



PROJECT REPORT

Stewardship and Sustainability in the Secwepemcul'ecw – Information Session March 16th, 2006

Summary Report

**Canim Lake Information
Session March 16th, 2006**

Summary Report

Kathie Swift and Jennifer Turner

This workshop was funded by the First Nations Forestry Program, a national partnership program between First Nations and the Government of Canada jointly managed and administered by the Canadian Forest Service, Natural Resources Canada, and Lands and Trust Services, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada.

The workshop was hosted by the Canim Lake Band 'Tsqescen'.

Publication of this summary report was supported by the BC Ministry of Forests and Range through the Forest Investment Account, Forest Science Program.

© 2006 FORREX Forest Research Extension Partnership

This document is an unpublished report for information and discussion purposes, and is not intended for broad public distribution. While the report may be peer-reviewed and formally published in the future, information is currently in draft form, and has not been peer-reviewed. No guarantee or warranty, expressed or implied, is made about the value or stability of the information or links made herein. When citing, please fully acknowledge this original source. For permission to reproduce, redistribute, or store this document for the purpose of serving through any other information retrieval system, please contact FORREX at: Suite 702, 235-1st Avenue, Kamloops, BC V2C 3J4.

For more information, visit the FORREX Web site: www.forrex.org

CONTENTS

ABOUT THIS REPORT	2
INFORMATION SESSION DISCUSSIONS	2
National Processes and Principles – Wild Salmon Strategy/Species at Risk Presentation	2
Sustainable Resource Management Planning Processes in the Cariboo Area Presentation	3
Forest Stewardship Planning Process/Forest Resources Evaluation Program Presentation	4
Timber Supply Analysis Principles Presentation	5
Forest Practices Board – Auditing Practices and Principles Presentation	7
The “New Relationship” Presentation	7
CSA Certification Process – Tolko Forest Industries Presentation	9
SFI Certification Process Presentation	10
Canim Band – Canim Lake/Caribou Tribal Council/ Management Planning Process Presentation	11
FORREX – The Role of Continuous Learning Presentation	12
Wrap-up – Conclusions and Recommendations	12
SESSION EVALUATION RESULTS	13
1. How worthwhile was this information session to you?	13
2. How would you rate the quality of the information session’s organization?	13
3. Overall, how would you rate the quality of the information session’s presentations?	13
4. Specific comments regarding the usefulness of the presentations	13
5. Did this information session increase your awareness of:.....	14
6. As a result of this information session, I plan to	15
7. Additional Comments from Participants	15
APPENDIX 1: STEWARDSHIP AND SUSTAINABILITY WORKSHOP EVALUATION	17
APPENDIX 2: STEWARDSHIP AND SUSTAINABILITY WORKSHOP EVALUATION SUMMARY	19

ABOUT THIS REPORT

The information session entitled “Stewardship and Sustainability – Canim Lake Information Session” was held on March 16th, 2006 in the community gymnasium. This report summarizes the discussions held during the information session as well as the evaluation feedback from session participants. Forty percent of the participants at the information session completed and submitted the evaluation forms containing in their packages. The results presented in this report reflect that input. Results from the information session evaluations will be used by FORREX and Canim Lake to guide future sessions and assist the presenters in improving future presentations.

INFORMATION SESSION DISCUSSIONS

National Processes and Principles – Wild Salmon Strategy/Species at Risk Presentation

Guy Scharf, Habitat Technologist, Habitat and Enhancement Branch, BC Interior North, Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO)

Notes from presentations for information not included in PowerPoint slides

- DFO doesn't manage the land and water that the fish need to survive; that is the job of the provincial government.
- There needs co-operation from land and water managers in order to protect fish.
- DFO manages commercial fisheries (i.e., sets limits, targets etc.)
- The provincial government deals with resident fish while DFO deals with anadromous fish.

Questions and/or Comments

1. What studies have been done related to dumping fluid (heavy metal water) into the Fraser River? What are the impacts?

DFO is involved in issues with the Fraser River, but the focus is on sediment generation. The metal component is the responsibility of Environment Canada. A lot of people think the solution is dilution. Environment Canada has to make all information related to this publicly available. To request such information, go to the ATIP (Access to Information and Privacy) homepage.

Citation—

Swift, K. and J. Turner. 2006. Canim Lake Information Session Summary Report. FORREX Forest Research Extension Partnership, Kamloops, B.C. Project Report. URL: <http://www.forrex.org/publications/other/filereports/CanimSummary.pdf>

2. Knowing that Coho is going on the endangered list, what processes would address negative impacts to this species?

Richard Bailey in Kamloops may be able to answer this.

3. How are sea lice affecting salmon populations?

It affects Chum and Pink Salmon. Fish associated with fish farms are under more stress and are therefore more susceptible to sea lice. Go to DFO Web site for more info on this issue. There are Pink salmon in the Williams Lake River and other areas during odd years. It is possible that sea lice is having an effect on these Pink salmon populations.

4. Fish populations in the area seem to be dropping off (e.g., Brook and Dolly Varden trout that the First Nations in the area used to eat) due to cattle activity near streams. How are the major BC cattle companies associated with rehabilitation of streams that run into Alkali Lake?

The person to contact on this is Alan Charbonneau. He should be told how you think land use is having a negative impact on fish. Because salmon aren't at the site, it is deferred to the provincial government.

Sustainable Resource Management Planning Processes in the Cariboo Area Presentation

Bev Frittenburg, Planning Officer, Integrated Land Management Bureau (ILMB), BC Ministry of Agriculture and Lands

Questions and/or Comments

1. Why was the Cariboo Chilcotin Land Use Plan (CCLUP) made a higher-level plan when other plans around the province weren't?

There are probably many reasons for this, but it is likely that the timing was good and there was information consensus. There were also many very key people involved in the plan and that helped.

2. How can stewards and non-government people can get actively involved in planning process?

People interested in getting involved should contact ILMB. Public meetings and other opportunities have already been held to try and get such input.

Forest Stewardship Planning Process/Forest Resources Evaluation Program Presentation

Harry Jennings, Stewardship Specialist, BC Ministry of Forests and Range

Notes from presentations for information not included in PowerPoint slides

- Licensees are not required to include detailed block or road planning in Forest Stewardship Plans (FSPs)
- CCLUP (and the objectives within it) is the primary driver in the 100 Mile House Forest District. Legislation relies on professionals to consider all pertinent information.
- Soils values are not found in the CCLUP so there are special provisions in FRPA to deal with this.
- Workshops like this are an excellent opportunity for discussion and interaction between various organization reps.
- Always better to have information incorporated up front.
- Landscape will look dramatically different once mountain pine beetle harvesting gets going full boar.
- Local FRPA Resource Evaluation Program contact should be in place this summer.
- The decision maker under FRPA is the Minister in every case. However, these decisions get delegated down in most cases to the district manager (as the Delegated Decision Maker (DDM)).

Questions and/or Comments

1. Is there no situation where a forest industry representative is the DDM?

No, this role can only be delegated to a government employee.

2. Under the old Forest Practices Code, the public had access to 5-year development plans and road building plans. This information could then be used to give input and voice concerns (e.g., risk to mountain caribou habitat). How will the government monitor this under FRPA?

There is no legislative requirement to show that level of detail under FRPA in the FSP or during the consultation process. However, eventually site plans containing specific cut blocks and road locations have to be produced by industry and, if asked, they have to make the information contained within a site plan available to the public. The government won't ask for site plans unless there is a specific concern.

3. Would it be up to the respective DDM to decide how "reasonable" is defined as it relates to reasonable effort to consult First Nations?

Refer to FRPA administration bulletin on FN information sharing. This bulletin details FRPA-related aspects of consultation and engaging requirements. There is an expectation that FSP

authors will make efforts to engage with FN and collect information around all values (particularly cultural values). This bulletin also describes what constitutes a reasonable effort. However, there is no legal definition for the term reasonable.

4. It is difficult to provide comments on FSPs because they are too broad.

FRPA is relatively new and the suitability of the FSP process is not yet known. There is an expectation that the FSP author will communicate with First Nations so that they can give the DDM enough information to show that a reasonable effort was made.

5. In order to do proper consultation, would it not be prudent to provide more detailed information at the beginning of the process?

The legislation does not require licensees to provide First Nations with detailed site information. However, certain licensees are trying to develop their own processes to allow for this to happen. If that type of detailed information hasn't been shared earlier in the process, the DDM may decide to do a formal consultation on every future cutting. A prudent professional would try to get that information sooner rather than later.

6. Who has legal and financial responsibility if something goes wrong in the bush?

The Compliance and Enforcement (C&E) division of the BC Ministry of Forests and Range is responsible for C&E monitoring. What was planned, what happened, and if something does go wrong, who was at fault?

7. Is monitoring of the success of First Nations consultation processes part of the FRPA Resource Evaluation Program (FREP)?

No, it is not part of FREP, but the provincial government as a whole is keeping tabs on this effort constantly because it is a government responsibility.

Timber Supply Analysis Principles Presentation

Ian Graeme, Manager, Decision Support, Ministry of Forest and Range

Questions and/or Comments

1. Is the AAC based on how much timber is available?

The AAC is calculated by attempting to balance a sustainable harvest level with other values.

2. How much has AAC increased with mountain pine beetle (MPB) provincially?

About 15 - 20%

3. What data went into the uplift decision? How can it be sustainable?

There is an expectation that the harvest level in most of the TSAs affected by MPB and that have had uplift will have to come down once MPB has run its course. We won't be harvesting all beetle-killed timber. We will reach a point when we are not able to harvest the timber but there is uncertainty around when that will be. On some TSAs more than others, there will be some serious mid-term consequences. Within the 100 Mile House Forest District, there is a need to focus existing AAC as much as possible on MPB so that there will be other timber to harvest in the medium-term (i.e., non-pine stands).

4. Are companies being asked to move to harvest dead wood only and leave green wood for later time?

The reality is there are a lot of considerations that go into what is harvested. Yes, the government is trying to encourage that. If you're harvesting non-pine timber supply, then you will be exacerbating the medium-term issue.

5. With current uplifts and salvage programs, forest practitioners are finding lots of previously partially harvested stands where it is no longer economically viable to harvest remaining trees. Is this part of the timber supply analysis? Are you taking out areas no longer economically viable? Is there a level of confidence in modelling stands that have had multiple entries?

This is a growth and yield question related to the impact of multiple entries. This also relates to other questions such as the impact of dead trees on residual growth of non-pine trees. There needs to be more research on potential growth and yield impacts of MPB.

Sensitivity analysis is also being conducted as part of the overall timber supply analysis. All conceivable factors and their uncertainty are considered to try and get a sense of how much difference is it going to make if estimates are out by a certain percent. This affects how to risk-manage for various harvesting scenarios and values.

6. With the tremendous focus on MPB, how are we dealing with spruce beetle and other forest health concerns?

MPB has been the focus over the last several years resulting in the possibility that other forest health concerns have been overlooked. Although MPB is still the main focus, the provincial government is starting to pay more attention to other forest health issues.

Forest Practices Board – Auditing Practices and Principles Presentation

Kevin Edquist, Forest Practices Audit Manager, Forest Practices Board (FPB)

Notes from presentations for information not included in PowerPoint slides

- The FPB coordinates with the FREP program to determine how to evaluate forest management. FPB looks at how to apply measures on the ground.
- Random audits are conducted to provide baseline information on what's happening.
- FPB is responsible for investigating public complaints – i.e., issues-driven. Anybody can complain to FPB.
- FPB is a reporting agency.
- First Nations may want the ability to do audit reviews in certain cases. The FBP can help to develop that capacity.
- FPB has also been concerned with applying FRPA value-driven indicator sets on the ground.
- The board is independent (appointed by government) but all resources are paid by the government.

Questions and/or Comments

1. How well are FPB recommendations being acted upon? Are there any routes of action if something's not being addressed?

The Board has made a lot of recommendations over the years. In general, these recommendations are pretty well followed. The FPB Chair can go back to the responsible Minister if certain recommendations are not being followed.

The “New Relationship” Presentation

Rhonda Morris, Manager – Negotiations Section, BC Ministry of Forests and Range

Notes from presentations for information not included in PowerPoint slides

- New Relations is not a product in and of itself. It is a shift in how government and First Nations work together and view each other.
- The “Leadership Council” (LC) was created with the recognition that there was some common interest and a stronger voice if First Nations worked together.
- BC's Premier and the LC crafted “the new relationship” document together.
- The LC, BC government, and Canadian government made a commitment to close education, health, and social gaps that existed between aboriginal peoples and other Canadian citizens.
- The Leadership Secretariat responsible for managing New Relationship fund. This fund exists to address First Nations issues such as consultation and land and resource management.

- Some consultation protocols have already been developed. Some industries are working on their own consultation protocols.
- Of the 60 Forest and Range Agreements (FRAs) that are signed, there have been no requests by First Nations in writing to transfer them over to the new Forest and Range Opportunities (FRO) agreement.
- Agreement term is about 5 years.

Questions and/or Comments

1. What is BC government's policy regarding Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK)?

In operational planning for FSPs, licensees are required to develop strategies and results to address traditional uses that are integral to First Nations culture. When looking to develop FSPs, licensees will be interested to know what information you have to bring forward.

2. What about direct award agreements?

This is a direct award of timber provided to First Nations. These agreements are for timber only (e.g., either as a result of MPB, wildfire, or inability of licensees to harvest AAC). It is a short agreement. The legislation specifies the government can direct award to First Nations where there is an interim measures agreement.

3. What is the consultation policy with the BC government?

This information is available on the Ministry of Forests and Range and the Ministry of Aboriginal relations Web sites. However, this information is currently be revised. People should also refer to the First Nations bulletin Harry introduced that discusses FSP development and how to engage and/or consult with FN.

4. What is an Interim Measures Agreement?

Interim Measures Agreement is a broad term that has been used for a long time and means interim to treaty agreement.

5. How much timber harvesting volume is going to First Nations?

A total of 16.6 million cubic metres is going to First Nations. Through the timber reallocation process, there was a 20% take-back from licensees. Three million cubic metres is going to First Nations through Forest and Range Agreements. Volume number may be higher in short-term due to MPB.

6. Please clarify interim accommodation as it is discussed in relation to FROs.

Interim accommodation relates to the economic component of First Nations interests. It does not include other accommodations.

7. Are there any obligations tied to FROs?

FROs are intended to deal with revenue and timber only. It is hoped that with this agreement litigation can be avoided. There are examples of direct awards that have been given to First Nations that have not signed a FRO. The government may look to extending the terms of these agreements to avoid having to re-negotiate every five years. This will provide more security to government and First Nations.

8. General Comment. There is uncertainty with aboriginal rights and title. Although there are CCLUP and various other land use plans out there, First Nations are developing their own land use plans (e.g., the Secwepemcul'ecw are taking a bulls-eye management approach). The real new relationship is in the treaty itself. However, there is recognition that these land use plans are stepping stones to get there.

9. Is the accommodation of the economic interest associated with FROs specific to forest sector?

Yes. Other sectors such as Oil & Gas have entered into different agreements. However, the Leadership Council wants to look at revenue sharing broadly and will therefore be looking across sectors.

CSA Certification Process – Tolko Forest Industries Presentation **Shawn Meisner, Senior Planning Forester, Tolko, Williams Lake Division**

Notes from presentations for information not included in PowerPoint slides

- The Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) is more difficult to implement on a large level. It seems to work better for small woodlots.
- CCLUP covers the first three Canadian Standards Association (CSA) criteria well. It does not seem to cover CSA Criterion 4.
- The purpose of the CSA public process is to determine what's meaningful to the public. What specifically matters on the land base?

Questions and/or Comments

1. Why did Tolko choose CSA over the other two certification schemes (FSC and the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI))?

Two reasons: (1) Tolko's operations stretch through Alberta and Manitoba and CSA certification already existed for these locations and (2) Tolko believes in the public process.

2. What are the differences between FSC and in terms of endangered species management (i.e., with FSC, critical habitat and old growth are netted out as n- logging zones. How does this work for CSA?)

In this area old growth and critical habitat are managed as per CCLUP objectives (i.e., the land use plan has already set aside critical habitat and Old Growth Management Areas (OGMAs)).

3. It sounds like Tolko wants aboriginal input (and to gain Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK)). How will TEK be applied to the forest industry? Along those lines, does Tolko plan on incorporating objectives from the NSTQ land use plan (i.e., will you use it for input and to change practices on the ground)?

Definitely. However, Tolko cannot ignore the CCLUP; but they can use information from the NSTQ land use plan that is not in conflict with CCLUP objectives.

Winona Gordon and the ILMB worked together to see where there was potential conflict between the CCLUP and NSTQ land use plans. They came to an agreement where there were differences and recognized there would be work to do in the future to deal with these. They looked at overlapping values and tried to harmonize information where it could happen.

SFI Certification Process Presentation

Gordon Todd, EMS Coordinator, West Fraser Ltd.

Notes from presentations for information not included in PowerPoint slides

- The Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) is an American system. West Fraser decided to go with this system because the US is their biggest market (it's all about market access).
- Most of the wood that the US mills get is from private land.
- There was recognition that a standard could be moved out to places where the wood is coming from. SFI was designed around acquiring wood from private lands.
- Indicators are not required for every SFI objective. West Fraser has indicators for some and not for others. Indicators are associated with activities that can be tracked and monitored.
- The biggest difference between CSA and SFI is that SFI is a policy-type process. It allows a company to show how they do things by pointing to a normal course of business.
- SFI objectives are broad because they apply to all operations.
- SFI audits the process you are using. It also builds on other initiatives (e.g., CCLUP). Having SFI certification has been helpful as we move into the FRPA world (i.e., professional reliance connection). SFI certification is just another checking system. It's a standard that follows you wherever you're active.

Questions and/or Comments

1. It is clear how the SFI system makes sense in the southern US. However, it doesn't seem to add a lot that is not already covered by FRPA.

What SFI certification does is show that we're practicing good forestry already as a result of BC practices requirements. Also, wood procurement is going to become a more significant part of operating (e.g., with 20% cutback and with increased mill efficiency).

2. How do you deal with endangered species? Do you reduce cut? Do you protect core areas?

Endangered species management is different for every species. For example, with the mountain caribou, habitat areas are already in deferral. West Fraser would not propose any activities in these areas. It becomes tricky in transition areas (e.g., south of Clinton) where there are many blue- and red-listed grassland species (close to forest edge). Whenever a forest company is operating these areas, they need good information on species needs. There is a need for more research related to this. A biologist was hired by West Fraser to look at all species overlapping in West Fraser's operating area and provide detailed recommendations on how to manage for these species and their habitats.

3. If, as a private land owner, I am selling wood to West Fraser, what does that mean in terms of my own forest management practices?

West Fraser will talk to the owner about what they're doing. A discussion will take place related to SFI certification requirements and what may be unacceptable. It does not mean that the owner has to follow West Fraser management procedures in order to be able to sell wood to their mill.

Canim Band – Canim Lake/Caribou Tribal Council/ Management Planning Process Presentation

Dick Hall, Canim Lake Band Forester – Secwepemcul'ecw

Notes from presentations for information not included in PowerPoint slides

- One of the bands' most significant accomplishments to date is the NSTQ land use plan. It is in review right now.
- It is a vehicle for First Nations to express their values associated with land use planning. CCLUP currently stands as *the* higher-level plan. There has been a general recognition that the level of consultation that took place when that plan was developed was not adequate.
- Where does the NSTQ land use plan fit in? First Nations would like to see it on par with the CCLUP.
- The big difference between these plans from a First Nations perspective is that the NSTQ identifies (spatially) specific areas that are of significance to them.
- Part of the reason to have this session was to broaden the perspective of what is happening now and how to fit the NSTQ plan into these initiatives.

- Another way of injecting First Nations values into land use planning is through the treaty process. Chapters within the treaty process that are trying to entrench FN values and meaningful involvement within traditional territories.
- Within the Cariboo Tribal Council there are two Chapters: the Forestry and Range Chapter and the Natural Resource Management Chapter. These Chapters are trying to entrench First Nations values and meaningful involvement within traditional territories.
- All comes back to the sustainability of resources including fish, wildlife, and all other values so that they are still there generations down the road.

Questions and/or Comments

1. Comment: The NSTQ land use plan is what First Nations want industry to use when developing an FSP. There is a recognition that the NSTQ land use plan needs to be adaptable.
2. How close is the NSTQ plan to being ratified?

It was just brought to the Board's attention yesterday. However, for tribal council and community members, this work is very time-consuming.

FORREX – The Role of Continuous Learning Presentation

Chris Hollstedt - FORREX

Notes from presentations for information not included in PowerPoint slides

- How does the best and more current information fit into planning and decision making?
- FORREX is a broker of information and knowledge from the people who have it to the people who need it.
- It is intended to help enable a knowledge-based society.

Wrap-up – Conclusions and Recommendations

Dick Hall, Canim Lake Band Forester

The whole concept behind sustainability is the goal of a co-operative and balanced approach to Sustainable Forest Management (SFM). We have to work co-operatively if we want to achieve SFM. This session was just an overview but it did a good job of touching on the role of various organizations and agencies.

To follow up from this workshop, people should think about where we should be focussing our energies now, given what we've learned today. It would be helpful to hold more workshops and continue to co-operate with the various groups here today. It is important to avoid re-inventing the wheel, so the extension of the knowledge that's out there is really important. Hopefully we can bring it all together and always evaluate and adjust what we're doing to ensure we are continuously getting better.

SESSION EVALUATION RESULTS

1. How worthwhile was this information session to you?

Sixty-nine percent of respondents said that the information session was very worthwhile or worthwhile. Twenty-six percent felt that it was somewhat worthwhile. No respondents felt that the information session was not at all worthwhile.

2. How would you rate the quality of the information session's organization?

Sixty-nine percent of respondents stated that the information session's organization was excellent or very good while the remaining participants felt that the information session was somewhat well organized.

3. Overall, how would you rate the quality of the information session's presentations?

Fifty percent of respondents felt that the overall quality of the presentations was good to excellent. The remaining fifty percent felt that the quality of the presentations was somewhat good.

4. Specific comments regarding the usefulness of the presentations

Information session participants were asked to provide specific comments regarding the usefulness of the presentations given. The following statements reflect the feedback from those responding to the evaluation survey.

- Presentations were good from a higher level perspective. It highlighted the level of complexity that is involved when engaging government and the users of the land. There appears to be still a massive void between the two groups and the challenge remains how do we do a better job of bridging the gap?
- Certification of timber/forest products – good sound values shared by everyone – get over the control mind set. BC could sustain everyone long into the future.
- I would have liked to have heard where the Cariboo Tribal Council is at in the treaty process and would have liked to receive presentations by all four first nations of CTC.
- Damn good closing by Dick.
- Importance of networking, critical to decision making, negotiating natural resources.
- Good collaboration done throughout.
- Forestry and land use plan.
- Room was cold most of the day. A variety of presentations – it was a lot of PowerPoint.
- Expecting more from First Nations – where they are at with the various processes – successes with FROs, etc.
- Difficult to hear the speakers.
- All presentations allowed insight to the processes and how the NSTQ can become increasingly involved with LUPs, etc.

- Overall it was great. Just couldn't hear some of the questions being asked. To increase clarity everyone uses the microphone.
- Round-robin poster sessions would work well with these topics. Introduce participants if dialogue desired.

5. Did this information session increase your awareness of:

- a) The Federal Wild Salmon and Species at Risk Strategies:
Eight-four percent of the respondents felt that the information session increased their awareness of the Federal Wild Salmon and Species at Risk Strategies.
- b) The Sustainable Resource Management Planning Process:
Eighty-eight percent indicated that the information session increased their awareness of the Sustainable Resource Management Planning Process.
- c) The Ministry of Forest and Range Forest Stewardship Planning Process:
Ninety-two percent of the respondents felt that the session increased their awareness of the Forest Stewardship Planning Process.
- d) The Ministry of Forest and Range Forest Resource Evaluation Program:
Eighty-five percent indicated that the session increased their awareness of the Forest Resource Evaluation Process.
- e) The Ministry of Forest and Range Timber Supply Analysis Process:
Sixty-eight percent of respondents felt that the information session increased their awareness of the Timber Supply Analysis Process.
- f) The Forest Practices Board Auditing Practices and Procedures Process:
Sixty-nine percent of respondents indicated that the session increased their awareness of the Forest Practices Board Auditing and Procedures Process.
- g) The "New Relationship:"
Eighty-one percent of respondents felt that the session increased their awareness of the "New Relationship."
- h) Tolko Ltd.'s Canadian Standards Association Certification Process:
Seventy-six percent of respondents indicated that the session increased their awareness of Tolko Ltd.'s Canadian Standards Association Certification Process.
- i) West Fraser Ltd.'s Sustainable Forestry Initiative:
Seventy percent of respondents indicated that they had increased their awareness of West Fraser Ltd.'s Sustainable Forestry Initiative.
- j) FORREX Forest Research Extension Partnership's Continuous Learning:
Eighty-five percent of respondents indicated increased awareness of the role of Continuous Learning.

6. As a result of this information session, I plan to

Information session participants were asked to say what they will do as a result of this information session. The following statements reflect the feedback from those responding to the evaluation survey.

- Continue to network with people who input and manage the landscape. Will inform my co-workers of what I have learned. Will try harder to network with First Nations in my sphere of influence.
- Keep looking at FORREX site for updates.
- Maintain contacts.
- Do more research.
- Attend more of these sessions and get out of the office more and talk to agencies/First Nations.
- Distribute to portfolio holders.
- Ask Canim Band *et al.* to go over their land use plan values with me to incorporate them into the FSP where applicable and practicable.
- Build relationships, try to share knowledge, find more tools to assist with contacts and connections with various sectors.
- Further study of various initiatives to better understand linkages. Also follow up with new contacts made.
- Attend more meetings and research it to death.
- Follow up with Dick to see how we can increase planning communications.
- Investigate.
- See where we fit into Canim's planning of information-sharing process.
- Follow up by looking at some of the Web sites that were provided.
- Build relationships with individual First Nation Bands more.
- Write a brief report in regards to how much I knew and to what was broadened.
- Do more research that applies to this community!

7. Additional Comments from Participants

- Could have been more oriented to First Nations issues and participation. Many talks were pretty bland.
- What is the next step? How will this stewardship, sustainability, and capacity-building initiative be followed up and continued? Great idea, nice to see the First Nations community taking the lead in bringing the players together to discuss Stewardship and Sustainability.
- Possibly more use of the microphone for questions and answers. More space for the email address in the follow up required section.
- Topics gave good overview of the Forest Industry and Government's roles.
- Great lunch, nice to see water and fruit for snacks! Great job!
- First Nations impacts assessment to NSQT and a First Nations Leadership to treaty. Ed John would be a great guest speaker.

- **FORCE** use of microphone by presenters and by persons asking questions. Audience is being lost. Increase pace of the day. Examples of where aboriginal knowledge as been incorporated would have been useful.
- A well-run, well thought-out day. Thanks!
- Would be useful to have an overview on NATQ LUP Process. Good initiative and opportunity to network.
- Keep it simple so that the elders can understand.
- Suggestion to have everyone move closer to the speakers. There were a lot of empty spaces.
- Suggest providing a participants list for further networking. Would have been a good forum for presenting the NSTQ Land Use Plan – even in draft.
- Couldn't hear a lot of speakers.
- It would have been great to hear from an archeological point of view also. They are in the mix of all these companies and organizations.

APPENDIX 1: STEWARDSHIP AND SUSTAINABILITY WORKSHOP EVALUATION

Thank you for taking a few minutes to give us your feedback. This will help us plan future activities.

1. How worthwhile was this information session to you?

Very worthwhile					Not at all worthwhile
1	2	3	4	5	6

2. How would you rate the quality of the information session’s organization?

Excellent					Poor
1	2	3	4	5	6

3. Overall, how would you rate the quality of the information session’s presentations?

Excellent					Poor
1	2	3	4	5	6

4. Please provide any additional/more specific comments regarding the usefulness of the presentations (please specify the presentation you are referring to if possible):

Meeting information session objectives:

5. How much has this information session increased your awareness of:

a. The Federal Wild Salmon and Species at Risk strategies:

Very much					Not at all
1	2	3	4	5	6

b. The Sustainable Resource Management Planning Process:

Very much					Not at all
1	2	3	4	5	6

c. The Ministry of Forests and Range Forest Stewardship Planning Process:

Very much					Not at all
1	2	3	4	5	6

d. The Ministry of Forests and Range Timber Supply Analysis Process:

Very much					Not at all
1	2	3	4	5	6

e. The Ministry of Forests and Range Forest Resources Evaluation Program Process:

Very much					Not at all
1	2	3	4	5	6

f. The Forest Practices Board Auditing Practices and Procedures Process:

Very much
1 2 3 4 5 Not at all
6

g. The “New Relationship” Update:

Very much
1 2 3 4 5 Not at all
6

h. Tolko Ltd’s Canadian Standards Association Certification Process:

Very much
1 2 3 4 5 Not at all
6

i. West Fraser Ltd’s Sustainable Forestry Initiative :

Very much
1 2 3 4 5 Not at all
6

j. FORREX Forest Research Extension Partnership’s Continuous Learning:

Very much
1 2 3 4 5 Not at all
6

6. Please complete the following sentence:

As a result of this information session, I plan to...

7. Please provide us with any additional comments you have regarding the usefulness of the various topics covered in this information session. Include suggestions for improvements to the information session overall.

8. Is follow-up required: Yes _____ No _____

If Yes, please provide your contact information:

Name: _____ Email: _____ Phone: _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR INPUT!!

APPENDIX 2: STEWARDSHIP AND SUSTAINABILITY WORKSHOP EVALUATION SUMMARY

Thank you for taking a few minutes to give us your feedback. This will help us plan future activities.

1. How worthwhile was this information session to you?

Very worthwhile					Not at all worthwhile
1	2	3	4	5	6

Average: 2.31

2. How would you rate the quality of the information session's organization?

Excellent					Poor
1	2	3	4	5	6

Average: 2.31

3. Overall, how would you rate the quality of the information session's presentations?

Excellent					Poor
1	2	3	4	5	6

Average: 2.54

4. Please provide any additional/more specific comments regarding the usefulness of the presentations (please specify the presentation you are referring to if possible): *(See p.13 of Summary Report)*

Meeting information session objectives:

5. How much has this information session increased your awareness of:

a. The Federal Wild Salmon and Species at Risk strategies:

Very much					Not at all
1	2	3	4	5	6

Average: 2.84

b. The Sustainable Resource Management Planning Process:

Very much					Not at all
1	2	3	4	5	6

Average: 2.96

c. The Ministry of Forests and Range Forest Stewardship Planning Process:

Very much					Not at all
1	2	3	4	5	6

Average: 2.65

d. The Ministry of Forests and Range Timber Supply Analysis Process:

Very much					Not at all
1	2	3	4	5	6

Average: 2.73

