Public Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting
Wednesday, December 2nd, 2015 - 5:00 to 8:00pm (includes catered light supper)
Peace River Provincial Building (9621-96 Avenue) - Room 108

MEETING NOTES - DECEMBER 2, 2015

Attendance

Terry Kosabeck (Facilitator) Sharon Tiggelers (Recorder)

DMI Staff Team: Amber Armstrong, Frazer Butt, Gordon Whitmore, Jim Witiw, Stefan Szabo, Steve Krahn, Trina Tosh, Wayne Wasiliew

PAC: Arie Loogman, Carolyn Kolebaba, Derek Bakker, Francois Allard, Harry Krawchuck, Jason Parker, Ken Buchinski, Peter Frixel, Rick Keillor, Bernie Morin, Paul Hvenegaard

Guests: Ryan Spooner –Silvacom, Jeannine Goehing-NAIT Boreal Research Institute

Regrets: Laval Bergeron, Al Benson, Ashley Zavisha, Dwight Weeks, Gareth Davies, Lee Rueb, Mark Ladd, Colin Needham, Kris Kennedy, Dave Walty, Tolko High Level, West Fraser, Judy Weiler, Sherri Larsen, Norm Duval, Doug Dallyn, Charlie Johnson, Andre Knight-Lira, Rod Burr

Dinner service   5:00pm

A) Welcome and Introductions *Terry Kosabeck, Facilitator*   5:15pm   5 min

5:05pm: Supper break – please return for 5:20 to start meeting.

5:20pm: Terry called the meeting to order.

Documents distributed included June 17 PAC Meeting Notes, September 23rd Field Tour Meeting Notes, December 2 (tonight) Agenda

      a. review of agenda

Jim – We have a couple additions to agenda for later in the meeting, DMI had been contacted by a national research group regarding public advisory forums. And a PAC member resignation to advise.

B) Business carried over *Terry Kosabeck, Facilitator*
- June 17 Meeting notes + Sept 23 Field tour notes (errors/edits, and adoption)

Terry – Called for any errors or omissions in meeting notes as presented– no response. Motion to accept - Arie, second - Peter, by show of hands – carried.

- <u>PAC Education Plan Update</u> – *Jim*

Jim briefly overviewed progress on PAC's Education plan. Recall recently Amber invited a members' survey on indicators and targets of interest. Survey responses identified specific VOIT targets of interest to PAC members from among the broader collection of other VOITs. We have inserted that feedback and sorted it into the topics list. Jim noted the list shown on the screen incorporates those VOIT areas into a separate column beside each of the listed PAC topics-of-interest.

These specific VOIT target areas represent those that PAC is interested in observing implementation, monitoring & performance by the various mills operating on DMI FMA tenure. DMI continues to up-date our progress on this list for PAC reference as an attachment to meeting minutes, marking those that have been addressed in past meetings, presentations or tours as covered off. Other topics without delivery dates have not yet been addressed. We can continue to draw from this at the end of each meeting to select next meeting's topic of focus. It is noteworthy that tonight is our 5th meeting this year.

- <u>2015 Stipends and Mileage Up-date</u> (PAC members-at-large) –*Amber*

5:25pm: Amber addressed the group with a powerpoint presentation on how PAC participation was benefitting their respective communities. The list of PAC-member selected charities were highlighted as those who received DMI donations of stipends from among the 11 qualifying PAC-members for the past period. About $1300 in stipends was donated across member-selected non-profit organizations, and travel mileage reimbursements of about $850 to qualifying members. DMI extended a thank you to everyone for attending the past year. Appreciation cards and chocolate were distributed.

- <u>Additions to Agenda</u>

5:30pm:

Jim - advised PAC that Geoff Milligan has retired from PAC as he is no longer able to commit time to the group. His contributions and clear interest in this forum on forest stewardship will be missed. This is normative to have a dynamic PAC membership group and we will continue to work with Amber to grow our membership diversity.

Jim – DMI received a letter (attached) from University of Manitoba regarding social research collaboration between 3 western Canada universities. They invite DMI's PAC to participate in a national survey of forestry public advisory forums.

Some background information; in 2003 the federal and provincial governments of the day came up with a new definition for Canadian sustainable forest management as part of a national accord, Canada's contribution to international conventions on biodiversity conservation. One particular criterion under this new definition was that of public participation or involvement in forest management, which resulted in groups like DMI's PAC being created across Canada.

In 2004 such advisory groups were surveyed across Canada, and a number in Alberta likely participated. They surveyed back then to measure quality of a new concept in process, or how well those groups perceived such participation was working in influencing and education. A research team funded by a national social science research council is now revisiting those questions 10-years ago, to gauge how well this national aspiration is working a decade later. They are retesting to see if it is functioning for community volunteers and asked DMI if the PAC members would participate in the survey.   Questions will likely ask if public-participation is working and about your role – a letter was provided of what they require.

We need a decision from the PAC to participate or not. It is not specifically about DMI's PAC forum, but will give you opportunity to provide feedback to a national survey, anchored to the 2004 baseline. University of Manitoba is leading the research.

DMI requests a vote whether you would like to participate, and whether DMI can provide your names and contact information to the researcher – it is an individual choice thereafter whether or not you participate as individuals.
Rick – Motion that the DMI PAC agree subject to individual discretion to participate. 2nd Arie. Consensus to proceed

Q. Jim – asked Amber if there will be results of the feedback available when they publish a report, and how it will be formatted ? what can the PAC members expect after they participate?
Action Item 1 – Amber will investigate as DMI's contact.

Jim –Project purpose summary is distributed. (attached to minutes)

Q. Do all provinces have PACs or require public feedback forums ?
A. Jim – Yes, all provinces agreed to commit to community outreach or public participation, but these bodies are called different things region to region. All provinces participated in the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers, so signed onto the accord to create such policy requirements. There are some distinctions and flexibility in how they do that province to province.

C) Area Sawmills Up-date (current initiatives info share) -Westside Mills & Eastside Mills

5:40pm: Bernie Morin/Canfor offered an up-date -Business as usual activities, including a Eureka Hall meeting with ATA trappers and had good participation, discussion was positive. Still harvesting 60,000 metres of pine beetle stands and summer fire area salvage. Winter freeze up is later than usual, but our harvest will go ahead. We continue to haul from stock pile site in Hines Creek to our Gande Prairie mill.

    Business Arising – Q/A
Q. Are you making lumber or chips from salvaged wood?
A. Bernie -mostly lumber. What cannot be used, cracked or burned, fuels co-gen.

Q. What about whole tree logs in the bush that you cannot use? Are they cut down?

A. Bernie -Usually only parts of trees are unusable. They are cut down and left, since they are so remote, the cost to transport to use for chips or in the co-gen is too high.

Q. What is the quality of the pine beetle timber?
A. Bernie -To us it is still salvageable unless really small trees. We still have some time to harvest dead pine.

Q. Who decides if the wood is still good?
A. Bernie -Wood culling, grading and sorting is done by contractors in the bush – they know what can be trucked and what is not useable.

Q. Do you look at it for cracking by visual inspection?
A. Bernie -Yes they can see if it will be clean and dry, it is an ongoing process and inspections are part of experience.

Q. Why does it not pay to haul culled trees or wood that is too far away to burn in co-gen rather than waste it?
A. Bernie -It is just too far away from our mill for what market will bear, and not needed. Some of it is 11 hours cycletime. We stage wood at our satellite yard in Hines creek, then can haul good logs year round, not just winter work. Processor operators are working in the yard in the summer as well.

D) Alberta Government Up-date (current initiatives info-share) *-Derek Bakker*

5:45pm: Derek Bakker–provided an up-date on policy matters since Al is not available. Essentially Ministries changed in May when the NDP was elected, but officially the change was December 1. Our team moved to the new Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. Policies have not changed but separate land management from Environment & Parks. Not sure if Al will stay assigned to public advisory resource rep but we will have someone attend the DMI PAC meetings.

New government wetland policy came into effect already for the White Area, will be initiated in 2016 for Green Area lands. Basic focus is to avoid damage to wetlands. Will be a minor change to normal forestry operations, since most wood supply trees do not grow in wetland and most roads up here are temporary in nature. The primary operation impact will be to permanent roads – it is a very complicated policy to apply. On 2015 fires salvage front, salvage planning has been underway since fire mop-up, Tolko was laying out blocks while fires were still smoldering.

Q. At one time in the past was AESRD two components, with separate forest protection staff?
A. Derek -We are currently structured with a forest management program as one unit as a separate program in the new ministry.

Q. It was tight with manpower. Are you now expecting more employees under the new government, to address capacity gaps?
A. Derek -Indications are the budgets will be the same going forward ….no cuts in manpower under discussion …but no increase either and empty positions will not be filled.

Break

E) Presentation –   *(PAC Education Plan interest topic: Community Sustainability)*

6:00pm: Terry recalled group.

Introduction of Presentation –*Stefan Szabo*

6:00pm: Stef introduced the evening's topic as an overview of a new tool for decision support in attempts to balance society's values across environmental, conservation, resource-based economy, and social or community interests   …all matters of community sustainability. Stefan described the background to a project using Silvacom specifically for the design and development, a Tolko-DMI-Silvacom initiative.

In 2008 Alberta introduced a land use discussion, regional planning. Then in 2010 they revitalized a Land Use Framework, the initial hotspot being the northeast side of the province for regional planning. Interesting to watch that process unfold, since other values, not just forestry, were integrated and land management discussions brought to the forefront including social and economic values. Ecosystem benefits became higher profile in the publics' eyes. Some new conservation areas were recommended within that planning region. There were also some spillover recommendations that resulted, outside of that Athabasca regional planning zone as potential protected areas opportunities to consider in the northwest Alberta landuse region. This was concerning, since those recommendations came from a neighboring region and local regional planning was not commenced nor were we asked for input into that.

In a DMI and Tolko discussion, Tolko proposed to Stefan the idea of building a decision support tool or land use analysis tool; *LuSEE* (Land Use Social Environment Economics) to provide a way of graphically representing all interests. "Where are the values on the landscape?" and clarify where the greatest environmental, social, agriculture, oil and gas and forestry use exist. The desired product could provide a dramatic map-based picture – highlighting the easy wins but also highlighting potential locations with conflict. As a tool, it enables a group to ask and analyze; "If we presented this scenario how would or has it affected all users?"

That data has now been developed for High Level area, part of the Lower Peace region, and in the Upper Athabasca. It is being adopted by forestry managers as a means to examine and compare different scenarios in land use planning. This tool has been in development since 2011. We hope it will become apparent really quickly how it can bring complex modeling into a visual tool, to assist difficult regional discussions. Introduction of Ryan Spooner from Silvacom.

6:10pm: Ryan – LuSEE –was developed as a tool to help rationalize different options in potential land use zoning outcomes ….how Land Use, Social, Environment and Economics layer, compete or appear on the landscape. The results could be used to look at alternative options from regional planning under the Land Use Framework.

Ryan described intention to illustrate an example of its potential use within a Lower Peace Regional context. It can be scaled up or down to accommodate any size of region or area of study interest. Through a presentation and discussion he demonstrated the development

and origins of the tool or model, and its use of existing data layers taken from multiple sources. The project uses available map layers from a large collection of existing sources, government and others. Many can be accommodated. We will show some examples tonight to demonstrate how it uses these together.

In building this we wanted to use credible existing data and did not apply any "weighting" to rate any of the individual map layers or contents of higher value than others. For example, is caribou more important than grizzly or water interests? The model can accommodate that type of weighted approach, but we did not do that, since that type of decision would be government's choice or the regional planning group. In our example, all values are equal, merely individual layers of map information.

Ryan walked through a series of sequential slides to illustrate the types of inputs and example map products across environmental, social and economic. The model then seeks a solution in the outputs, as an example of hotspots for competing natural and human interests in a region, as well as economics expressions for conceptual comparative scenarios of cost.   It also can highlight a comparison of proposed conservation areas to alternative locations where the root conservation interests might better be addressed elsewhere.

Prospective end-users and interested parties in such a tool might be regional planning groups, government, and industry. Basically any organization wanting to explore an intersection of land use, economics, conservation and other regional interests to find opportunities, risks and solutions.

    a. **Q/A period**   -Terry thanked Ryan and opened the floor for questions.

Q. Comment –It seems we need to rationalize a more equitable approach to balancing inter-regional expectations of government on conservation areas burden. To expect higher percent conservation in the north has implications on regional economic development opportunity.

A. To-date the government has not welcomed input on defining LUF conservation targets or inter-region proportionality, with their mandates or terms of reference issued to Regional Advisory Groups -RAGs.

Q. How much land is conservation already, and what percentage of area do they want to add ? Do you have that information?

A. Ryan -I do not have that data but can get it – good point – by region what area is already protected? Currently it appears that on the surface they sought areas in the north that are unused, away from where there is a high portion of people, industry or farming, as additional conservation land to potentially set aside.

A. Comment -This tool can help reveal where that conservation land might best be located, from among a range of various scenarios of low conflict. The model offers assistance in choosing between different scenarios or potential land use arrangements, …it does not select the end-solution

A. Comment -For example Mackenzie County has the most protected land already, they are justified to be upset over more land being designated for conservation.

A. We did not have all the information available to us regarding their inputs when they set up the proposed conservation areas, not all were included in values identified as threatened.

A. The target may have been 5- 20 percent, just guessing, but this model is more to provide a relevant alternative scenario or two for negotiation with the Alberta Government. This is a tool to help reveal and evaluate alternative outcomes.

Q. Comment –This appears weak in addressing First Nations values.

A. Ryan –Yes, that might be a product of the absence of available map layers showing where those values are, for this demonstration. But the tool could accommodate any available acceptable data layers, if they exist and are available to use. In some cases government historical resources was the only information available to us. We have an absence of Aboriginal land use data.

Q. How do you value people over animals – for the north how much are we prepared to not develop to help out the areas that are over-developed like southern municipalities?

A. The initial trial in land use regional planning challenged the RAG to find 15 – 20% conservation areas somewhere. That was a government request.

Q. Comment -The north is being asked to give up more of the land base but other regions were not.

Q. Comment -Priority was clear to ensure including oil and gas development when the first criteria were set by government for regional planning.

Q. Comment -They cannot compare north to south. The land base here is only about ½ productive, agricultural availability may be even less.

Q. Comment -To say the north is sacrificed for the south is not quite accurate – the reasoning in land use decisions is more complex.

Q. Comment -Irrigation in the south allowed more development, if we drained more agriculture land and added irrigation we would have more farmland.

Q. Does it not still come down to societal values?

A. Yes, the model doesn't give you a solution but gives you, society, more valuable information on which to base choices across a range of different outcomes.

Q. Environmental objectives -how were they developed and why were certain ones missing? There seem to be weakness or gaps on some environmental data.

A. If there is something missing in tonight's demonstration, we could not get our hands on readily available information. We used accepted layers mostly from government sources. The tool can however accommodate any new information if such data exists.

Q. One particular absence is a fish sustainability index layer. Why is it not being included among other layers of species at risk too?

A. We used accepted layers available at the time from government sources. If that layer is now available, it could readily be added. This is a tool that could also be used by government and so could add as many layers and levels as they want.

A. We absolutely wanted to use existing layers. There is no intent at all to be limiting.

Q. I know the data is available. Why not use it in your model?

A. The point tonight was simply to demonstrate the model's capabilities. If such specific data is available or released by government, it can readily be added to the analyses inputs. Our goal was to build this to be adaptive and expandable. We did reach out and asked for input from government, but fish sustainability was not mentioned.

Q. Land use data or environmental values tend to focus on existing features. They miss opportunity to include environmental capacity. Why not identify land capacities?

A. Good point. –If such data existed spatially, it could be accommodated too by this model.

Q. It appears that this tool anchors heavily to present value and misses opportunity future value?

A. Good observation. The tool could be used though to accommodate more dynamic circumstances by doing re-assessments in the future of outputs and values as a re-visit on past choices.

Q. This presentation is a little bit over my head with the values of users. Is there a clearer way to explain the detail?

Q. Could you say that it is an appraisal or an evaluation at a given point in time?

A. Great point – always a challenge to explain. We use the best information available at the time, and allow within planning process for adding additional information as new information becomes available. Reassess if you cannot capture the change over time. Then re-plan at a point in the future.

Q. First how do we know that we are getting what we planned ? and second how do we add new values to something that is moving?

A. It is a tool to provide decision assistance for current land use discussions today, and it has the capability to add additional information as available tomorrow.

Q. What is the status of this program? Is it proprietary belonging to the group that invested in it?

A. FRIAA has supported its development with research grants in the past, and the important thing is that they want to see such products used for forest resource improvements and management enhancement. Our interest there is shared, and by sharing awareness of this tool, we are interested in feedback and comment on data layers.

A. Yes, it is owned by the project investors, but intended to be developed for promotion and uptake by government commissioned committees and others. The better the tool, the more people could rely on the model presented tonight. It is up to the proprietors to allow use, but we are actively promoting it to see wider uptake in Alberta.

Q. What about its resolution ? Can you go smaller than township level?

A. Currently it is coarse, but that is because it depends on the resolution of data layers provided as inputs. Some is only by township resolution, and some other data has more detail. It can certainly accommodate finer data sets if they are available.

Q. What about energy sector uptake ? Have you presented this to oil and gas?

A. Our collaborator group has a list that we would like to present to the Government, no individual oil and gas companies are on the list yet, but we hope to begin promoting it to their associations first to test for interest.

Q. There are multiple disciplines involved in land management in Alberta, but this project is only financed by one industry, why?

A. Fair observation. -It looks that way, but the forest sector has a growing history of relationship or collaboration with various land users, ecological researchers and governments. We have certainly taken this project on as a leadership initiative because we have a vested interest through our tenures and earlier mentioned

Government policy commitments to sustainability. Those inherently include biodiversity, soils, water and economics. Many of the data layers used in this tool are in fact constructed by other disciplines, but they remain individual layers or individual-focus value interests. We think this product pulls them together for a collective look, and in that is multidisciplinary in its application.

Q. Is it possible that there are other models those other groups in Alberta use themselves? Is there a link to ALCES tools ?
A. It is not connected to the ALCES product. Yes we suppose that they may have their own proprietary process but they have not shared it for this model.

7:20pm: Terry thanked Ryan for his wonderful presentation, good information presented to the group. Given the evident amount of discussion, this proved a worthwhile topic of interest.

Amber requested when we have a moment to get a group photo, voluntary, anyone not wanting to participate can decline.

F) Next Meeting
- Date, Meeting Place & logistics / Meeting topic/theme

Terry – lead discussion. A February date proposed to be the 24th, a Wednesday evening, 5:00pm. Asked the group. Consensus agreed. For the meeting place DMI would request Provincial Building, Peace River again but will confirm location with Al and Derek.
<mark>Action Item 2</mark> – Derek or Al Benson will confirm availability with Amber.

Jim - suggested topic be selected from our earlier review of what was left in PAC Education list.
LiDAR/Wet Areas Mapping proposed. Consensus agreed.
<mark>Action Item 3</mark> – Jim will confirm availability of identified guest speaker from the Province who led the development of this Alberta technology.

Stefan -on behalf of DMI thank you to everyone for attending have a Merry Christmas and Happy New Year.

Jim – Due to the freezing rain warning if anyone travelling out of town tonight and needs a hotel room, DMI will gladly cover. Thank you everyone for attending.

7:38pm: Motion to adjourn - Ken, 2nd Francois – show of hands – carried.

Attachment: Letter from national research team, surveying public advisory forums

UNIVERSITY OF **MANITOBA**

Natural Resources Institute

Clayton H. Riddell Faculty of

Environment, Earth, and Resources

303 Sinnott Building
70 Dysart Road
Winnipeg, Manitoba
Canada R3T 2M6
Telephone (204) 474-8373
Fax (204) 261-0038

Dear Mr. Bill Downing:

We are contacting you today regarding an on-going national survey of all forest-related public advisory committees, Model Forests, and community forests in Canada. Our hope is that the members of the public advisory committees with which you are involved may be able to help us by participating in this undertaking.

This research follows-up a survey conducted in 2004 by a team of researchers then led by Dr. John Parkins, from the Canadian Forest Service. An objective of this survey was to better understand the roles of advisory committees and members perceptions of the overall effectiveness of these committees. The report from this survey is attached to this email. Given changes in the forestry sector since the previous survey, as well as the development of new forestry initiatives, such as community forestry, the goal of this project is to reconsider our findings in light of these changes. This new research is being funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

As a first step in this follow-up survey, we are wondering if you could provide us with the name and contact details for the chairperson of your public advisory committee. Once we are in contact with the chairperson, we will discuss with them the optimal approach to engage members of the committee in this follow-up survey.

We would appreciate it if you email Anderson Assuah with a response to this inquiry at your earliest convenience. As well, if any questions, comments, or concerns arise, please feel free to contact us with those. Thank you for your time.

Best regards,

Anderson Assuah

Research Assistant
Natural Resources Institute, University of Manitoba
(204) 887-6163
assuaha@myumanitoba.ca

On behalf of:

Dr. Maureen Reed
Assistant Director, School of Environment and Sustainability
(306) 966-5630
mgr774@mail.usask.ca

Dr. John Parkins
Department of Resource Economics and Environmental Sociology, University of Alberta
(780) 492-3610
jparkins@ualberta.ca

Dr. John Sinclair
Natural Resources Institute, University of Manitoba
(204) 474-8374
john.sinclair@umanitoba.ca

Attachment: Purpose of national research team survey on public advisory forums

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN
School of Environment and Sustainability
USASK.CA/SENS

Research Project Information

The Role of Stakeholder and Public Participation in Collaborative Forest Governance in Canada: Contributing to Theory and Practice through Comparative Study

The purpose of this research is to understand how Forest Advisory Committees, Model Forest Boards, and Community Forest Boards, can foster diverse values, learning, and adaptive capacity to assist Canada's forest-based communities during times of environmental, social and economic transition. The research is funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Three key questions shape the research: How do these different forest governance and decision-making bodies operate currently and has this changed over the past decade? To what extent do these collaborative arrangements contribute to learning and adaptation, and thus allow the stakeholders and communities they represent to shape their economic, environmental and political futures? To what extent do they help Canada to meet its stated goals of sustainable forest management?

To address these questions, we will, among other things, be conducting a national survey of participants involved in these different forest governance and decision-making bodies. We believe this research has the potential to benefit participants through identifying and disseminating strategies for more effective participation and engagement. By providing insight relating to the evolution and contributions of public (citizen) and stakeholder participation in the country's evolving forestry sector, the aggregate results from this study have the potential to contribute to improved decision-making, and guide policy and practice to help Canadian forest-based communities adapt to the fundamental economic, social, and environmental changes that affect them.

Drs. John Parkins (University of Alberta), Maureen Reed (University of Saskatchewan) and John Sinclair (University of Manitoba) are all investigators on this research. If you would like to know more about this research, please contact one of the following research team members:

Principal Investigator
Dr. Maureen Reed, Professor and Assistant Director, School of Environment & Sustainability, University of Saskatchewan, 328 Kirk Hall, 117 Science Place, Saskatoon, SK, S7N 5C8, Tel (306) 966-5630, e-mail: maureen.reed@usask.ca

Research Associate
Dr. James Robson, Natural Resources Institute, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba Tel: (204) 474-8374, e-mail: james.robson@umanitoba.ca

Attachment:

DMI Public Advisory Committee –*Education Plan & discussion interests*   (March 2016)

Focus: "Operational scope" on-the-ground practices and activities, that generally have roots in science, government natural resource policy, and strategic long-range forest plans

This list was compiled through feedback from PAC members to the PAC co-chair & DMI, and is not presented in any particular order of sequential priority.

General area of interest -topical theme	Perceived root values at interest (as revealed within the request)	Related DMI VOITs + Commitments of interest to PAC members (DMI DFMPs)	Potential speakers, presentors, expertise
LiDAR mapping technology Delivery March 2nd, 2016	Understanding connections of new technology to DMI practices in protection of water values (aquatic biota, hydrology conservation)	Indicator 33, 37	DMI staff, Dr. Barry White (ESRD LiDAR program development)
Ecosystem-based management (effectiveness, monitoring forest practices & cumulative effects)	• How DMI ecosystem based management approach is measured for efficacy & success at the biotic or species-response level (e.g. biodiversity indices?) • Are long-term changes monitored for comparisons to undisturbed biodiversity nearby? • The roles of variable-retention legacies	Indicators 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 37	DMI staff, UofA Dr. John Spence or NRCan Dr Dave Langor (EMEND science program leads)
Mountain Pine Beetle (local context) Delivered Nov 26, 2014	• Species biology • Eastward infestation migration status • Up-date on current policy and regional strategy. • Clarify fire risk management strategy for dead stands on the landscape	Indicators 22 + 7 Commitment C8	Conifer mills staff, ESRD Forest Health staff

General area of interest -topical theme	Perceived root values at interest (as revealed within the request)	Related DMI VOITs + Commitments of interest to PAC members (DMI DFMPs)	Potential speakers, presentors, expertise
Watercourse spatial buffers (logging proximity constraints) Delivery (3 meetings, 2015) starting April 29, June 17, Sept 23 field tour	• How fisheries science (stream flow/volume, temperature, habitat state) informs the definition of current regulatory policy on watercourse buffer sizes (Alberta). • Understanding the intersection of science, fisheries management, forest management strategy targets, and operational ground rules (field distancing practices) • Landscape strategies in retention for watershed values consideration • Cumulative effect of natural disturbance and MPBeetle surge harvest on water values?	Indicator 7, 12, 30, 33, 34, 37	Alberta ESRD staff (Al Benson, Darren Fearon), Ab Innovates Dr. Brian Eaton, Alberta ESRD Senior Fisheries Biologist, DMI + sawmill woodlands staff
Forest sustainability evidence reflected in: • the characteristics of local 2nd-generation forests • perceptions of excessive logging of mature forest in proximity of the mills • recent clear-cutting in the region	• Understanding reforestation policy and practices • Growth performance evidence in local regenerating trees. • Transferring genetic properties from mature forests to new regeneration • Clear-cutting vs ecosystem-based design (MPBeetle?) • Cumulative effect of natural disturbance and MPBeetle surge harvest on ecosystem? • Disproportionate spatial allocation of footprint impacts (near access or communities)	Indicator 6, 13, 17, 23, 44	DMI staff (silviculture, AAC development), Conifer mills staff, ESRD Reforestation staff, UofA -Dr. Philip Comeau (WESBOGY science lead)

General area of interest -topical theme	Perceived root values at interest (as revealed within the request)	Related DMI VOITs + Commitments of interest to PAC members (DMI DFMPs)	Potential speakers, presentors, expertise
Natural disturbance-based harvest design	Science rationale for connecting forest management to natural disturbance: • wildfire as a destructive source of renewal • distinctions between human harvest-design and wildfire (patterns, ecosystem response, resiliency) • distinctions between stand-replacing fires, stand-altering fires (light burns) • NW Alberta fire patterns & tree-ring evidence	Indicators 6, 7	Dr. John Spence (EMEND science lead), Dr. David Andison (foothills Research Institute –Healthy Landscapes, natural disturbance science lead), Dr. Colin Bergeron (EMEND fire history)
Reforestation strategies (soils, regeneration properties)	Alberta forest policy requirements & ecology considerations in new policy, Forest science connections: • Forest soils properties & soils biodiversity • Soil ecosystems resiliency • Understory plant communities (competition and interactive dependencies) • Rationale for scarification treatments & options in conifer • Mixedwood forest regeneration strategies • Herbicide (a tool for mixedwood forests?)	Indicator 17, 23, 24, 37, 44	DMI staff, Conifer mills staff, ESRD Reforestation staff, Dr. Sylvie Quideau (EMEND forest soils & soil biology scientist, others?) Dr. Vic Lieffers, Derek Sidders (EMEND reforestation scientists) Dr. Ellen Macdonald (EMEND mixedwood forest plant scientist)
Local fisheries; Arctic Grayling	• Local inventories on status • Historic trends on presence absence in northern Alberta • Accounting for effects of seasonality (Drought : Precipitation years) • Climate change impact assessments on fisheries?		UofA Dr. Mark Poesch ESRD Fisheries staff, Alberta Conservation Association staff, Rich McCleary –fRI

General area of interest -topical theme	Perceived root values at interest (as revealed within the request)	Related DMI VOITs + Commitments of interest to PAC members (DMI DFMPs)	Potential speakers, presentors, expertise
Community sustainability Delivered Dec 2nd, 2015 *(Land Use Rationalization model overview –a tool of opportunity for northwest Alberta use / Silvacom-DMI-Tolko project)*	• Benefits or returns to resource dependent communities • Alberta policy considerations • Mill business considerations	Indicators 24, 25, 43, 44, 45	Silvacom + DMI woodlands staff (LU Rationalization Tool –social + economic + environmental layers)
Performance Delivered Feb 4th, 2015	• Industry performance in various pre-defined management plan target areas (VOITs, commitments)	All VOITs and Commitments (sample set)	DMI staff sharing Stewardship Report outcomes