings (type cuts).

Canfor recognizes that the debris left within cutblocks is aesthetically unpleasant to some members of the public. There are two types of debris - merchantable and unmerchantable. We refer to the unmerchantable woody material (tops, branches, and rotten logs) left within cutblocks as "down woody debris". (This topic of merchantable and unmerchantable debris is discussed more fully on next page (ref: page 41 of May 29th document). Although down woody debris may look visually unappealing, the debris plays an important role in nutrient cycling, and provides microsites for conifer seedlings and habitat for wildlife. It is important that non-merchantable material is left behind for those reasons.

Issue 2 will be dealt with similarly as with the above issue. Canfor will be assessing what we can do to improve the aesthetics of the debris left along main roads. Some options are to ensure that large amounts of accumulated debris are cleaned up along the main roads and that in some cases the road is buffered with trees left standing. We will get back to the committee on this issue once a strategy is developed.

Issue 3 will be dealt similarly as issue 1 as a discussion on aesthetics in the DFMP. Canfor has a cleanup policy in place and if contractors are negligent in their cleanup, Canfor cleans it up and appropriate fines to the contractor are levied. Sometimes the used oilcans, barrels, etc. are brought to a central location and cleaned up prior to completion of operations.

Issue 4 will be discussed in the DFMP. Canfor started signing cutunits close to main roads in 1994. We hope to continue this practice.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 31/32

Issue:

13. Merchantable wood use

1. The Committee is concerned that all merchantable material should be effectively utilized. What is Canfor doing to ensure all merchantable wood in the cutunits is being utilized?
2. The Committee recognizes the importance of the down woody debris (decant, rotten logs, branches, tops, etc.) to the site. Can Canfor provide the educational information about the role of “down woody debris” in the bush in a brochure format for the general public?
3. The Committee is concerned about the amount of merchantable timber left behind after industrial clearings by the energy sector. Does Canfor have responsibility to salvage that timber?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be discussed within the DFMP in terms of improving utilization. Most of the woody debris, in piles or distributed within the blocks, is non-merchantable fiber that does not meet the merchantability standards established by the LFS. Canfor conducts an annual survey to determine how much of the “waste” left within cut blocks contains merchantable pieces. Since 1995, the amount of merchantable material left in the bush has declined from 2.2% to 0.42% (1997). Canfor’s *Waste & Residue Survey Summary* will be referenced.

Issue 2 will be discussed in the DFMP as to its importance/abundance in the FMA. Canfor will be updating brochures in 1999 and will look at incorporating a section on wood waste & down woody debris to inform the public of the difference and the role that the down woody debris plays in the environment. Although the down woody debris may look visually unappealing, it plays an important role in nutrient cycling, and provides microsites for conifer seedlings and habitat for wildlife. It is important that down woody material is left behind for those reasons.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 41

Issue 3 will be discussed in the DFMP in terms of the Company’s salvage **plans**. Canfor has first right of refusal on all salvage wood from the FMA. Canfor is committed to salvaging 100% of the merchantable salvage wood as long as it is accessible and its location made known to the Company. Due to the complexity and variability of the salvage wood process, it may never be possible to determine if 100% of available wood has been salvaged. **[SFMP: 4b 1.3b.1]**

Ref: Oct 25/00 minutes

Issue:

14. Roads in FMA

1. Road construction and reclamation practices in the FMA and their subsequent effects on fish population are an issue.
2. Committee would like to see more gates used to control access on those roads that are built to a lower standard to protect the road surfaces (less use) and reduce siltation into creeks.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be addressed in generic terms in the DFMP (i.e. environmental practices). More detail will be provided in the new operating ground rules, which will be developed about 6 months after the submission of the DFMP. Canfor recognizes that there is a concern with its' roads and culverts standards and will be offering this committee a tour this fall to view some of our roads and reclamation work. Results from this discussion will be used in a review of our practices to see where improvements can be made. We currently have an erosion control booklet that is given to our contractor that outlines correct procedures to use when doing reclamation work. We do monitor our roads on an annual basis, however, due to the large number of them, we recognize that we may miss some problems.

Issue 2 regarding gating of roads will not be discussed in the DFMP. In order to gate a road, we need a minister's order to post. We have found that gating of roads do not always work as people will break the locks and enter regardless. Access control is a difficult issue to deal with because we can not legally stop any member of the public (non-commercial) from using our roads without a ministers order.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 34

Issue:

15. Condition of County & MD Roads

1. Some committee members expressed a concern that the condition of gravel and paved roads in the County of Grande Prairie and the MD may be deteriorating. Are log load weights monitored to ensure the road infrastructure is not damaged?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be discussed in the DFMP in terms of Canfor's over-weight monitoring program. Our program applies to all the roads on which we operate. Canfor submits a log load report to the government. If the loads come in overweight, then a fine is levied. Fines vary based on amount of weight they are over. The Categories for fines are over 3000 kg, (pay \$300) & over 5000 kg (pay \$500). Canfor pays the fine to the government and the fines are passed on to our contractors. A 'Mill Levy' is paid to the government by each mill. The amount of the Mill Levy goes up or down depending on the number of overloads that are reported each year. The money collected from the mill levy is used to pay for bridge improvements and intersection improvements. Our overweight monitoring program is currently being reviewed to see where improvements can be made.

In addition, we have contracted out a random inspection program on the trucks that haul for us. All trucks are inspected for mechanical problems on a random basis. If problems are found, they are banned from our haul until proof of repairs is shown.

It should also be noted that there is a task force of industry & government representatives currently looking at the weights that log trucks are currently allowed to haul with and how it is affecting roads and truck configurations (specifically, manufacturer specifications). We will update the committee once results from this task force are known.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 35

Issue:

16. Oil/gas industry activities in FMA

1. Timber extraction and oil/gas/utilities operations are the primary activities conducted in the FMA. There is a need for the three industry sectors to coordinate specific activities to reduce landbase conflicts i.e., promotion of common corridors.
2. The Committee is concerned with the amount of gas flaring. What is the impact of gas flaring on timber growth?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be addressed by incorporating a management objective into the DFMP. This may require the joint development of a communication plan with LFS, Canfor, Tolko and CAPP. It should be pointed out that the energy sector has a short planning horizon and therefore, we recognize the difficulties this presents in developing plans for use of common corridors, especially in terms of long term access. A discussion of how Canfor manages access will also be included in the plan i.e., Canfor minimizes "new" road construction by utilizing existing access where possible and evaluates oil/gas roads to determine their use by Canfor.

Regarding **Issue 3**: Oil/gas flaring is not a current forest management concern and we will not be addressing the issue within the DFMP. The Committee's issue will, however, remain as a concern within the *Issues List*. The impact of gas flaring on timber growth is not currently known.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 4

Issue:

17. Road Development in the FMA

1. There is a need to reduce the amount of road development in the FMA. Do Canfor and Tolko work together to coordinate their roads? Will Canfor work with future forest product companies within the FMA?
2. The committee is concerned with the amount of fragmentation caused by road development.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be discussed in the DFMP. Canfor and Tolko conduct integrated AOPs, which includes coordination of harvested areas and roads. Canfor will co-ordinate road development with any other forest product companies that obtain timber rights within Canfor's FMA. There is a tie with this issue and the issue about Canfor coordinating activity with the oil & gas companies (Similar management objective).
Ref:
May 29/98 pg. 33

Issue 2 will be discussed in the DFMP in the section on Landscape Structure. Canfor will be comparing current landscape structure to future landscape structure at key points in time. Five indices were selected to evaluate Landscape structure on the FMA - distribution of seral stages, distribution of patch sizes, fragmentation, connectivity, and patch shape. Fragmentation quantifies the degree of isolation of elements within a landscape. Canfor has selected mean patch size (MPS) as a measure of fragmentation and as discussed in the SFMP, preliminary data indicates that MPS targets are met over all time periods.. **[SFMP 1c 1.2a.1]**

Ref: Oct 25/00 minutes

Issue: 18. Grazing Leases/licenses – ACCESS

1. Committee feels that due to increasing public demand for grazing lease sites, the public may request access to FMA lands for grazing purposes.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be discussed in the DFMP in terms of what grazing leases/licenses are currently active on our FMA. Until such time that we are requested to supply access to others for grazing purposes, we can not address the issue. It should be noted though, that grazing and growing trees are often in conflict and CANFOR cannot afford to give up its' productive landbase.

Ref: June 17/98 minutes p.3

Issue: 19. Other forest companies adjacent or within Canfors FMA

1. Does Canfor work with other forest companies to ensure forest resources are managed effectively and harvested areas are reforested?
2. What forest companies operate on crown lands (green zone) directly adjacent to and/or overlapping the FMA boundary?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be addressed in the DFMP as a discussion of how reforestation and forest resources are managed. Forest management in Alberta is conducted at three levels – provincial, regional and local. At the provincial level, legislation and regulations have been enacted to control all aspects of harvesting and reforestation. Canfor also works with other companies on issues such as regeneration standards that pertain to the forest industry as a whole. At the regional level, forest companies work together to improve forest management by sharing data/information regarding forest resource management and coordinating research on issues of common interest, i.e. caribou, soil compaction. On a local level (FMA level) Canfor collects data directly related to forest resource management within the FMA i.e., fisheries inventory, historical/ archaeological survey, rare plants study, etc. Canfor and Tolko work closely to prepare integrated AOPs that coordinate road access, harvest planning, etc.

Issue 2 will be addressed in the DFMP as a map that indicates the allocated crown land, located adjacent to the FMA, on which other forest companies operate, in addition to any companies operating within the FMA.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 11

Issue: 20. FMA Expansion lands

1. Is unallocated crown land available within proximity of the FMA boundary for possible FMA expansion? Does Canfor currently obtain any timber from these unallocated areas?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be addressed in the DFMP by the map identified previously in this document. The map will contain the location of the unallocated crown lands located within the proximity of the FMA. CTP/LTP operations occurring on those lands will be discussed in generalities within the DFMP as a discussion of timber supply. In the past, Canfor has purchased timber from these operations. We are unsure at the present whether or not these lands would be made available for FMA expansion.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 17

Issue:

21. Vegetation Management (Herbicides)

1. The public requires information on Canfor's vegetation management techniques in order to evaluate the need for herbicides. The decision to use herbicides should not be solely determined based on economic factors but should be based on site-specific information and scientific data. Company plan should consider flora and fauna risks in addition to environmental risks.
2. Herbicide use by all sectors of the public, including agriculture and forestry, should be evaluated to determine the effects of accumulated amounts of herbicide (i.e. how persistent is the herbicide within the types of soils on the FMA – recognition that soil temperature plays a role in herbicide persistence).
3. Good stewardship of the land with respect to herbicide should also be required on private lands.
4. The company should have a monitoring process (audits) to ensure herbicides are used appropriately and are having the desired effect.
5. It is important to utilize the services of experts when discussing herbicides with the public.
6. Herbicide use by all commercial users needs to be monitored and evaluated by the government. The rules must apply to everyone equally.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be addressed in the DFMP within the *Vegetation Management Strategy*, which provides a detailed description of vegetation management techniques. In accordance with the *Vegetation Management Strategy*, Canfor evaluates the following factors for each area on which vegetation management is considered:

- * human health risk
- * environmental risk (air & water)
- * injury to crop species
- * effectiveness of competition control
- 57. autecology of crop and competitive species (autecology means the relationship that the species has to environmental conditions)
- * autecology interaction between primary crop and competition species
- * cost

Flora and fauna risks are indirectly assessed when considering type of treatment. Documented research ([Excretion of triclopyr herbicide in the Bovine. – copy can be obtained from Canfor](#)) has shown that any residual effect from vision would pass through the animals system within 72 hours with no ill effect.

Issue 2 will not be discussed in the DFMP, as Canfor has no control over herbicide use however, information about herbicides is documented in the Vegetation Management Manual which will be referenced and appended to the DFMP. We have researched the effects of herbicides in soils and the environment. [Ref.: Persistence, leachability & lateral movement of triclopyr (“Release”) in selected Canadian forestry soils – one of the sites is northern Ontario which would be similar to our boreal forest soils & and also “Measurement of the environmental effects associated with forestry use of “Roundup” (glyphosate)"] *These abstracts and others are available from Peter Blake @ Canfor if interested.*

Issue 3 will not be discussed in the DFMP, as Canfor has no control over land stewardship other than on the FMA or through our *Wood Purchase and Woodlot Management Program* (identified previously).

Issue 4 will be discussed in DFMP within the *Vegetation Management Strategy* that provides direction for development of monitoring programs.

Regarding **Issue 5**: Canfor has access to herbicide experts and has called upon them in the past to provide information pertaining to herbicide issues. If warranted by circumstances, Canfor will continue to invite these experts to future public meetings.

Issue 6 will not be discussed in the DFMP, as we are not the regulating agency for monitoring of herbicide use. Canfor recognizes that the committee would like to see equal monitoring of herbicide use, however, this involves many departments of the government and could be best handled via public letters to your MLA's.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 13/14

Issue: **22. Use of Fire as a Management tool**

1. Canfor (and the forest industry in general) should increase the use of fire as a management tool. Committee recommends that fire should be used more often as a management tool as part of the overall reforestation strategy.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be addressed in the DFMP in terms of Canfor's use of fire as a silvicultural tool. Canfor's *Silviculture Field Guide* will be referenced. Control burns are not done often due to the precise weather requirements. The weather in the past has not been very conducive to control burns (too high a risk for fire to get out of control).

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 20

Issue: **23. Alberta Forest Conservation Strategy**

1. Some members of the public may feel the forest industry is not supportive of the *Alberta Forest Conservation Strategy*. Does Canfor support the document?
2. What size and area of ecological benchmarks will be established by Canfor?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Regarding **Issue 1**: Canfor fully supports the Alberta Forest Conservation Strategy (AFCS) and will make such a statement in the DFMP. Canfor is not in a position to comment regarding the opinions of other forest companies.

Issue 2 will be discussed in the DFMP as a discussion of ecological benchmarks (areas left in a natural state). The objectives of each ecological benchmark area not yet known/established, therefore, we can not say with certainty where our benchmarks will be. Canfor will be looking at Benchmark areas that could either be in or outside of the FMA that will achieve the objective of benchmarking. Such areas could be; The Parabolic Sand Dunes, Cactus Creek (Peace Block Area), Fourth Creek (Peace Block Area), Youngs Point and Swan Lake.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 21

Issue: **24. Additional Ecological information for FMAC members**

1. Are opportunities available for FMAC members to obtain information regarding ecologically based forest management?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Regarding **Issue 1**: Various public meetings, conferences, open houses, and joint FMAC/Ecosystem Task Force meetings were held to provide members with pertinent ecological information. This information will be contained in the DFMP within the section where committee roles and functions are discussed.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 27

Issue: **25. Data requirements for Ecologically base management plan**

1. What data and information will Canfor utilize to develop an ecologically based management plan?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Regarding **Issue 1:** Many forest companies in Alberta have adopted ecologically based forest management as the basis for their detailed forest management plans. The manner in which individual companies attain this goal varies based on their specific circumstances and philosophies. Our DFMP will only, therefore, provide information and data pertaining to Canfor's specific approach to ecologically based forest management. It should be noted that this was one of the tasks of the Forest Management Ecosystem Task Force. (Ref: Terms of Reference – appendix 5 (indicators and measures document))

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 28

Issue: **26. Old Growth**

1. The public requires a better understanding of "old growth" and its various characteristics such as age, distribution, geographic location, fire hazards, wildlife communities, role in fur industry, merchantability, economics, etc.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Regarding Issue 1 " Old growth" will be discussed in the DFMP in a section relating to management strategies and the AAC. The details for this have not been fully developed yet.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 23

Issue: **27. Ecologically based administrative units**

1. The administrative units utilized in the previous management plan were not ecologically based. Is Canfor proposing to use ecologically based management units in the current AAC calculations?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be addressed in the DFMP in terms of landscape management units. Canfor has, with the assistance of the Forest Ecosystem Management Task Force, Forest Management Advisory Committee and Alberta Environmental Protection, agreed to utilize published reports to delineate the FMA into logical ecologically based units. Canfor refers to these delineations as landscape management units (LMU's). Fourteen LMUs have been identified within Canfor's FMA. Each LMU has a recurring pattern of landform, slope and vegetation that will be evaluated for various resource uses. (Ref: Terms of Reference – appendix 3)

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 18

Issue: **28. Fire History**

1. Fire history within the FMA should pertain to natural regions and not be applied, as it is currently, on a FMA wide approach. The Committee recommends that the fire return interval for each LMU should be determined and understood, however, some research and documentation is required to fill in current data gaps.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Regarding **Issue 1:** Canfor agrees with the Committee that research and documentation is required to fill the data gaps for fire return intervals for the FMA. Currently we have some information, but it may not be enough. We will be exploring the idea of calculating fire return intervals based upon LMU's, however, this may not be completed until after the submission of the DFMP.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 26

Issue: **29.** MAI (mean annual increment)

1. Using an average mean annual increment (MAI) for the FMA is not as accurate as using a MAI determined for each land management unit (LMU). Will Canfor be using MAI based on LMUs?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Regarding **Issue 1**: Canfor is currently reviewing the available data to determine if MAI will be used in the AAC calculation on an LMU basis. If our evaluation determines that this is feasible, it will be applied and discussed within the DFMP in the section discussing the overall AAC strategy.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 50

Issue: **30.** Effects of Ecosystem management on operations.

1. Ecosystem management will involve changes in cutting regimes.
2. In changing to a different regime we need to assess why we are changing and what the tradeoffs are.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1: We recognize changes will occur and will not know the details until after we evaluate the management alternatives generated from the AAC calculation runs. The results of these runs will help select our management and operational strategies.

Issue 2 will be discussed in the DFMP in a section on Adaptive Management. Canfor will be implementing ecologically based management using adaptive management. Adaptive management is a loop process where management strategies are stated, forecasted, monitored, evaluated and revised, as necessary.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 25

Issue: **31.** Area DFMP covers

1. What area(s) does the DFMP cover? Is the Annual Allowable cut calculated from any areas outside your FMA?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Regarding **Issue 1**: The DFMP will primarily contain information regarding Canfor's FMA, however, there will be reference to lands located outside the FMA when Canfor's overall timber supply is discussed. A map illustrating the location and geographic extent of the FMA will be included in the plan. It should be noted that the AAC is calculated only for lands within Canfor's FMA.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 15

Issue: 32. AAC – calculation of.

1. The public requires information on how the AAC is calculated (i.e., volume versus area) and who conducts the calculations.
2. How can the public be sure that the calculated AAC is an accurate figure?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Regarding **Issue 1:** Canfor will describe the entire process for calculation of the AAC within the DFMP. The Committee's questions, as stated above, will be answered. A technical AAC report will also be included in the DFMP. This report, produced by Simons Reid Collins, is intended for government reviewers.

Regarding **Issue 2:** Canfor is very confident that the AAC is correct. Professionals using the most current data available calculate the AAC. In preparation for the DFMP, Canfor has spent \$2 million to reclassify the forest cover within the FMA to Alberta Vegetation Inventory (AVI) standards. An additional \$1 Million was expended on collection of field data. The DFMP is developed in accordance with government legislation and the LFS must approve all management plans prior to their implementation.
Ref: May 29/98 pg. 43

Issue: 33. AAC – provisions for oil/gas activity

1. There is a need to understand how the AAC is determined. Do AAC calculations make provisions for seismic lines, well sites and roads and, if so, how are these deletions adjusted after the DFMP is approved?
2. Low impact seismic line cutting should be used to minimize environmental impact.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be addressed in the DFMP in the section where the AAC is discussed. Seismic lines form a percentage deduction to the AAC in the plan. Well sites and roads are withdrawn as each activity occurs. During our re-inventory, all existing wellsites & roads were taken into account in the calculation of our new net landbase on which our AAC will be calculated on.

Regarding **Issue 2:** The LFS administers seismic lines and promotes the use of existing lines and low impact seismic line cutting. Seismic lines are not an activity conducted by Canfor. However, the issue may be addressed as a component of the management objective/communication plan identified previously.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 9

Issue: 34. AAC – effect of ecosystem management

1. What if Ecosystem management alters the AAC significantly?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

ISSUE 1: The assumptions around ecosystem management and the effect on our AAC will be discussed in the DFMP. Various alternate runs [of the AAC] will be made and compared to a base run to demonstrate the effects that each alternative has on the AAC. These will be discussed at the Task Force level. Some of these runs will be brought to the committee for discussion. We will have to consider the impact on jobs and keeping the operation viable. There needs to be a balance between the AAC, ecosystem management and the economies of operating a business.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 44

Issue: 35. Understorey protection

1. Protection of understories is an important factor in providing trees for the future. Are understories protected during harvest?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be discussed in the DFMP in terms of how understories are protected by both coniferous and deciduous operators. Canfor makes every effort to protect healthy, vigorous spruce understories. Deciduous operators, such as Tolko Forest Industries Ltd., also protect coniferous understorey during their harvesting operations.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 24

Issue: 36. Role of Understories in AAC

1. What role does coniferous understories play in calculation of the AAC?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be discussed in the DFMP in terms of the role of coniferous understories in the calculation of the AAC. Coniferous understories are very important to the AAC. They represent the future forests (growing stock) and contribute a significant volume of timber to our AAC.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 46

Issue: 37. Deciduous AAC calculation

1. In the last plan, a deciduous AAC was not calculated. Now that deciduous timber is allocated to other companies, will a deciduous AAC be calculated for this plan?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Regarding **Issue 1**: Under the Forest Management Agreement with the provincial government, Canfor has the right to manage FMA lands for coniferous timber production. Canfor's DFMP will incorporate the needs of other users as much as possible. We are in the process of calculating a coniferous and deciduous AAC for the FMA. The DFMP will contain a section describing the deciduous AAC calculation.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 48

Issue: 38. Impact of deciduous harvest to Canfor

1. What impact does deciduous harvest have on forest management within the FMA?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Regarding **Issue 1**: The impacts of deciduous harvest will be discussed within the DFMP in terms of the effects they have on operational and strategic planning within the FMA. On an operational level, Canfor integrates planning with deciduous operators to coordinate roads and harvest activities to minimize environmental impact and to protect coniferous understories. From a strategic planning perspective, Canfor must incorporate the needs of deciduous operators for a long-term deciduous timber supply from the same landbase (our FMA) while maintaining an economical supply of coniferous timber for our mill. The effect of maintaining a deciduous AAC on the coniferous AAC will not be know until we perform the AAC Runs.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 47

39. Deciduous utilization off of Private Land

Issue:

1. Why can't farmers sell all of their aspen to Tolko when they are clearing their land

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will not be discussed in the DFMP text. This issue will be included in the appendix as an issue brought up by the committee, however, committee must realize that this issue is strictly related to Tolko. Tolko has contracts to honor and must keep a balance between private, incidental and salvage wood that is utilized in their mill. Some of the concerns with private wood are distance from the mill and top size. This issue is worked on daily and will be addressed with the government as to the amount of private wood Tolko can buy. Also timing of the availability of the private wood is an issue because sometimes farmers give no advance warning of volume available.

Ref: Feb 17/99 meeting minutes

Issue:

40. PSPs

1. What are permanent sample plots (PSP) and where are they located within the FMA?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Regarding **Issue 1**: A discussion of PSPs will be discussed in the DFMP within the section relating to calculation of the AAC. A full description of their role will be provided. Canfor has established 835 plots throughout the FMA. Most of the plots are used to provide growth and yield information for the AAC. Thirty plots are used to monitor special programs like weeding, thinning, fertilization trials, controlled burns and herbicide treatments.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 45

Issue:

41. GIS

1. What is a geographic information system (GIS) and how is it used by Canfor?
2. What information does Canfor currently maintain on the system and what are your future plans with respect to GIS?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Regarding **Issue 1**: A complete discussion of GIS will be included in the DFMP. The GIS system is a computer software program that allows us to digitally look at our forest. We analyze different aspects of forest management through the use of storing certain data attributes in databases that can be linked directly to the forest cover type shown on the computer screen. The role of the GIS in AAC calculations, forest management and forestry operations will be provided in the DFMP. It is being used quite extensively.

Regarding **Issue 2**: A discussion of the current information contained on Canfor's system, and our plans for compiling and incorporation of information in the future, will be discussed in the DFMP.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 53

Issue: 42. Currency of map data

1. How current are Canfor's maps and how often are they updated?
2. There is a need to demonstrate the changes in activity levels that occur within the FMA over time.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be addressed in the DFMP within the section where GIS map update procedures are discussed. We recently completed a comprehensive inventory of our FMA over a 5-year period using the most up to date inventory criteria (AVI standards)

Regarding **Issue 2**: Canfor recognizes that the Committee desires a method to compare levels of activity within the FMA. A satellite map provides a "snap-shot" of the FMA activities that have occurred up to the time of the photography (current one is 1993). Canfor is considering obtaining an updated image in 1999. When this is done, the two images will be brought to a meeting for a comparison. For our operational planning, we use current larger scale aerial photos to view the current activities on the land and plan our harvesting activities.

In the DFMP we will be able to demonstrate, using the AAC analysis, changes that occur overtime such as ageclass distribution. (Ref: Pilot study in the Terms of Reference). After the DFMP submission, a monitoring program will be put into place along with a stewardship report to compare DFMP strategies to operations. (Comparison of activity using data as opposed to photos).

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 16

Issue: 43. 2 pass vs. 3 pass

1. The terms "2 pass system " and "3 pass system" need to be defined. What are the advantages and disadvantages of each system? Will Canfor utilize these strategies in some areas?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Regarding **Issue 1**: A discussion of the overall harvesting strategy will be contained within the DFMP. A 2 pass system involves alternate clear cutting in blocks or patches, normally in two passes, where the second cut is approximately equal to the first in area, volume, operability and quality. Approximately 50% of the current merchantable volume covering approximately 50% of the current merchantable area may be harvested in the first cut, with the balance harvested in the second cut. A three pass system is similar, however, the timber is harvested in three passes of approximately equal area, volume, operability and quality (a 33% split is used) with 20 years between passes.

There are advantages and disadvantages to each. A 2-pass system requires less roading and results in less fragmentation. A three-pass system leaves more wood behind initially (66% as opposed to 50%) and can result in older age classes. However, a 3-pass system will reduce your AAC and increase access into the area (with the increased roading that is required). No decision has been made yet as to whether or not we will be utilizing a 3-pass system in any given areas.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 51

Issue: 44. 15/11 utilization standard

1. What is a 15/11 utilization standard and does Canfor adhere to the standard?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be contained in the DFMP as a discussion of utilization and merchantability standards. Currently, a **merchantable coniferous** stand is having 50 m³ or more net volume/hectare of merchantable trees that meets rotation age. A merchantable coniferous tree is having a minimum 15cm (6 inches) stump diameter measured 0.3 meters from ground and having a minimum 3.66-meter usable length to an 11-cm (4 inches) top diameter.

In our new DFMP, this definition may be changing due to the management of mix-wood.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 49

Issue: 45. Low volume stands

1. Does Canfor intend to develop chipping technology in order to harvest pulpwood i.e., black spruce (muskegs), low-volume pine stands? Committee does not want to see low volume productivity stands (poor site indices) chipped in order to increase Canfor's wood supply (AAC).

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be discussed within the DFMP in terms of an overall strategy regarding productive stands that are selected to contribute to the overall AAC. Currently, the low volume black spruce stands are not part of our AAC and therefore not considered in our operational planning. Stands that contain less than the 50 m³ or more net volume/hectare of merchantable trees that meets rotation age are also not part of the current AAC.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 36

Issue: 46. Utilization of wood chips

1. Are all the wood chips produced at Canfor's mill fully utilized?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be discussed within the DFMP in terms of products manufactured by Canfor and the markets for them. It is to Canfor's benefit to ensure all chippable wood is utilized. Canfor sells chips to Weyerhaeuser Canada Ltd., Grande Prairie Operations and Alberta Newsprint Company Ltd.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 42

Issue: 47. Utilization of wood by-products

1. What does Canfor do regarding utilization of wood by-products? What are Canfor's plans to increase utilization of mill by-products?
2. There is a general increased awareness around recycling. The committee would like more detailed information about what (qualitative and quantitative) Canfor recycles in both the mill and woodlands

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be discussed in generalities within the DFMP in the section regarding "mill facilities". Canfor continually looks for new markets to utilize wood by-products. The Company currently sells shavings to farmers and donates firewood to minor hockey and to our campsites that we operate within the FMA. We have also recently reopened the Fingerjoint plant to utilize trim ends. Canfor is participating in a *Mill By-Product Study* to research ways to utilize by-products as agricultural soil amendments.

Issue 2 will be handled by having a complete quantitative list available for the public meetings in the fall of 1998. This will not be included in the DFMP.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 37

Issue:**48. Value added products**

1. The production of value-added products should benefit the region, and not be sent somewhere else for production.
2. Local people need to benefit from our forests.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 is primarily a market driven issue. Grande Prairie currently produces finger jointed lumber which is a value-added product. In addition, Canfor has formed alliances and partnerships with companies which produce various other value-added products. These companies rely on Canfor's product for their mills and they have the expertise, so we prefer that these companies produce the various value-added products that they do.

Issue 2 relates to issue 1 but also incorporates concerns around local employment and benefits to the local communities. These issues are addressed elsewhere in this issues list.

Ref: Feb 17/99 meeting

minutes

Issue:**49. Canfor's incinerator**

1. The public is concerned with Canfor's incinerator. What can Canfor do to minimize or eliminate the amount of waste incinerated?
2. What measures does Canfor take to ensure the incinerator meets air quality standards?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Regarding **Issue 1**: In our opinion, the use of the incinerator is not a direct forest management issue. It is currently the only viable option available to Canfor for disposal of unused by-products. Canfor is continually looking for ways to find a viable method to replace the incinerator:

- trucking of hog fuel to other facilities was evaluated but proved to be very expensive,
- A co-generation plant is currently being investigated (via a feasibility study) with the City, County, Ainsworth and Weyerhaeuser as potential partners.
- it was determined that facilities that could use our by-products are too distant for economical transport and
- the medium density fiber plant planned for Prince George, B.C. is on hold.

Since the incinerator is the best option available, our strategy is to reduce the amount incinerated by minimizing the amount of wood by-products produced (i.e., use as much of each log as possible – utilizing trim ends in our Fingerjoint plant and selling chips to pulp mills). We are also participating in a mill by-product study being conducted by Fairview College. The project is researching the use of by-products as agricultural soil amendments. Canfor is also working with the Alberta Forest Products Association to find opportunities to reduce waste.

Issue 2: Air quality is very important to Canfor. Canfor's incinerator exceeds all the regulated standards for air quality. Environment Canada monitors the fly ash and Canfor's incinerator is in compliance with all established limits. Canfor has installed a PM10 System Monitor to measure particulate matter within Grande Prairie City limits. The data is submitted to Environment Canada.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 39/40

Issue:

50. Jobs

1. Jobs are an important public concern. What are Canfor's employment statistics and what percent of Aboriginal people are employed by Canfor directly?
2. What does Canfor do to encourage Aboriginal employment?
3. How many people does Canfor employ per m³ of AAC? The Committee would like to see more value-added enterprises to increase the number of jobs per m³.
4. What is Canfor's economic contribution to local communities and contractors.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be discussed in the DFMP in terms of Canfor's direct and indirect employment statistics. Canfor currently directly employs 191 people, with an additional 300 employed by our contractors. Canfor does not track employment by race and cannot address the Committee's inquiry regarding the percentage of aboriginal employment. We can, however, state that Canfor employs aboriginal people in our mill and within our contractor's workforce.

Regarding **Issue 2**: Canfor has established a relationship with the Sturgeon Lake Band where they are hired on in the summer to conduct vegetation management activities and at the same time are our stand-by fire crew in partnership with the LFS. This will be discussed in the DFMP under the reforestation and/or forest protection section.

Regarding **Issue 3**: To respond to the Committee's inquiry regarding the number of people employed by Canfor per m³ of AAC, Canfor directly employs 3 people per 10,000 m³ and 7 people per 10,000 m³ when all direct employees and contractor employees are combined. Direct employment numbers are 190 direct employees and 490 including contractors. The DFMP will reflect both numbers. The committee has asked that the jobs per m³ number be compared with that from other industrialized countries. We will look into this and get back to the committee. The issue around value added will be deferred until year-end when Canfor has completed its repositioning exercise to determine what businesses we will be in.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 54

Issue 4 will be discussed in the DFMP in the Resource Management - Philosophies, Values, Goals, Indicators and Objectives Section. Canfor strives to hire local contractors and suppliers if they – offer competitive skills, have the proper equipment, deliver goods and services at a competitive price and provide overall service. It is Canfor's overall strategy to form long-term partnerships with suppliers and contractors to better serve the needs of both parties. Canfor's accounting ledger does not currently distinguish between local and non-local contractors, however, we are developing the systems to track that number. **[SFMP 5b 1.1 (goal)]**

Ref: Oct 25, 2000 minutes page 3

Issue: **51. Wood product benefits to community & youth**

1. The Committee feels the youth of the community should receive some benefits when public resources are used locally by companies. Can Canfor work with regional high schools to provide opportunities for youth to work with wood products?
2. Canfor's public relations efforts do not adequately portray the extent that Canfor contributes to the community

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will not be included in the DFMP, however, Canfor is willing to work with community members to assist regional high schools to obtain local wood products. Canfor would like to see proposals from schools who would require the lumber.

Other ways in which Canfor supports the youth in this community are through the Grande Prairie Regional College. We support the college office administration work experience program by sponsoring a student each year to work in our office to obtain the required 40 hours of work experience. We are also large supporters of the forestry program and hire summer students from there as well as support their work experience component during the school session. The students from the college come from the entire region, not just the City of Grande Prairie.

Issue 2 is not a forest management issue and will not be addressed in the DFMP. Canfor supports a wide range of community based activities with cash contributions, services in-kind and direct participation (i.e. Trade shows, Canada Day parade, etc.). We advise the public about our efforts through newspaper advertisements and company newsletters, etc. In 1997 & early 1998, we focused our advertising efforts to capture our community involvement activities. We will continue this practice and trust that this meets the committees concerns. Recognition also comes in the form of "thank-yous" from the groups and organizations that we support through our donations (i.e. Canfor logo on T-shirts, Canfor banner on display at events, and media acknowledgements).
Ref: May 29/98 pg. 55/37

Issue: **52. Informing public of our operational plans**

1. There is a need to inform the public not only of Canfor's long-term plans but also provide a link to the operational plans. What does the company do in that regard?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Regarding **Issue 1**: Since 1996, Canfor has made each AOP (annual operating plan) available at the Grande Prairie Public Library. Starting in 1998, other libraries such as Spirit River, DeBolt and Valleyview will also receive copies. In addition, we hold annual Forestry open houses where we invite the public to view our operational plans and share their thoughts on how we are managing the forest. This is done in late March, or early April of each year prior to submitting our AOP to the government in May. This allows us time to incorporate any comments into our plans that the public may have.
Ref: May 29/98 pg. 52

Issue: **53. Forestry Principles Document**

1. In the forestry principles document, local communities and municipalities need to be recognized as well as First Nations
2. Under First Nations, cultural benefits need to be added (as per email from Doug Madill)

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 – This concern has been incorporated into the 4TH Draft (close to the final version).
Issue 2 – After a review with the public group, this suggestion was added into the document.
Ref: Feb 17/99 meeting minutes

Issue:

54. Documentation of questions raised at meetings

1. The Canfor Public Advisory Committee requests that Canfor document questions raised at public meetings.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Regarding **Issue 1**: A hired facilitator is used to ensure that all questions and issues raised are documented and dealt with. Comprehensive minutes for every FMAC meeting are prepared by a hired notekeeper and reviewed by members at the following meeting. In order to effectively document the committees concerns and thoughts, an issue list format was designed with committee input. The issue list provides a long-term record of this committee's work. The list is continually reviewed by members to ensure accuracy of content.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 30

Issue:

55. Forestry terminology

1. The field of forestry has terminology and definitions that, in many cases, are not understood by the public. The Committee recommends that the use of acronyms and abbreviations be minimized and their meanings clarified to improve readability.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Regarding **Issue 1**: The DFMP will be written in terms for the general public to understand. The use of acronyms and abbreviations will be limited and when used, their meanings will be clarified. The report for the AAC calculation is designed to be reviewed by LFS personnel and by necessity will contain technical terminology and information. At the back of this document is a brief glossary of terms used.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 29

Issue:**56. FRIP**

1. What is the FRIP program and how does it work?
2. What projects has Canfor undertaken with FRIP funding?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be discussed in the DFMP in general terms and will provide information to assist the public understand FRIP (Forest Resource Improvement program). It should be noted that the Forest Resource Improvement Association of Alberta (FRIAA) is now **administrating** the FRIP program. FRIAA is an association incorporated under the Societies Act (Alberta). All Alberta timber disposition holders are eligible for membership and, upon payment of dues to the Association, they have voting rights. A Board of Directors governs the activities of the Association. The society is an independent body that evaluates each project based on a set list of criteria. Although the government is not a part of this body, projects will get referred to them when warranted.

Issue 2 will be included in the DFMP. A discussion of the projects Canfor has undertaken with FRIP funds will be provided. By way of summary, Canfor remitted \$5,375,915 to the FRIP program since 1995. To date (May 98) we has received \$2,880,217 from the FRIP program as follows:

PROJECT	<u>AMOUNT (\$)</u>
Fisheries Phase I	\$45,000
Fisheries Phase II	\$54,907
Fisheries Phase III	\$48,581
Stand Tending Phase I	\$1,015,291
Stand Tending Phase II	\$338,940
Stand Tending Phase III	\$549,870
Stand Tending Phase IV	\$494,545
Soil Compaction Phase I	\$22,500
Soil Compaction Phase II	\$15,000
Soil Compaction Phase III	\$7,500
Growth & Yield Phase I (HinesCreek)	\$8,388
Dual Path Mounding Phase II	\$90,010
Dual Path Mounding Phase III	\$89,670
Regenerated Yield Standards Initiative (RYSI) (G.P.)	\$17,325
Forest Inventory - AVI (Hines Creek)	\$24,579
Swan Lake Aeration	\$29,459
Hydrography, DEM & Watershed Data Sets	\$23,153
Air Photo Indexing	<u>\$5,500</u>
	\$2,880,217

Canfor has plans for eight additional projects. They are currently being prepared as FRIP proposals for submission to FRIAA. Details will be available in the DFMP.

Ref: May 29/98 pg. 56/57

Issue:**57 Top Piles**

1. The committee is concerned with industries policy to burn waste (top piles). Would Canfor consider alternative disposal methods (i.e. composting) or leaving some piles for habitat for smaller animals?

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be discussed in Company's Forest Protection Plan, which will be referenced in the DFMP. Currently, the Company burns all top piles to reduce potential fire hazard, as directed by Alberta Environment. To change this policy would require co-operative discussions between the Company and Alberta Environment. At this point in time, the liability associated with not burning these piles is too high for the Company to assume.

Ref: Oct 25/00 minutes

Issue**58 Post Fire pioneer plant species**

1. The committee is concerned that after a fire, the pioneer plant species that would normally colonize the site may not be on site after harvesting.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1: Although the Committee's concern will not be directly addressed in the DFMP, Canfor is a partner in a research project titled, "Understory Vascular Plant Regeneration with Reference to Site Conditions following Disturbance" (authored by Treena Fenniak and supervised by Dr. S.E. Macdonald). This project is part of the EMEND (Ecosystem Management Emulating Natural Disturbance) series of research projects being conducted in the Hines Creek area. This project will clarify the relationships between post disturbance site conditions (successional communities) that occur immediately following both harvesting and fire.

Ref: March 25/00 minutes pg 3

Issue:

59 Run off Effects in Watersheds

1. The committee is concerned that logging is responsible for more frequent and faster runoffs - therefore creating higher peak flows and lower lows. The committee would like to see a change in logging practices to address this concern.
2. The committee is concerned with the effect of herbicides on the moss layer and the subsequent effect on the run-off.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be discussed in the DFMP in the section describing ECA (Equivalent clearcut area). ECA will be used as a surrogate to measure water yield increases. Water yield refers to streamflow quantity and timing. It can be altered by compaction or disturbance of the ground surface (i.e., roads, skid trails), or by vegetation growth or removal. ECA models assume that streamflow maximums will not adversely affect water yield if no more than 20-40% of the vegetative cover is removed in the area above the H60 (elevation above which 60% of the watershed lies). The area above the H60 is considered to be the source area for major snow melts and peak flows. Each watershed will be monitored, as harvested areas are planned, to ensure there is less than 40% ECA. Currently, the ground rules allow up to 50% removal of vegetative cover in a given watershed area. Canfor has committed to change this practice and has established the objective to not exceed the 40% removal of vegetation above the H60 in defined watersheds. **[SFMP 3c 2.1a.1]**

Ref: CSA matrix minutes March 04, 2000 page 9

Issue 2 – The committee was provided an opportunity to attend a Herbicide Information Session held in Valleyview on Nov 22, 2000 to obtain answers from a panel of experts regarding their herbicide concerns. This issue, therefore, will not be discussed in the DFMP.

Ref: Oct 25, 2000 minutes page 3

Issue:

60. Scarification

1. The committee is concerned with the impacts of Scarification on soil erosion
2. The committee is concerned with the impacts of Ripper Scarification on animal movement.

Incorporation of Issue/Information into DFMP:

Issue 1 will be discussed in the DFMP in the section on Environmental Protection. In addition, Canfor's Environmental Management System (EMS) has identified soil erosion as a significant aspect and during field visits, we monitor scarification activities to ensure that soil erosion is not occurring.

Ref: CSA matrix minutes March 4,2000 page 5

Issue 2- Scarification techniques (in broad terms) will be discussed in the DFMP. Canfor has decreased the amount of ripper scarification done over the past 5 years. Most sites are now left for raw planting as opposed to ripper scarification, however, if the site has too much competition, then some type of scarification is required and if these sites are too wet for summer access, the ripper plow is our only option at this time. Canfor's use of the Ripper plow for scarification has decreased from about 1800 ha (out of our 3000 ha) scarification program in 1995, to about 223 hectares in 1999.

Ref: Oct 25, 2000 minutes page 3