



Spray Lake Sawmills

**Crowsnest Forest Products
Public Advisory Committee
Kanata (Blairmore)
Oct 26th, 2022 Finalized Meeting Notes**

Present: Gary Clark, Brenda Davison, Bill Skene, Dianne Sawley, Larry Sears, Bruce Mowat, Annette Mahieux-Bone, Don Scott, Shannon Frank, David Whitten, Matt Denney (SLS), Erroll Kutcher (SLS), Jake Guay (SLS), Jason Mogilefsky (SLS), Kyle Rast, Jim Lynch Staunton, Alix Hennig
Absent: Ron Davis, John Kinnear, Brian Gallant, Vicki Kubik

Meeting started at 11:00 a.m.

Agenda item –Welcome and Round Table introductions

- Round table of introductions

Agenda item – Who is SLS & What is the Alberta Forest Management Planning Process?

- Matt Denney: Presented introduction to SLS\CFP, planning hierarchy model and FMP process and timelines.
- Bill Skene: Does Spray Lake Sawmills get any more landbase to harvest timber when the tenure was converted to a FMA in the FMU?
- CFP – No it's the same landbase, we just have the responsibility for a Forest Management Plan (FMP).
- Diane Sawley: How does the conversion to a FMA from a quota affect the rights to timber on the landbase (quota holders, other industry etc.)?
- CFP – The Companies' rights are the same except for withdrawal from the landbase, then CFP is entitled to compensation, which is a standardized process.
- Brenda Davison: How many hectares of forest land are removed per year in the C5 area
- CFP – from CFP's it is appx 500-800 ha per year.
- Larry Sears/ Diane Sawley: How does the planning process for roads and their reclamation take place (organizational structure). Concern with closing access roads used for fence maintenance and salting.
- CFP – Issue would involve working with the Range Management division of the GoA. CFP is required to reclaim their roads unless we have approval not to.
- Diane Sawley –Grazing land is being lost to tree cover encroachment is there anything that can be done in the FMP to address it?
- CFP–probably not, as those areas are typically unmerchantable/non commercial forest, and are not included in our AAC landbase calculations. We agree, this is a big problem and we discussed this same issue in the B12 FMP. There's all of this open aspen forest

that isn't being managed and isn't commercial forest so a forest products company isn't operating in those stands. In C5, there's not even a deciduous (aspen) allocation provided in the Forest Management Agreement. Range improvement is the jurisdiction of the Range Management Division rather than Forestry Division.

- Brenda Davison: When the tenure is converted who is responsible for monitoring the VOITs
- CFP – this becomes a company responsibility and will be apart of future stewardship reporting & FMPs
- Bill Skene: How is the timber supply affected by natural disturbances
- CFP – If the disturbance is over a certain amount (2.5% of the productive forest area) the harvest level must be dropped by the disturbance amount or the company can choose to rerun timber supply analysis to determine the new harvest level.

Agenda item – Public Consultation Program & Public Advisory Terms of Reference

- Jason Mogilefsky: Explained the history of the Forest Service in North America- Its about fire management, protection of air water and wildlife habitat, and the economy that our society needs a sustainable wood supply:
 - There are multiple objectives and its about making sure forest management doesn't negatively impact the environment. We respect the knowledge the public and stakeholders have and we want to learn what the emerging issues and opportunities are.
 - The public consultation process is meaningful as we want to hear all of the potential issues and we promise to thoughtfully respond to each of them and if the concern is incorporated into the plan we will communicate how.
 - It doesn't mean we will agree on how to deal with all of the concerns however, we will thoughtfully address the concerns. If there are any concerns, please bring them up at the meetings or directly with us so we have an opportunity to deal with it as early as possible to avoid conflict.
 - We want to build constructive working relationships, whereby we learn of emerging concerns and opportunities early on the planning process looking for potential win/win solutions.
 - FMP development is a slow process, there are three FMP milestones we are consulting on, this is the first item that we need to conclude by January 2023. The VOITs are then computer modelled in a timber supply model that's an iterative approach that takes a year and a half to complete, so the second item to consult on is the draft spatial harvest sequence expected by May 2024. The third item we will be consulting on is the Draft FMP- it should be completed by September 2024.
 - Every dataset, model and outcome is reviewed by GoA before we move to the next step.
 - We ask that meeting notes are not shared outside of the PAC until approved.
- Alix Hennig and others– How can the details of the meetings appropriately be shared with their collective organizations represented in the PAC.

- CFP – Once PAC members have reviewed the meeting notes for accuracy and the final meetings notes are distributed, they will be posted on the company website and then they can be shared.
- Bruce Mowat: Is concerned with the amount (lack) of coordination that could be taking place between CFP, the PAC and between members of the PAC in between meetings and with so few meetings taking place.
- CFP–Lets get through this first meeting to get a feel of the process, the next meeting is set for January, this is a very, very slow process, we have until January 2023 to capture your input, we will go over examples of the VOITs next to get an idea of how they work to drive the plan. Please feel free to contact us anytime outside of the meetings with any questions etc. The VOITs set the targets and are the performance measures of the FMP, so we want to make sure we capture as much as we can and double check the VOITs.
- Diane Sawley: Preliminary meeting times in May and November and May are not great for people in the ranching industry.
- CFP—we need to stick to the identified consultations schedules, if someone cant make a meeting, there’s an option to send an alternate. If a meeting is missed that’s okay to, as all of the meeting agendas and information will be sent and members can still participate by emailing or calling us to answer any questions.
- David Whitten: Does the PAC accurately portray the public from the area? where are the government representatives?
- CFP: There are two PAC members representing local governments (the MD of Crowsnest Pass (Vicki Kubik) and Rancheland #66 Ron Davis (Alt-Robert Strauss)).
- Alix Hennig: Seems like a disproportionate amount of Ranchers on the PAC (in terms of voting)?
- CFP: We considered that as well, however given cattle grazing is the dominate land use, we felt the representation on the PAC is appropriate.
- PAC discussion that perhaps trappers should be added as a stakeholder on the terms of reference.
- Shannon Frank: it’s a bit confusing how the word consensus is used in the terms of reference as compared to how it sounds voting will be done.
- CFP: (Jason) asks the group if 51% is the measure of a consensus without CFP having a vote.
- Shannon Frank: Consensus means everyone agrees rather than a simple majority so if it’s a simple majority the ToR should be edited to reflect that.
- Alix Hennig: Is concerned with the proportion of groups represented if voting becomes common practice.
- PAC: Will the SLS staff who are present also be voting?
- CFP: Only PAC members vote and voting is centered around acceptance of the business rules in the PAC terms of reference. We won’t be voting on VOITs or anything to do with the FMP. If something comes up where we decide there’s a need to change the terms of reference we will be voting to accept the changes.
- Gary Clark- This committee doesn’t have power its about participating in the process.
- Larry Sears: Motion to approve the Terms-of-Reference for the Public Advisory Group with the replacement of “consensus” with “simple majority” and changing the phrase “no other personal” to “only PAC” in in decision making section of the document.
 - Seconded- Gary Clark
 - 100% voted in favour to accept the PAC ToR

Agenda item – FMP Milestones and Timelines

- Bill Skene: Is there a possibility to have another PAC or something to review the Annual operations.
- CFP the current purpose of the PAC is for the forest management plan development, there will still be the open house to review the annual operations, operational maps are always up on our website and you can reach out to us anytime in regards to learning more about operations.

Agenda item – Open Discussion-VOITs identifying issues and opportunities

- Jason Mogilefsky- We are hoping to learn what the emerging issues and opportunities are to incorporate early into the planning process to avoid conflicts. Is there anything missing from the VOITs? Please review the VOITs and feel free to provide a written submission. We will be consulting on VOITs through January 2023 and need to finalize VOITs in order to begin running the timber supply model, an iterative process that takes a year and a half to complete.
- VOIT 29: David Whitten: restoration of existing bike trails post harvest
 - More discussion related to trails
- Brenda Davison: The forest is not supposed to serve only people and if trails are created without approval there should be no effort to re-establish and conserve them post harvest.
 - What are the controls for limiting the amount of disturbance in the FMA area. How is the SSRP going to affect the amount of disturbance in the area.
 - Jason used VOIT ID 29 to show the starting point for how this can be captured in the VOITs.
 - Discussion around integration with other users and the science to establish acceptable levels of disturbance on the landbase, concerned with the effectiveness of the targets related to grizzly bears.
 - Jason used VOIT 4 as an example that addresses forestry road footprint and VOIT 14 addressing threatened species habitat
- Alix Hennig: There was a proposal by the government to increase the amount of linear disturbance in the porcupine hills, pointed out that the government can change their targets but this group can not.
- Annette Mahieux-Bone asked if there could be an option to have the meetings available on zoom.
- CFP at this point the plan is to hold in person meetings.

Meeting wrap up – Anticipate the next meeting will be some time in the January 2023

Adjourn: 2:07 pm