

**DMI Response and Action Plan to the May 2008 PAC DFMP Review
August 13, 2008**

The following items are taken from the PAC review (dated May 10, 2008) of March 12 DFMP Summary Document. Individual items have been clipped from the letter and organized into like responses. The information contained within are proposed reactions to be tabled for discussion and possible editing at the PAC meeting August 13, 2008.

Item 1:

PAC was given copies of the revision at the end of March 2008 and asked for their thoughts and Gap Analysis by the April 28 2008 PAC meeting. We had expected to see the document much earlier in the year

PRPD Interpretation	PRPD Comment	Action	Timeline
There is frustration with pace and lack of progress.	We predict timelines to the best of our ability. There are often many unexpected time delays – it is the nature of our business.	PRPD Planning Team will implement Gantt chart project planning. Review of the Gannt will become a regular agenda item. PRPD will attempt to better inform PAC on agendas and ‘curriculum’	Implement at September meeting

Item 2:

Most members at the meeting expressed concern that they had not had enough time to review the document in as much detail as they would like. Several members stated that they reserved the right to add to this summary in the future, when they had had enough time to complete their reviews.

PRPD Interpretation	PRPD Comment	Action	Timeline
PAC review of final product requires at least 8 weeks	We understand, but timelines are tight.	PRPD will schedule the required time in the Gantt plan.	Implement by September 2008.
Comment on DFMP and other products may be received at any time.	The role of PAC is to provide ongoing input on any forest management related topic. PRPD fully expects that any PAC member will provide commentary at any time.	PRPD will host discussion as appropriate when topics are tabled	Ongoing. New issues will be dealt with at the next available meeting or discussed and scheduled for a future date as meeting time allows.

Item 3:

Members had a hard time deciphering the technical language. In the future we would like a parallel document produced for us, either in layman's language, or one with a running explanation of the technical statements.

PRPD Interpretation	PRPD Comment	Action	Timeline
Self explanatory	The 2008 Summary Document serves multiple audiences – technical reviewers and public. As such there is detailed technical language within. It is exceedingly	Upon ARD approval of the 2008 document, PRPD will produce a 10 page executive summary aimed at the non-technical audience. The 2010 DFMP will be	Target: December 2008.

	difficult to describe detailed technical material in very simple terms – BUT we will try!	professionally edited to attempt a more ‘layman’s’ language.	
--	---	--	--

Item 4:

The coarse filter approach doesn’t meet my needs. I want more measurable, discrete and tangible evidence. Use more of a fine filter approach, the coarse filter stuff is old, there must be more advanced research out there

Need more measured end results for indicators and targets

Overall it was felt that there was too much of a gap between the VOIT statements and the values that PAC members have for the forest. We can’t really see evidence of how the VOITS meet our needs, The “build it and they will come” method is too open ended for our liking.

PRPD Interpretation	PRPD Comment	Action	Timeline
More VOIT discussion is required. Perhaps some outside expertise is required to summarize ‘state-of-the-art’.	The coarse filter approach is definitely not ‘old’ in management science timescales. The DMI 1999 DFMP was the first in Alberta to attempt it on a wholesale level and that plan is yet to be fully implemented.	PRPD will specifically discuss Objectives, Indicators, and Targets so that we as a group establish VOITs that are sufficiently measureable, discrete, and tangible.	Ongoing

Item 5:

Species book. Good start but only 148 species listed. Look at more than 8 mammals, why is there nothing on Marten, Coyotes, Beaver. These need to be addressed.

PRPD Interpretation	PRPD Comment	Action	Timeline
These are VOITs coming out in laymen's language.	<p>The species book is meant to address species at risk.</p> <p>The named species are obviously valuable fur bearers and this comment establishes a clear VOIT request.</p>	<p>Specifically seek trapper input into VOIT process.</p> <p>Use discussion to draw similar VOIT requests out of other PAC members if they are required</p>	December 2008

Item 6:

Needs to discuss habitat requirements of species in more detail and look at inter-species interaction more.

PRPD Interpretation	PRPD Comment	Action	Timeline
More VOIT discussion required	Unsure what about species interaction	Cover in VOITs	December 2008

Item 7:*Needs more coniferous retention*

PRPD Interpretation	PRPD Comment	Action	Timeline
Self explanatory VOIT request	Conifer operators involved need to directly address	PRPD will ensure that conifer operators respond / address the VOIT request. Specifically invite conifer operators to meeting(s) to discuss specific conifer concerns	December 2008

Item 8:*Larger partial retention areas in known active trap lines.*

PRPD Interpretation	PRPD Comment	Action	Timeline
There is a perceived problem with the current retention size distribution?	We were unaware that there was a concern with retention size. We do not have inventory on active vs non-active trap lines. This could be modeled as an alternative strategy to be pondered for selection as the preferred management	1) Follow up with trapping stakeholder(s) to clarify VOIT request. 2) If required, develop 'active' trapline inventory 3) Model the request as an alternate scenario	1) October 2008 2) December 2008 3) February 2009

	strategy		
--	----------	--	--

Item 9:

More uneven aged management

PRPD Interpretation	PRPD Comment	Action	Timeline
VOIT request	<p>What specifically constitutes 'more'?</p> <p>What do you want managed 'uneven-aged'?</p> <p>To what end?</p>	Specifically address in VOIT discussion	December 2008

Item 10:

We want a whole lot more transparency

PRPD Interpretation	PRPD Comment	Action	Timeline
	<p>Transparency concerning what aspect of our relationship?</p> <p>We sincerely believe that there is not a single forestry company in Canada involved in CSA SFM that is as transparent as DMI.</p>	Follow up discussion and schedule required actions	August 2008

Item 11:

Measurable values must have quantifiable parameters. e.g.; #110. Target is 100%- of what?

Pg 120. Question. Is it possible the “Alberta pays compensation” will really happen. This needs clarification and is an example of the unclear language throughout the document

Table 272 needs volume/seral stage column to aid in clarification.

Generally it was felt that there was too much ambiguity in the language in the document. We would like to see more defined language.

PRPD Interpretation	PRPD Comment	Action	Timeline
PRPD has asked the public members to undertake a daunting task – grab a large technical document and digest it in a short time frame. There is a lot of room for improvement as the PAC had difficulty reviewing the material.	We need to improve the clarity of the message. The layman’s executive summary is required	Provide more review time in future with opportunity for question/answer sessions. Implement executive summary and professional edit of 2010 document.	Ongoing December 2008 September 2009

Item 12 :

Better erosion control

PRPD Interpretation	PRPD Comment	Action	Timeline
A misinterpretation / false perception?	There are numerous VOITs addressing erosion. What / where specifically is there a problem?	Specifically discuss in VOIT process	December 2008.

Item 13:

Need retention areas and buffers to be more wind firm. Re-design these areas to last for quite a few years

PRPD Interpretation	PRPD Comment	Action	Timeline
A misinterpretation / false perception?	Perhaps we have inadequately explained the goals of retention. They are designed to fall down over time as in nature following fire. Are there specific areas where this is known to be problematic? We have not identified them.	Specifically address in the VOIT discussions.	December 2008

Item 14:

During the training of contractors, DMI needs to get more information to them about others that are using the same area.

PRPD Interpretation	PRPD Comment	Action	Timeline
Process change request?	We have had little focused discussion to date on processes or training. Is this a trapping issue?	Follow up to find the details. Work towards a mutually acceptable action plan to address the concern	September 2008

Item 15:

Land owners should be able to sell wood directly to DMI. See 7.1 pg 161.
This doesn't allow for small operators

PRPD Interpretation	PRPD Comment	Action	Timeline
	DMI purchases as much as 300,000m ³ of wood per year directly from land owners. DMI does have a small contractor program. The description in the summary document is not detailed enough	Clarify concern and set action plan if required. Strengthen this written section in next document.	September 2008 September 2009