



**Sustainable Resource  
Development  
Alberta Community  
Development**

**Preliminary Stakeholder Input  
VALUES IDENTIFICATION**

**June 27—  
July 15, 2005**

**R11 Forest  
Management Plan**

# Table of Contents

1.0	Background Introduction .....	1
1.1	Process Overview .....	2
1.2	Stage 1: Stakeholder Identification.....	3
1.3	Stage 2: Process Scope and Guideline Development.....	3
1.4	Stage 3: Preliminary Stakeholder Input (Values Identification).....	4
1.5	Stage 4: Charrette Orientation Session.....	5
1.6	Stage 5: Charrette Planning Event.....	5
1.7	Stage 6: Evaluation .....	6
1.8	Stage 7: Plan Approval.....	6
2.0	Preliminary Stakeholder Input Summary .....	6
2.1	Meeting Participants .....	7
2.2	Meeting Schedule .....	9
2.3	Meeting Agenda.....	9
3.0	Stakeholder Input .....	10
3.1	Adjacent Land Managers .....	10
3.2	Commercial (Accommodations/Helicopter Operators).....	12
3.3	Commercial (Trappers/Recreation Industrial) .....	13
3.4	Environmental/Cultural .....	15
3.5	Fish and Wildlife Associations .....	18
3.6	Municipal and Provincial Governments.....	21
3.7	Recreational Users .....	22
4.0	Stakeholder Core Values Identification .....	23
4.1	Core Value Summary .....	23
4.2	Core Value Clustering Exercise Results .....	24
4.2.1	Core Value: Access .....	24
4.2.2	Core Value: Air Shed Quality .....	24
4.2.3	Core Value: Community Integrity .....	24
4.2.4	Core Value: Domestic Grazing .....	25
4.2.5	Core Value: Ecosystem Integrity .....	25
4.2.5.1	Sub Value: Natural Disturbance Emulation.....	25
4.2.5.2	Sub Value: Holistic Picture.....	25
4.2.6	Core Value: Existing Obligations .....	26
4.2.7	Core Value: Fish.....	26
4.2.8	Core Value: Forest Health .....	27
4.2.9	Core Value: Information and Education.....	27
4.2.10	Core Value: Infrastructure .....	27
4.2.11	Core Value: Multi-Agency Cooperation.....	28
4.2.12	Core Value: Public Safety .....	28
4.2.13	Core Value: Recreational Opportunities.....	28
4.2.14	Core Value: Science Based Decision Making.....	29
4.2.15	Core Value: Social Values .....	29
4.2.15.1	Sub Value: Inherent Value .....	29

4.2.15.2 Sub Value: Economic Value .....	29
4.2.15.3 Sub Value: Aesthetics .....	29
4.2.15.4 Sub Value: Cultural Value .....	29
4.2.16 Core Value: Watershed Integrity.....	30
4.2.17 Core Value: Wildfire Threat.....	31
4.2.18 Core Value: Wildlife.....	31
4.3 Additional Input.....	32
5.0 Next Steps.....	32
6.0 Appendix.....	33

## 1.0 Background Introduction

Wildfire has been suppressed over the past several decades to protect life, property, and other values derived from Alberta's forests. The resultant increased fuel load has caused concern at both a landscape level, and in the Wildland/Urban Interface. Wildland/Urban Interfaces are areas where industrial or agricultural installations, recreational developments, or homes are located within flammable natural vegetation. Ongoing fire suppression has resulted in increasing interface hazards and has impacted natural forest processes.

Alberta Sustainable Resource Development (SRD) has identified the development of a Forest Management Plan within the R11 Forest Management Unit as an urgent priority in order to address the high/extreme fire hazard within this area.

Recognizing the Partners in Protection/FireSmart initiative, developed by an Alberta-based coalition of professionals representing national, provincial, and municipal associations and government departments responsible for emergency services, land-use planning, and forest and resource research and management, SRD decided to develop a Forest Management Plan based largely on stakeholder input and provincial planning guidelines. It was determined that meaningful upfront public involvement was essential to the overall creation of the Plan.

In addition to minimizing the high risk of unplanned, uncontrolled wildland fires, there is also a high risk of pine beetles migrating to and infesting Alberta forested lands. The impact of a pine beetle infestation would further compound the fire hazard.

Rocky Mountain House SRD staff formed a planning team consisting of individuals representing various government departments and agencies to lead in and manage the development of a Forest Management Plan. Team members include:

### Project Leaders:

- Kevin Gagne, Senior Forester, Sustainable Resource Development
- Daniel Lux, Forest Health Officer, Sustainable Resource Development

### Team Members:

- Anne Murphy, GIS Technician, Sustainable Resource Development
- Jim Allen, Wildlife Biologist, Sustainable Resource Development
- Gary Mandrusiak, Fire Prevention Officer, Sustainable Resource Development
- Myles Jensen, District Team Leader, Community Development
- Yvette Choma, Administrative Support, Sustainable Resource Development
- Rita Stagman, Administrative Support, Sustainable Resource Development
- Stephen Wills, Forest Planner, Sustainable Resource Development

- Robert Anderson, Habitat Coordinator, Alberta Conservation Association
- Ksenija Vujnovic, Heritage Protection Specialist, Community Development

In order to gather useful, timely and cost effective stakeholder and public input, the planning team researched various multi-stakeholder processes. After careful consideration and communication with major stakeholders in the area, the planning team proposed that a Charrette input gathering process would be appropriate. A public Charrette is an effective method of obtaining multi-stakeholder input on planning initiatives. It is a collaborative process that harnesses the talents and energies of parties representing various disciplines and stakeholder groups to create and support a feasible plan. The public design Charrette has emerged as an alternative to the “design and present” convention often followed by those leading stakeholder processes. The “design and present” approach fosters a reactive stakeholder process, whereas a Charrette process engages stakeholders in the initial development of a plan.

The Charrette is an intensive workshop held over 2 to 3 consecutive days, providing the opportunity for participants to focus and build the momentum required to complete the process. Charrette participants work collaboratively to set objectives, indicators and targets for the various values identified as important by the stakeholders and the planning team. Participants will also be given an opportunity to apply these objectives to the R11 Forest Management Unit by participating in an initial spatial planning exercise. This will further develop their understanding of the complexity involved in creating the R11 Forest Management Plan. It will also provide for an opportunity for the participants to make recommendations on priority areas. This information will be used by land managers to further develop the overall Forest Management Plan and subsequent specific operational plans.

The Charrette process is a highly successful approach traditionally used by urban planners and more recently the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) for landscape planning. For more information, visit the National Charrette Institute website at <http://www.Charretteinstitute.org/>.

In addition to the Charrette event, preliminary meetings and ongoing opportunities for stakeholder input and feedback are included in the process.

## 1.1 Process Overview

In order to facilitate the creation of the R11 Forest Management Plan, the planning team developed a process consisting of the following stages:

- Stage 1: Stakeholder Identification
- Stage 2: Process Scope and Guideline Development
- Stage 3: Preliminary Stakeholder Input (Values Identification)
- Stage 4: Charrette Orientation Session
- Stage 5: Charrette Planning Event

- Stage 6: Evaluation
- Stage 7: Plan Approval

## 1.2 Stage 1: Stakeholder Identification

The intent of the process is to identify and involve key stakeholders who could be impacted by a landscape plan in the R11 planning unit. In May, 2005, a list of stakeholder groups identified as having an interest in the R11 Forest Management Unit was created. Stakeholders include the general public, environmental and other non-government organizations (NGO's) and businesses in and around the R11 landbase. The planning team determined that a number of meetings would be held with groups sharing similar interests and values. As such, groups were organized into the following clusters:

- Adjacent Land Managers
- Commercial (Accommodations/Helicopter Operators)
- Commercial (Trappers/Recreation Industrial)
- Environmental/Cultural
- Fish and Wildlife Associations
- Municipal and Provincial Governments
- Recreation

Invitation letters were sent to the various stakeholder groups explaining the process, detailing their opportunities for participation, along with a map of the R11 Forest Management Unit. (See Appendix I.)

## 1.3 Stage 2: Process Scope and Guideline Development

To set the stage for the process, the planning team established the minimal guidelines required from a government perspective. These guidelines will be used to guide the efforts of the participants in the process, as well as land managers when developing the Forest Management Plan.

The planning team reviewed the fire hazard ratings in the R11 Forest Management Unit and determined that the high/extreme hazard must be reduced by 5%. In addition, the planning team reviewed existing legislation and policies pertaining to the area along with FireSmart and provincial landscape planning guidelines.

The planning team determined that the following minimal guidelines must be adhered to by those participating in the development of the Plan. The Plan must:

- Adhere to existing Integrated Resource Plans (IRPs), legislation, and any existing landscape plans for the area (e.g. existing prescribed burn plans,

existing FireSmart initiatives, wilderness area plans, Bighorn Access Management Plan, and FLUZ).

- Reduce the number of high/extreme fire risk stands by 5%
- Reduce the threat of wildfires escaping to surrounding forests outside of the R11 area, the communities of Nordegg and the Bighorn Reserve, along with resorts, campgrounds, and lodges within the area

The planning team has also determined that there is a need to provide stakeholder participants with the necessary data required to effectively set objectives, indicators and targets. Therefore, existing government data will be made available to support the process. In addition, the planning team will ensure experts are available to provide information during the Charrette planning event.

It was also determined that an effective Charrette event should include no more than 15 participants. Individuals interested in participating in the process will be encouraged to submit their names indicating their interest in representing the perspectives common to their stakeholder group, along with the perspectives of other groups with similar interests and values, as identified in the Stage 3 meetings. Participants must accept and agree to adhere to the minimal guidelines set by the planning team. Stakeholders not participating in the Charrette event will be encouraged to provide input throughout the process. Progress reports will be provided.

#### 1.4 Stage 3: Preliminary Stakeholder Input (Values Identification)

With the assistance of a facilitation team, a series of meetings were scheduled to provide an opportunity for stakeholders to:

- Learn about the R11 Forest Management Planning Process
- Provide input and ask questions from their stakeholder group's perspective

Separate meetings were conducted with each group to identify the important factors that should be considered when planning and implementing the R11 Forest Management Plan from their group's perspective. It was also an opportunity to ask the groups how they would ideally envision the R11 area 20 years in the future.

The intention of these preliminary meetings was to give stakeholders an opportunity to identify the values that need to be recognized and addressed when designing the R11 Forest Management Plan. It was also an opportunity for stakeholder groups with similar interests to discuss commonalities and to ask questions. This information will be used by the planning team to prepare an information package for those participating in the Charrette process. A summary

of the information collected during this Stage of the process forms the bulk of this report.

Those attending these meetings were invited to submit their name to the planning team by July 18, 2005, indicating their interest in participating in the Charrette event.

#### 1.5 Stage 4: Charrette Orientation Session

In order to further set Charrette participants up for success, an orientation meeting will be scheduled to review the Charrette process, expectations and guidelines, and overall deliverables. Data packages will be distributed and reviewed with the participants.

#### 1.6 Stage 5: Charrette Planning Event

The Charrette event will be held September 13-15 at the Goldeye Center near Nordegg, Alberta. One member of the planning team will participate along with those selected to represent the various stakeholder values and interests identified in Stage 3 of the process. The participating member of the planning team will be an active participant representing the planning team's and government's interest. A facilitation team will be responsible for managing the Charrette process.

Participants will collaboratively set objectives, indicators and targets for the values compiled in Stage 3 (VOITs) and any additional values brought forward by the planning team's representative. Members of the planning team and additional resource expertise will be available to respond to specific questions, to gather additional information and to help formulate indicators that are in alignment with existing government data.

Once the participants have completed the VOITs exercise, they will identify general areas on the R11 Forest Management Unit map that are rated as high/extreme fire hazard areas that they think will achieve the objectives set and remain within the process guidelines. Those providing expertise to the participants will rely on their knowledge and give an early indication whether the key objectives can be met and what method of treatment (e.g. prescribed burns, harvesting, etc.) would be most appropriate.

Upon the completion of the Charrette event, it is expected that the values of the stakeholders and the planning team will be satisfied. In addition, it is anticipated that a map identifying general areas meeting the key objectives and recommendations or priority management areas will also be completed. The work completed during the Charrette will be viewed as a conceptual plan that will be evaluated in Stage 6 of the process.

In the event that the targets set within the conceptual plan are deemed not achievable during the evaluation process, adjustments will be made by the

planning team, however, the areas identified for treatment in the Charrette conceptual plan will not be changed without additional consultation with the Charrette participants.

### 1.7 Stage 6: Evaluation

An evaluation process will be conducted to review and complete the conceptual plan created during the Charrette event. The planning team will review, analyze and complete the VOIT lists, geography, and data inventory to design detailed and specific areas for treatment.

Once the specific areas are outlined, all of the values will be measured using the identified indicators. The planning team will compile a final report and forward the Forest Management Plan to the Charrette participants for review.

In addition, the Plan will be posted on the SRD website and hard copies will be made available to the general public. Stakeholders identified in Stage 1 of the process will also be provided an update. Individuals or groups will have the opportunity to provide written comments to the planning team within a 30 day period. Following the 30 day period, the planning team will forward the final Plan, including the written comments received, to the Department's Executive for final endorsement.

### 1.8 Stage 7: Plan Approval

Departmental Executives will review the Plan and provide comments to the planning team. The planning team will make final revisions and resubmit the Plan. Once accepted by the Executive, the R11 Forest Management Plan will be forwarded to the Director of Forest Management for final approval. It is the goal of the planning team to have the Plan ready for final approval by March 2006.

Once approved, detailed operational plans will be created for each area designated for treatment within the Plan. The Plan will cover a 20 year period. Ongoing opportunities for stakeholder input will be provided throughout the implementation of the Plan.

## 2.0 Preliminary Stakeholder Input Summary

The following pertains specifically to the input gathered during Stage 3 of the process, Preliminary Stakeholder Input (Values Identification). As indicated in Section 1.4, the intent of these meetings was to provide stakeholders with the necessary background information regarding the R11 Forest Management Unit and the R11 Forest Management Planning process. It was also an opportunity for stakeholder groups to bring forward input and to ask questions.

The information included in this summary will be used by the planning team to prepare for the upcoming Charrette event in September. This summary is also intended to provide

each participating stakeholder group with a record of the responses to the two key questions posed by the facilitation team during each session. It is not intended to serve as a transcript or minutes of each meeting.

## 2.1 Meeting Participants

Within each stakeholder cluster, the following groups were invited to attend the meetings: *Note: \* Indicates groups who sent a representative(s) to the meetings*

### Adjacent Land Managers

- Banff and Jasper National Parks \*
- Sundance Forest Industries. Ltd.\*
- Sundre Forest Products
- Weyerhaeuser Co. Ltd.

### Commercial (Accommodations/Helicopter Operators)

- Ahlstrom Air
- Aurum Lodge\*
- Triple R Camping
- Camp Alexo
- Camp n Fun Adventures
- Cheechako Wilderness
- David Thompson Resort
- Goldeye Centre
- Icefield Helicopters
- Nordegg Resort Lodge
- Development in Progress Representative
- Ruff'n Reddy Campground Services\*
- Shunda Creek Hostel\*
- West County RV Rentals

### Commercial (Trappers/Recreation Industrial)

- Alpenglow Adventures
- AltaLink
- Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers
- Centre for Outdoor Education\*
- Dave Jensen

- Fortis Alberta Inc (Land Department)\*
- Frontier Lodge
- Hela Ventures
- Husky Wilderness Adventures
- Klondike & Voyageur Adventures
- Otter Rafting
- Ron Manz
- TransAlta
- Yamnuska

#### Environmental/Cultural

- Alberta Wilderness Association\*
- ALERT\*
- Canadian Parks & Wilderness Society
- Friends of the West Country
- North Saskatchewan Watershed Alliance\*
- O'Chiese First Nations
- Red Deer River Naturalists
- Red Deer River Watershed Alliance\*
- Sierra Club of Canada, Prairie Chapter\*
- Stoney First Nations
- Sunchild First Nations\*

#### Fish and Wildlife Associations

- Alberta Conservation Association\*
- Alberta Fish & Game Association\*
- Alberta Outfitters Association\*
- Alberta Professional Outfitters Society\*
- Alberta Trappers Association\*
- Foundation for North American Wild Sheep\*
- Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation
- Trout Unlimited Canada

#### Municipal and Provincial Governments

- Alberta Environment\*
- Clearwater County\*

#### Recreation

- Alberta Bicycle Association
- Alberta Equestrian Federation\*
- Alberta Off-Highway Vehicle Association\*
- Alberta Snowmobile Association\*
- Alberta Trail Riders Association
- Alberta United Recreation Society
- Central Alberta Light Horse Association
- Friends of the Eastern Slopes\*

## 2.2 Meeting Schedule

The following schedule was followed for conducting the meetings.

- June 27, 2005 (AM) Municipal and Provincial Governments
- June 27, 2005 (PM) Recreational Users
- June 28, 2005 (AM) Commercial (Accommodations/Helicopter)
- June 28, 2005 (PM) Commercial (Trappers/Recreation Industrial)
- June 29, 2005 (AM) Fish and Wildlife Associations
- June 29, 2005 (PM) Environmental/Cultural
- July 05, 2005 (AM) Adjacent Land Managers

## 2.3 Meeting Agenda

A common agenda was followed for each meeting. All sessions, with the exception of one were able to complete the objectives of the agenda within the allotted time. The agenda was as follows:

- Introductions
- Agenda Overview
- Alberta Sustainable Resource Development R11 Forest Management Unit Presentation
- Question and Answer Session
- Stakeholder Input

- Question One: “From your group’s perspective, what are the important factors that should be considered when planning and implementing the R11 Forest Management Plan?”
- Question Two: “Ideally, how would your stakeholder group envision the R11 area in 20 years?”
- R11 Forest Management Planning – Process Steps
- Final Comments
- Meeting Close

Participants who attended the Environmental/Cultural session were encouraged to provide a written response to the planning team regarding Question Two. Please note that Question Two was posed to each group as a meeting closing question. It was intended to set the stage for further planning and to capture any values that may have been overlooked. Feedback provided was generally not recorded under any one specific stakeholder group.

### 3.0 Stakeholder Input

The following is a summary of each stakeholder group’s response to Questions One and Two presented during each session. Participants were asked to focus specifically on their stakeholder group’s perspective when responding. During the sessions there was tremendous agreement in the responses given. In many cases, individual stakeholder groups simply added additional information and agreed with what had been presented by others during their session. This finding further validated the value of clustering similar stakeholder groups to participate together. Overall, session participants responded favourably to being able to focus on their interests in the R11 Forest Management Unit with groups sharing similar values.

#### 3.1 Adjacent Land Managers

Session participants included representation from Parks Canada (Banff and Jasper) and Sundance Forest Industries.

Question One: “From your group’s perspective, what are the important factors that should be considered when planning and implementing the R11 Forest Management Plan?”

Parks Canada:

- Zone 2 management boundaries
- Shared responsibilities
- Joint prescribed burns
- Data sharing
- Wildlife mutual aid

- Wildlife conservation
- Visitor experience
- Protect natural region, e.g. trails
- Strategic framework for grizzly bear management, scientific threshold
- Salvage logging policy (benefit wildlife)
- Adaptive management experiment (monitoring and research, fire regimes/practices – long term range variation)
- Literature regarding summer and winter range - managing human use, e.g. oil and gas, forestry

Sundance Forest Industries:

- Fire hazard
- Pine beetles (timber supply)
- Planning Standards
- Coordination of access (between forestry and oil and gas)

Question Two: “Ideally, how would your stakeholder group envision the R11 area in 20 years?”

Parks Canada:

- Diverse, healthy forest by whatever means
- Healthy wildlife populations living their traditions the trans-boundary way
- Collaborative approach
- Healthy watershed
- Access management, some resolve to manage access and human use in the area
- Adaptive management experiment with an active program to determine if objectives are being achieved
- Public data system, transparency
- Cost effective ways of achieving accountability

Sundance Forest Industries:

- More diverse age class structure to the forest
- Annual performance reporting on objectives, e.g. number of campers, beetle surveys, human fires, etc.

### 3.2 Commercial (Accommodations/Helicopter Operators)

Session participants included representation from Aurum Lodge, Ruff 'n Ready Campgrounds and Shunda Creek Hostel.

Question One: "From your group's perspective, what are the important factors that should be considered when planning and implementing the R11 Forest Management Plan?"

Aurum Lodge:

- Client enjoyment (wilderness) – Bighorn Value
- Commercial site selected on value of the area (preserve unique areas)
- Tourism attraction (industry) – value
- Wilderness appeal
- Visual impact (fire being the preferred option)
- Reduce fire risk (bring back to natural forest)
- Natural environment
- Natural processes
- Watershed (environment)
- Access (no additional permanent access)
- Minimal changes (natural area versus landscape changes)
- Wildlife habitat
- Need to address infestations (e.g. beetles and mistletoe)

Ruff 'n Ready Campgrounds:

- Agreed with the other groups perspective
- Thompson Creek (old growth – thick stand) – thinning suggested

Shunda Creek Hostel:

- Visual impact - client impact (impression)
- Client use
- Financial impact
- Knowledge/education (e.g. logging, fire, etc.)
- Communication - informative
- Accepted Risk Management (wildfire, insurance) – in relation to strategic areas managed infrastructure not to be the driving force

- Visual impact of prescribed burns is often seen negatively by the public – looks like logging/clear cutting
- Generally people more receptive to burning versus logging
- Financial impact
- Communication/information

Question Two: “Ideally, how would your stakeholder group envision the R11 area in 20 years?”

General Comments:

- Like it looked 20 years ago
- Responsible usage
- Enjoyment levels of today are maintained
- Need for prescribed burns is now, we are loving the “natural environment”, fire risk is also apparent
- More people using area, however resources still need to be managed

### 3.3 Commercial (Trappers/Recreation Industrial)

Session participants included representation from the Centre for Outdoor Education and Fortis Alberta. Input was also received from a participant representing the Caroline Snowmobile Club, Bighorn ATV Society, and a Grazing Lease Holder perspective.

Question One: “From your group’s perspective, what are the important factors that should be considered when planning and implementing the R11 Forest Management Plan?”

Bighorn ATV Society:

- Trails
- Infrastructure (bridges)
- Tourism
- Promotion of smart use of area

Centre for Outdoor Education:

- Waterways – regarding debris
- Access, existing trails re-established
- Access (foot access, ease of travel)
- Forest surrounding Centre
- Educational opportunity

- Strategic management, cut-lines
- Strategic decision making, use this as an opportunity
- Visual impact, buffers
- Communication (stakeholder process update)

Fortis:

- Damage to structures and facilities,
- Safety aspects, staff and public
- Communication, serving clients
- Existing initiatives RE Vegetation control
- Smoke density, around the power lines

Grazing Leases:

- Keep trails open so livestock can be managed
- Seasonal factors - timing of year when cattle are in the area (June 15 – October 15, related to the safety of the cattle)
- Avoid Overgrazing
- Pasture, work with oilfield, etc. regarding projects

Snowmobile Club of Caroline

- Infrastructure, bridges and signs
- Safety
- Trail system maintained, new and existing
- Visual, buffers if the health of the trees exist
- Volunteer Contributions

Question Two: “Ideally, how would your stakeholder group envision the R11 area in 20 years?”

General Comments:

- More quad trails for summer use, best way to do that – manage the traffic on busy areas by shutting down busy areas and encouraging the use of other areas. Maybe make some exceptions for hunting times, potentially create a pay for use pass for the closed areas. Create new areas opened at staggered times to promote interest that is still managed and protected.
- Snowmobile group would like to be updated on trails, etc.
- Strategic use of mechanized vehicles as we get closer to the parks

- Create tourism products that are indicative of the past and cultural re-enactment of the area
- Smaller grass roots based structures, community based local tourism rather than large US based organizations
- Preserve the culture
- Cultural immersion
- Keep it more natural – the place where “Adventure Begins” – an example of how we all work together.
- Create 2 mile buffers along the park to prevent the park areas from being damaged – foot access, mountain bikes or horses only
- Most of the area is well out of the power line area – but if we can, keep it the ‘Wild West’ and natural.
- Seasonal use of trails where appropriate

### 3.4 Environmental/Cultural

Session participants included representation from the Alberta Wilderness Association, ALERT, the North Saskatchewan Watershed Alliance, Red Deer River Watershed Alliance, Sierra Club of Canada (Prairie Chapter), and the Sunchild First Nation.

Question One: “From your group’s perspective, what are the important factors that should be considered when planning and implementing the R11 Forest Management Plan?”

Alberta Wilderness Association:

- Ecosystem Approach (Driver of process)
- Sustainability
- Fire/pests (Province-wide approach over boundary approach)
- 1973 – Eastern Slopes Policy
- Return of a Watershed Agency to plan for the Eastern Slopes
- Access (People access and fire risk – adding to the problem)
- Access eliminated/decreased not created
- Protect identified publicly owned property/areas (in policy development)
- Natural processes – Fire (versus logging or thinning)
- Fire management based on natural ecosystem processes
- Identify areas free to burn (province-wide)
- Water (top priority in Plan)

- Wildlife habitat protection
- Fire research
- FireSmart (no taxpayer money – Alberta companies and residents responsibility – regulate Smart policies)
- Broad public input

ALERT:

- Adopt the Alberta Forest Conservation Strategy
  - Role of this is Y to Y (Yellowstone to Yukon) connectivity (vegetation, wildlife, etc.)
  - Holistic – interactive – interconnected
  - Legislation required to protect Bighorn Country
  - Flooding considerations
  - Infrastructure protection done at community level
  - Communities – education re risk
  - Protection should be done outside the R11 area (e.g. responsibility of FMA holders to protect their FMAs)
  - Insect infestations (recognize role) – need for discussion re climate change and fire
  - Use horse or helicopter when burning (no logging)
  - Allow wildfires to burn (assist with prescribed burns for ecosystem protection)
  - Climate change considerations
  - Kootenay Plains (spiritual, ecological, wildlife, etc.)
  - Wildland Recreation Priority
  - Old growth habitat (and species in these areas)
  - Watershed protection
  - Ecosystem protection (driver)
  - Do not want Forest Management Plan (use of name R11)
  - Ozone (ground level)
  - Acknowledge significance of this area on Canada and beyond in planning
- North Saskatchewan Watershed Alliance:
- Management of surrounding areas & the impact
  - Beetles (management in and around R11)

- Understand and respect natural functions
- Natural rebalancing of watershed system (provincial scale and beyond)
- Upstream and downstream impact
- Big picture planning beyond R11

Red Deer River Watershed Alliance:

- Cumulative Process rather than site specific (area rather than boundary)
- Watershed protection
- Water flow – quality and quantity
- Flood prevention
- Wildlife corridors identified and protected

Sierra Club of Canada - Prairie Chapter:

- Wildfire, insects and disease (let it happen to the point that there is a risk to facilities and human health – minimal intervention can take place)
- Ongoing process (beyond plan – need checkpoints)
- Economic contributions (e.g. Parks)
- Natural processes run their course
- Minimal interference with natural processes
- Climate change – strategy required (integrated plan, continent-wide)
- Support ecosystem-based rather than Forest Management Plan
- Ecosystem integrity needs to be the basis for all decision-making

Sunchild First Nation:

- Involved in planning stage from the beginning and throughout
- Expand buffers
- Due diligence
- Work together, regional and local
- Water, ceremonies, protection/respect
- Traditional
- Animals (salt licks)
- Mountains – significance
- Ecosystem
- Sacred – Mountains, Wood, Animals and Water
- Holistic pictures – planning and implementing

- Hunting
- Treaty Rights (involved)
- Protect environment
- Grave sites
- 1930 – Natural Resources Transfer Act, treaty signed with Canada, not the province of Alberta, gave up the lands to the depth of a plough which is 6-8 inches
- Communication, consultation
- Reclamation/restoration
- Access roads
- Impact of additional uses such as oil & gas, logging, etc. - would like to see a buffer
- Communication and involvement
- Coordination of County and other regulators
- Emergency Response/Evacuation (who is out there, coordinated planning)
- Return to natural state following disturbances

Question Two: “Ideally, how would your stakeholder group envision the R11 area in 20 years?”

General Comments:

- This question was not posed to this group as they ran out of time.

### 3.5 Fish and Wildlife Associations

Session participants included representation from the Alberta Chapter Foundation for Wild Sheep, Alberta Conservation Association – Fisheries, Alberta Conservation Association - Wildlife Conservation, Alberta Fish & Game Association, Alberta Outfitters Association, Alberta Professional Outfitters Society (APOS), Chungo Creek Outfitters, Lost Guide and Outfitters, and the Sunde Trapper’s Association.

Question One: “From your group’s perspective, what are the important factors that should be considered when planning and implementing the R11 Forest Management Plan?”

Alberta Conservation Association – Fisheries:

- Small creek-fish impact
- Drainages (need for data RE timber harvest and fire impact)
- Cooperative fisheries program

- Spawning areas
- Fish inventories
- Bull trout
- Fish communities
- Upper North Saskatchewan river (inventory and telemetry)
- Access management (access to important fish areas)
- Road networks (sediment)
- Ecosystem management
- Fish habitat

Alberta Conservation Association - Wildlife Conservation:

- Range restoration program
- Creating high quality habitat
- Ungulate habitat
- Healthy ecosystem in general, range of age classes in the area from new to old growth

Alberta Fish and Game Association:

- South facing slopes – limited reforestation to increase pasture
- Healthy range of habitats – diversity
- Return to natural state (prior to suppression)
- Mimic natural fire conditions/patterns
- Access Management
- Fisheries (roads and bridges – service system)
- 1983 IRP be used as historical data – it was valid work

Alberta Outfitters Association and Chunga Creek Outfitters:

- Habitat improvement
- Defensible decisions (e.g. feral horses)
- Wild Fires – business impact
- Continuity of operations
- No new access or reduces access
- Proactive management (past-future data considerations)
- Feral horses

- Diversity of vegetation
- Predator/prey ratio
- Understand trade-offs re decisions

Alberta Professional Outfitters Society (APOS) and the Alberta Chapter of North American Association for Wild Sheep:

- Winter habitat
- Long-term planning
- Review legislation
- Corridor management
- Game populations
- Wild land status – world renowned
- Stakeholder input (Government promises)
- Liability issues on public property that need to be addressed

Lost Guide Outfitters:

- Communication Plan – let stakeholders and public know the timing of burns
- Timing of the burns (During operation times, Calving of ungulates)
- Between APOS and Fish & Game, similar values

Sundre Trapper's Association:

- Removal of Large trees (FLUZ)
- Affects on Pine Martin and fur-bearing animals
- Access – new access issues

Question Two: “Ideally, how would your stakeholder group envision the R11 area in 20 years?”

General Comments:

- See it as good or better for our children and grandchildren (Trying to save it, not see it destroyed)
- One of the true wilderness areas left, want to keep it that way
- There has to be a place for everyone, but there are some serious problems with ATV's and 4x4's
- In regards to the photos in Dan's presentation, would like to see more photography to capture the historical changes

- Large (50+) herds of 6 point elk (from old photos) would like the young biologists to look back into that era and what was so good in that era to create the sights we were able to see. What is changing?
- Let's go back to 1960 and try to determine where we have gone wrong. We have some history and data and have identified a need to make a change. Use the historical data to make it right. Keep in mind that this is the last postage size piece of wilderness left in Alberta. The ultimate goal is to preserve it

### 3.6 Municipal and Provincial Governments

Session participants included representation from Alberta Environmental Protection and the County of Clearwater. The Alberta Environmental Protection participant also brought forward the Red Deer River Watershed Alliance perspective.

Question One: "From your group's perspective, what are the important factors that should be considered when planning and implementing the R11 Forest Management Plan?"

Alberta Environmental Protection:

- Supporting Red Deer River Watershed Alliance and the North Saskatchewan Watershed Alliance
- County Development Nodes (approval process)

County of Clearwater:

- Recreation and Tourism (areas set aside for tourism and areas for infrastructure in IRP; impact of tourism and recreation in the future; visual impact; social enjoyment)
- Development nodes (areas within and surrounding each node; impact on existing and future developers)
- Infrastructure
- Nordegg
- Beetles

Red Deer River Water Shed Alliance:

- Landscape management
- Watershed management
- Balance social and ecological interests
- Work together (input)

Question Two: "Ideally, how would your stakeholder group envision the R11 area in 20 years?"

General Comments:

- An area that has something to offer that people want e.g. hiking through natural areas
- More concerned about pine beetles than fire

### 3.7 Recreational Users

Session participants included representation from the Alberta Equestrian Federation, Alberta Office Road Vehicle Association, Alberta Snow Mobile Association and the Friends of the Eastern Slopes.

Question One: “From your group’s perspective, what are the important factors that should be considered when planning and implementing the R11 Forest Management Plan?”

This group shared the same interests. They are as follows:

- Trails
- Camping
- Visual Impact
- Economic Impact
- Beetles
- Infrastructure
- Berries
- Hunting & fishing
- Impact on Tourism/Recreation and Community

Question Two: “Ideally, how would your stakeholder group envision the R11 area in 20 years?”

General Comments:

- Still there
- Still trees
- Still clean water
- Still water
- Recreation opportunities
- Vibrant communities around them – but not too close

## 4.0 Stakeholder Core Values Identification

Following the stakeholder meetings, the planning team reviewed the input received and analyzed the responses given by the stakeholders. The facilitation team led the planning team through a clustering exercise whereby all the responses given during the meetings were presented and then sorted into similar themes. These themes were then analyzed to determine the core value(s) presented.

The planning team will be encouraging meeting participants to review the work completed to ensure the stakeholder input was captured and clustered appropriately. The core values identified will likely serve as the foundation of the Charrette process. Objectives, indicators and targets will be set collaboratively for each core value.

### 4.1 Core Value Summary

Based on the analysis conducted by the planning team, the following core values were identified and will guide the planning efforts of the R11 Forest Management Unit. They include:

- Access
- Air Shed Quality
- Community Integrity
- Domestic Grazing
- Ecosystem Integrity
  - Holistic Picture
  - Natural disturbance emulation
- Existing Obligations
- Fish
- Forest Health
- Information and Education
- Infrastructure
- Multi-agency Cooperation
- Public Safety
- Recreational Opportunities
- Science-Based Decision Making
- Social Values
  - Aesthetics
  - Cultural Value

- Economic Value
- Inherent Value
- Watershed Integrity
- Wildfire Threat
- Wildlife

## 4.2 Core Value Clustering Exercise Results

The information provided below includes how the planning team clustered the input received from the stakeholder groups. The information provided in each bullet represents stakeholder input as presented in the sessions.

### 4.2.1 Core Value: Access

- Access
- Motorized hunting access
- Trail access maintained (new and existing)
- Trails open
- Access, foot access, ease of travel re safety
- Access existing trails or areas re-established
- Strategic management, e.g. cutting breaks
- No new access or reduced access
- Access management (access to important fish areas)
- Access roads
- Access, people access and fire risk, adding to problem
- Access eliminated/decreased, not created
- Use horse or helicopter re burning – no logging

### 4.2.2 Core Value: Air Shed Quality

- Air quality

### 4.2.3 Core Value: Community Integrity

- Development Nodes
- County Development Nodes (approval process)
- Nordegg
- Forest surrounding Centre (Outdoor Education Centre)

- Social Gateway community

#### 4.2.4 Core Value: Domestic Grazing

- Avoid overgrazing
- Pasture
- Trails open to manage livestock
- Seasonal factors (no burning in summer where cows are)

#### 4.2.5 Core Value: Ecosystem Integrity

##### 4.2.5.1 Sub Value: Natural Disturbance Emulation

##### 4.2.5.2 Sub Value: Holistic Picture

- Landscape Management
- Natural environment
- Natural process
- Minimal changes
- Strategic decision making – use this as an opportunity
- Healthy ecosystem – range of age class
- Healthy range of habitat
- Return to natural state – prior to suppression
- Mimic natural fire patterns
- Long term planning
- Corridor management, beyond the game
- Proactive management, past and future data considerations
- Diversity of vegetation
- Ecosystem management
- Long term range management variation, fire regimes/practices
- Ecosystem
- Holistic picture, planning and implementation
- Natural state following disturbances
- Protect environment
- Sustainable resources
- Reclamation

- Restoration
- Understand and respect natural functions
- Big picture planning
- Ecosystem approach, driver
- Sustainability
- Natural processes (over logging or thinning)
- Fire management based on natural ecosystem processes
- Role of this area Y to Y, vegetation, wildlife, etc. Connectivity
- Holistic
- Interactive
- Interconnected
- Old growth habitat and species in the area
- Ecosystem protection (driver)
- Wildfire, disease, insects – let happen unless a risk to facilities, human health, intervention can take place
- Natural process run the course
- Allow wildfires to burn

#### 4.2.6 Core Value: Existing Obligations

- 1983 IRP historical data
- Importance of existing IRP
- Literature - summer and winter range , managing human use, e.g. oil and gas use
- Review legislation
- Treaty rights, involved
- 1973 Eastern Slopes Ppolicy
- Do not want Forest Management Plan, use of name R11

#### 4.2.7 Core Value: Fish

- Bull trout
- Fish inventories
- Upper North Saskatchewan River
- Spawning areas

- Small creek fish impact
- Cooperative fish inventories – data available
- Fish communities
- Fish habitat

#### 4.2.8 Core Value: Forest Health

- Beetles
- Infestations, e.g. beetles, mistletoe
- Beetles
- Beetles, timber supply
- Fire/pests - province wide approach over boundary approach
- Insect infestations, recognize role, need for discussion, climate change/fire

#### 4.2.9 Core Value: Information and Education

- Communication – informative
- Knowledge/education (logging, fire)
- Communication (serving clients)
- Promote smart use of area
- Notification plan (prior to burn or intervention)
- Communication, stakeholder process update
- Education opportunity
- Defensible decisions
- Understand trade-offs re decisions
- Communication plan, notify stakeholders and public
- Communication/involvement
- Broad public input

#### 4.2.10 Core Value: Infrastructure

- Infrastructure
- Staging areas, washrooms
- 4-H groups
- Bridges, campgrounds
- Infrastructure, volunteer groups

- Bridges, infrastructure
- Infrastructure, e.g. bridges
- Structure facility damage
- Volunteer contributions

#### 4.2.11 Core Value: Multi-Agency Cooperation

- Work together – input
- Stakeholder input, government promises
- Shared responsibility work together
- Data sharing
- Adaptive management experience, monitoring and research
- Work together (regional and local)
- Coordination of County and other regulators
- Protection should be done outside the R11 area (e.g. responsibility of FMA holders to protect the FMA)
- Cumulative process rather than site specific (area rather than boundary)
- Continuity of operations
- Joint prescribed burns
- Wildfire mutual aid

#### 4.2.12 Core Value: Public Safety

- Smoke density
- Safety
- Safety (safety, public)
- Liability issues
- Emergency response plan – know who is out there, coordinated planning

#### 4.2.13 Core Value: Recreational Opportunities

- Recreation & Tourism
- Snowmobiles
- Trails
- Camping

- Recreation
- Trail riding
- Quads
- Hunting
- Fishing
- Berries
- Tourism

#### 4.2.14 Core Value: Science Based Decision Making

- Defensible decisions
- Understand trade-offs re decisions
- Scientific thresholds
- Planning standards, adherence
- Due diligence
- Fire research
- Ongoing process, beyond plan, checkpoints
- Ecosystem integrity for all decision making
- Climate change considerations

#### 4.2.15 Core Value: Social Values

##### 4.2.15.1 Sub Value: Inherent Value

##### 4.2.15.2 Sub Value: Economic Value

##### 4.2.15.3 Sub Value: Aesthetics

##### 4.2.15.4 Sub Value: Cultural Value

- Balance social & ecological interest
- Economic impact
- Client enjoyment, Bighorn Value
- Commercial site based on value
- Wilderness appeal
- Client impact
- Financial impact
- Tourism industry, attraction value

- Wildland Status – world renowned
- Wildfire business impact
- Visitor experience
- Mountains significance
- Economic contributions, e.g. parks
- Visual, view-scape
- Visual impact
- Visual impact, fire prevention option
- Buffer along trails
- Visual impact
- Buffers, visual enjoyment
- Involved in planning stage, beginning, throughout
- Expand buffers, culture perspective
- Traditional sites
- Sacred mountains, animals, woods and water
- Hunting
- Grave sites
- Kootenay Plains, spiritual, ecological, wildlife etc.

#### 4.2.16 Core Value: Watershed Integrity

- Watershed management
- Supporting Red Deer River Watershed Alliance
- Watershed environment
- Watershed
- Buffer zones (water courses – fisheries)
- Drainages (need for data timber harvest and fire impacts)
- Road networks, sediment
- Water protection/respect (ceremonies)
- Management of surrounding areas and the impact
- Upstream and downstream impact
- Water (top priority in plan)
- Flooding considerations

- Watershed protection
- Flow quality/quantity
- Flood prevention
- Watershed protection

#### 4.2.17 Core Value: Wildfire Threat

- Fire risk
- Thompson Creek, old growth
- Accepted risk management
- Existing Initiatives re vegetation control
- Timing of burns
- Fire hazard (timber supply)
- Infrastructure protection done at a community level
- Communities, education re risk

#### 4.2.18 Core Value: Wildlife

- Wildlife habitat
- Removal of large tree
- Zone 1 FLUZ – Pine Martin
- Squirrel (fur bearing)
- Range restoration program
- Ungulate habitat, high quality
- Winter habitat
- Game populations
- Habitat improvement
- Predator/Prey ratio
- Wildlife (species) conservation, e.g. grizzly, caribou, bull trout, long toed salamander
- Strategic framework for grizzly bear management
- Salvage logging policy, if applicable, benefit wildlife
- Feral horses
- Animals, salt lick
- Wildlife habitat protection

- Wildlife corridors identified and protected

#### 4.3 Additional Input

An additional analysis was conducted regarding input provided by stakeholders that was deemed beyond the scope of the R11 Forest Management Planning process. Input was deemed as such if the input received requires provincial level policy. The planning team will provide further explanation to stakeholders if requested. The information categorized as additional input includes:

- Acknowledge significance of this area to Canada and beyond in planning
- Adopt Forest Conservation Strategy
- Allow wildfires to burn, assist with prescribed burns to burn for ecosystem protection
- Climate change strategy required, integrated plan continent wide
- FireSmart, no taxpayer money, companies and residents – regulated FireSmart policies
- Identify areas free to burn, province wide
- Legislation required to protect Bighorn Country
- Ozone, ground level
- Protect identified publicly owned property/areas
- Return of a Watershed Agency to plan for the Eastern Slopes
- Wildland Recreation Priority

#### 5.0 Next Steps

Upon completion of Stage 3 of the process, the planning team will prepare background information packages based on the core values identified. The information will be presented to those participating in the Charrette process.

Those participating in the preliminary stakeholder meetings are invited to submit their names by July 18, 2005 to the planning team if they would like to be considered to participate in the Charrette planning event. Additional opportunities for input, including written submissions, will be considered at any time by those not participating in the Charrette or subsequent process steps.

For more information or to provide comment, please contact planning team member Yvette Choma at (403) 721-3965.

## 6.0 Appendix

*The following is the invitation letter sent to stakeholder groups and individuals.*

Dear ,

Alberta Sustainable Resource Development and Alberta Community Development are developing a forest management plan for the Bighorn Backcountry. With a history of fire suppression and lack of forest disturbance, this area is threatened with an increased risk of escape wildfires, insect outbreaks, and a decrease in the available habitat for many wildlife species. We are developing a management plan to reduce the number of high and/or extreme fire hazard stands, provide fuel breaks to protect the Community of Nordegg, the Big Horn Reserve, resorts, campgrounds, and lodges in the area, and to protect the surrounding forests. Additional goals will be to decrease hazard from pine beetles and improve winter range habitat for elk, mule deer, big horn sheep and other species.

The area being planned has the same boundaries as the Bighorn Access Management Plan; a map is provided with this letter. Prescribed burns will be the preferred method of hazard reduction, however some timber harvest may be considered in areas deemed appropriate under existing plans and legislation.

As someone who uses the Bighorn Backcountry for (insert stakeholder sphere here), we would welcome your input. We realize that there are several values that need to be considered when planning this type of forest management. We would like to meet with you and other (insert stakeholder sphere here) users on XXXXXX, at XX:XX, at the Provincial Building in Rocky Mountain House. At this meeting we would be very interested in your organizations opinion of the values that should be incorporated into the plan. We will also explain the other avenues you have to get involved in the planning process.

We hope to see you at the meeting, which we anticipate will take no more than 2 to 3 hours. Please contact Yvette at 403-721-3930 to confirm your attendance or if you have any questions or need any additional information.

Sincerely

R11 Landscape Planning Team

Note to Reader:

---

This document was prepared by the facilitation team leading Stage 3 of the R11 Forest Management Planning process.

**INTERACTIONS<sup>®</sup>** Inc.

Box 31, Site 3, R.R. 2

Rocky Mountain House, Alberta

T4T 2A2

Telephone: 1.403.845.2792

Facsimile: 1.403.845.4301

Email: [interactions@interactionsinc.com](mailto:interactions@interactionsinc.com)

Web: [www.interactionsinc.com](http://www.interactionsinc.com)

---