

Tolko SFM Plan
Report on Satisfaction Survey
of
SFM Committee and Interested Parties

Introduction

To promote adaptive management in terms of the continuing operation of the Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) Committee, and the desire to provide mechanisms for continual improvement, Tolko Manitoba has commissioned this survey in order to gauge the level of satisfaction of participants with the public involvement process for SFM on the Defined Forest Area (DFA) and to provide the opportunity for participants to offer input on strengths and weaknesses of the current process. The survey has been conducted as two components to measure the satisfaction of the membership of the SFM Committee and of the interested parties on the Tolko Manitoba Forest Management License Area No. 2 (Defined Forest Area) who have been included in mail-outs of information on the Company's SFM development process.

The results will be utilized to provide a mechanism for improvement in the operation of the SFM committee and the interaction of the Company with interested parties as the SFM Plan is implemented. The results will also be documented within the SFM Report in terms of the progress made towards achievement of the target set for Indicator 6.3.1.1.1 within the SFM Plan Performance Framework for the DFA. Indicator 6.3.1.1.1 has been established to measure and report upon the degree of satisfaction with the public participation component of the planning process for the DFA. The target established for this indicator is to achieve a satisfaction level such that the majority of the SFM Committee members responding to the survey indicate being satisfied (or better) with the public participation process of the SFM Committee.

Privacy of the Survey

For all participants of the survey, steps have been taken to ensure that the survey has been answered in a confidential manner. The process put into place by the Company in implementation of the survey included the use of a consultant to design, receive, compile and report on the results of the survey. The responses from participants have been mailed directly to the consultant for compilation. The responses of the survey have been compiled in a summary format for provision of the results to Tolko. The results are also being provided back to the committee in summary form. It is then expected that these results will be used by the Company and by the committee in order to promote improved participation of the committee in SFM for the Forest Management License Area No. 2 (Defined Forest Area).

Compilation of the Results

For most of the questions the respondents were requested to provide a ranking of their satisfaction with that aspect of the operation of the committee or the communication and involvement with the interested parties in terms of:

- Very Satisfied;
- Somewhat Satisfied;
- Somewhat Unsatisfied;
- Very Unsatisfied; and,
- No Opinion.

A few of the survey questions were of a somewhat different format with instructions provided for each question.

For each question, the opportunity was also offered for the committee member to document any additional detailed comments that they may have had pertaining to that subject area.

In order to maximize the value of undertaking this survey and to provide for a reasonable turn-around in terms of getting feedback back to the SFM Committee participants were asked to complete and return the survey as quickly as possible. Survey participants were requested to return the completed survey no later than December 31st, 2004.

For SFM Committee members in attendance at the December 1st, 2004 meeting the survey was distributed directly to participants. The survey was mailed out to remaining Committee members and to the interested parties on the Company's contact list with instructions to complete and return directly to GeoSpatial Consulting using the enclosed self addressed and stamped envelop provided in the package.

GeoSpatial Consulting was contracted by Tolko Manitoba to conduct this survey, to compile the results and to provide a summary of the findings to the Company for its use and for the information of the SFM Committee.

The original questionnaire surveys were utilized as a template for reporting of the survey results in order to provide a familiar background for review by the committee. The individual survey responses were compiled using an EXCEL spreadsheet in order to enable calculation of the percentage of responses falling within each of the identified categories. These responses were then compiled and transferred to this reporting document for summary of the results. The results for both the SFM Committee Members survey and the Interested Parties survey have been captured in this report.

The surveys have been compiled based upon responses received as of January 31st, 2005. This allowed for a period of approximately 2 months from the time that the surveys were

distributed out to participants at the SFM Committee meeting on December 1st, 2004 and subsequent immediate mail-out to interested parties.

Response to the Surveys

The total response to the survey was as follows:

- SFM Committee Member Survey – 10 responses received.
- Interested Parties Survey – 6 responses received.

As such, a total of 16 survey responses were received out of 94 surveys distributed out to the SFM Committee (39) and to Interested Parties (55) for a response rate of 26% from the committee and 11% from interested parties.

Summary of Results

SFM Committee Member Survey

Summary of Expression of Satisfaction

The overall response of all respondents who completed and returned the survey from the membership of the SFM Committee is summarized in the table below. This summary is based upon the overall total response indicated for all questions for which a rating of satisfaction was requested:

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
51 %	40 %	6 %	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied			91 %
Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied			6 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			3 %

Principle Strengths

Within the SFM Committee survey, respondents were requested to list principle strengths of the process. From the suggestions provided, the following summary of strengths has been prepared in order to attempt to capture the essential strengths indicated by the respondents. This listing is a result of review and integration of the suggestions provided in the returned surveys and is not listed in any particular order of priority.

- The Committee provides a public consultation process that builds on Company and public volunteer participation, commitment and sharing of knowledge to develop, implement and follow-up on a national forest management standard through a locally applied consultation process.
- The ongoing nature of the process allows the participants to be kept aware of the Company's commitment and follow-through on the SFM Plan and other forest

management plans to see how their concerns are treated and to have further input for handling of ongoing issues and concerns.

- The use of a structured facilitated process with operating ground rules for the committee has enabled an open process for the involvement of communities, resource users and other interested parties to provide input to decision-making for the license area.
- The number and variety of stakeholders brought together through the committee provides the opportunity to give voice to stakeholder issues and concerns, improves the incorporation of public values in forest management planning and enhances the awareness of all parties.

Principle Areas for Improvement

Within the SFM Committee survey, respondents were requested to list principle areas requiring improvement as the process continues. From the suggestions provided, the following summary of suggestions for improvement has been prepared in order to attempt to capture the essential suggestions of the respondents. This listing is a result of review and integration of the suggestions provided in the returned surveys and is not listed in any particular order of priority.

- Continue efforts to provide education and awareness training opportunities including:
 - Education of staff, contractors and committee members on Aboriginal values
 - Increasing public awareness on forestry
 - Education of contractors operating on the license area
 - Education and awareness opportunities for the committee through seeking out speakers from government and other organizations on pertinent areas of interest and concern to the committee
 - Use of ongoing regular correspondence/newsletters mail-outs to keep stakeholders aware of SFM process to ensure awareness that this is an ongoing process versus a one-time activity.
- Continue to promote and encourage involvement of Aboriginal communities, small communities and other stakeholders in public consultation processes and decision-making for the license area including:
 - Potential establishment of additional regional FRACs
 - Encourage increased representation at local meetings
 - Continue to encourage staff to work with local constituents to provide solutions or partial solutions to their concerns.
- Ensure that the SFM Plan implementation process with the committee includes follow-up on SFM Plan audit findings and re-evaluation of goals, objectives and targets that are easily met or exceeded in order to continue to improve.

- Consider utilization of the SFM Committee as a body to assist the Company in implementation of the SFM Plan and other forest management decision-making processes including:
 - As a study group to review and make recommendations on pro-active approaches to improving forest management
 - Seeking academic and professional input from other jurisdictions to identify opportunities for improvement in local practices
 - Acting as a liaison and/or arbitrator in situations where forest management activities are contentious for local people

Interested Party Survey

Summary of Expression of Satisfaction

The overall response from those interested parties who completed and returned the survey from the Interested Parties mail-out is summarized in the table below. This summary is based upon the overall total response indicated for all questions for which a rating of satisfaction was requested:

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
47 %	10 %	0 %	13 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied	57 %	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied	13 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			30 %

Principle Areas for Improvement

Within the Interested Parties survey, respondents were requested to list principle areas suggested for improvement to the public consultation process, particularly related to the work of the committee in moving forward to implement and monitor the SFM Plan and implement SFM for the Forest Management License Area No. 2. From the suggestions provided, the following summary of suggestions for improvement has been prepared in order to attempt to capture the essential suggestions of the respondents. This listing is a result of review and integration of the suggestions provided in the returned surveys and is not listed in any particular order of priority.

- Encourage ongoing contact and involvement of various stakeholders throughout the forest management planning and implementation of operations
 - Involvement of diverse stakeholders at the grass-roots level (trappers, fishermen, First Nations, etc.)
 - Promote in-field contact with resources users
 - Promote contacts with community representatives

- Consider engagement of relevant expertise to work with the committee and stakeholders for projects such as conducting a High Conservation Values Forest Assessment
- Developing research appropriate to effective monitoring and improved indicators and targets.

Summary and Reporting on Indicator 6.3.1.1.1

This survey has been undertaken in support of commitments made by Tolko for the assessment and reporting of SFM Performance Indicator 6.3.1.1.1 of the performance framework for the DFA.

As part of the management strategy associated with this indicator, Tolko has committed to facilitate this review of the SFM Committee public involvement process annually, with this being the first such review. The review is conducted in order to enable input by the committee members and interested parties on ways and means to maintain the interest of participants and areas requiring improvement. This is one mechanism for promoting continual improvement in the planning process for the DFA.

As described on the fact sheet for Indicator 6.3.1.1.1, the target established for this indicator is stated to be, “the majority of the SFM Committee members responding to the survey being satisfied (or better) with the public participation process of the SFM Committee”. As part of the adaptive management and continual improvement process for the DFA, the Company has committed to continue to support the functioning of the committee (recently united with the ongoing FRAC committee for the DFA), and to assess the satisfaction of the committee membership annually. As described in the fact sheet for this indicator, reporting will commence with the presentation of the results of this survey to the committee and to the management of Tolko. Further annual review will be conducted based upon the results and feedback obtained from the committee on this initial version of the survey.

As indicated above in the summary of the responses for the satisfaction component of the survey the satisfaction level of the SFM Committee members has been reported to be very high with 91% of the responses being satisfied (somewhat or very satisfied). The results of the survey indicate a good level of satisfaction of committee members generally with the process that has been utilized to date to involve the public in the development and implementation of the SFM Plan for the DFA through the development and continuing input of the SFM Committee. The results of this first satisfaction survey are supportive of the committee and the Company’s efforts thus far in achieving the target established for this indicator.

Though not established as a part of the assessment process for Indicator 6.3.1.1.1, the Company has also requested a component to this survey to assess the satisfaction of the interested parties who have been continuing to receive information on the proceedings of

the SFM Committee as the process has unfolded. The overall satisfaction indicated by the interested parties has been assessed in this survey at 57%; however, as indicated in the results, there was also a relatively high level of responses whereby “no opinion” was expressed by the respondent. This may not be surprising given that the interested parties are less directly involved in the process and as such, may not feel themselves to be in a position to comment as strongly one way or the other. In addition, the number of responses received was relatively low at only 11% or 6 responses out of 55 surveys mailed out.

Overall, the level of satisfaction with the public participation process involving the SFM Committee has been described as good by the participants of the survey. The operation of the committee (facilitation, agenda, minutes, etc.), support by the Company (including presentations and information response), the openness of the proceedings, and the contribution of the process to decision-making in planning for the DFA were all generally rated as being satisfactory (very or somewhat satisfied) by the respondents. A desire to promote further First Nations participation and to continue to build upon the current representation on the committee to expand the values represented are noted as areas that respondents felt should be strengthened.

Detailed Survey Results

The detailed results of the surveys are presented in the following two sections to describe the responses received from the members of the SFM Committee and from the Interested Parties.

SFM Committee Survey Results

1. How satisfied are you with the degree to which the goals of the process have been carried out in respect of development of an SFM Plan in accordance with the Canadian Standards Association Guidelines and to develop procedures for monitoring the effectiveness of the SFM Plan?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
50 %	50 %	0 %	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied			100 %
Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied			0 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

Comments and Suggestions Provided:
Very satisfied, but feel some of the goals and targets could have been more demanding than the status quo that now exists.

2. How satisfied are you that the interests/values of the Forest Management License Area No. 2 are adequately represented by the committee?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
30 %	70 %	0 %	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied			100 %
Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied			0 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

Comments and Suggestion Provided:
The committee could use some community representatives, but that is always a problem.
Generally good. It is difficult to have all represented – big FML Area, lots of issues, limited number of people available to participate. Should have more government people present, especially from Winnipeg and Wildlife Branch.

3. How satisfied are you that aboriginal interests/values of the Forest Management License Area No. 2 are adequately represented by the committee?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
20 %	50 %	30 %	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied	70 %	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied	30 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

Comments and Suggestions Provided:
The Aboriginal input should be more widespread across the license area.
Métis participation very good. Treaty participation lacking.

4. How satisfied are you with the schedule of meeting dates that has been used and the frequency at which meetings of the committee are held?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
40 %	50 %	10 %	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied	90 %	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied	10 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

Comments and Suggestions Provided:
Meetings should be every 2 – 3 months.
Overall good. Lots of “stuff” to do in timeframe allocated.

5. How satisfied are you with the agenda process that has been utilized including consideration of:

- An agenda prepared and available for each meeting
- Agenda allows for input by the committee membership for new agenda items
- Agenda agreed to prior to commencement of the meeting itself
- Agenda followed and all agenda items addressed

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
60 %	40 %	0 %	0 %

Very or Somewhat Satisfied	100 %	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied	0 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

Comments and Suggestions Provided:
The process has been very good and allows for a lot of input – issues cannot be put on hold – they must be resolved.

6. How satisfied are you with the minutes that have been produced to capture the discussions of the committee including consideration of:

- Minutes capture the essence of the discussions of the committee
- Minutes are produced and circulated to the committee membership in a timely manner
- Minutes are reviewed and revised as necessary at the following meeting of the committee

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
70 %	30 %	0 %	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied	100 %	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied	0 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

Comments and Suggestions Provided:
Well done.

7. How satisfied are you with the meeting facility resources provided for meetings of the committee including consideration of:

- Meeting locations
- Meeting room facilities

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
80 %	20 %	0 %	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied	100 %	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied	0 %

Satisfied		Unsatisfied	
Respondents Expressing No Opinion		0 %	

Comments and Suggestions Provided:
Excellent.
Good.

8. How satisfied are you with the presentations made to the committee on forest management and the Forest Management License Area No. 2 by the Company?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
40 %	50 %	10 %	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied	90 %	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied	10 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion		0 %	

Comments and Suggestions Provided:
Lots of expertise provided by the Company, at great expense I might add.
Good for the group assembled.

9. How satisfied are you with the process utilized to identify parking lot issues and to resolve these through committee member participation?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
30 %	40 %	20 %	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied	70 %	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied	20 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion		10 %	

Comments and Suggestions Provided:
This process has been good and issues have been brought back from the parking lot as more information was found.
Some committee members did not follow through with commitments.

10. How satisfied are you with the information being made available to you by the Company for use in the discussions of the committee in terms of the provision of documents and other materials brought forward at the meetings?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
60 %	30 %	0 %	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied			90 %
Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied			0 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			10 %

Comments and Suggestions Provided:
No comments or suggestions provided.

11. How satisfied are you that the roles and responsibilities of members of the committee are clear and have been respected and maintained including consideration of the Operating Ground Rules for the Canadian Standards Association SFM Committee as follows:

- Identification of local values that relate to the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers SFM criteria and critical elements
- Developing objectives that describe desired future state or condition of each value
- Selecting indicators that assess progress towards meeting objectives
- Establishing targets for each indicator that provide statements of expected results
- Developing procedures for monitoring effectiveness of the SFM Plan
- Communicating the progress of the committee to their constituents
- Attending meetings or selecting and briefing an alternate to represent them

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
30 %	40 %	30 %	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied			70 %
Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied			30 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

Comments and Suggestions Provided:

Too many of the parameters are based on not being charged by Conservation. This is not very pro-active. Note: Comment appears to be out of context to the survey question which was intended to relate to the “operating ground rules” for the operation of the SFM Committee.
We can always improve on this. We are not yet perfect.
Sometimes limited due to lack of data available for measurement. This often resulted in default to meeting government guidelines, measuring infractions, etc. (i.e. status Quo is Ok when it may not be). Note: Comment appears to be out of context to the survey question which was intended to relate to the “operating ground rules” for the operation of the SFM Committee.

12. How satisfied are you with the facilitation process that has been utilized to assist the SFM Committee in its work including consideration of:

- Facilitation of the process to follow the agenda agreed to and meet the objectives of the meeting
- Organization of efforts of the committee
- Facilitator maintains a neutral position and focused on running the meeting and achieving the objectives of the agenda as set out and agreed to by the committee
- Facilitator promotes a consensus approach to the proceedings

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
90 %	10 %	0 %	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied	100 %	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied	0 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

Comments and Suggestions Provided:
Very good facilitation.

13. How satisfied are you that the process is maintained as an open process that allows members of the committee to bring forward and express their views in an open manner?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
80 %	20 %	0 %	0 %

Very or Somewhat Satisfied	100 %	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied	0 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion		0 %	

Comments and Suggestions Provided:
No comments or suggestions provided.

14. How satisfied are you with the opportunity provided for all committee members to participate in the discussions to the level that they are most comfortable?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
70 %	30 %	0 %	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied	100 %	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied	0 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion		0 %	

Comments and Suggestions Provided:
No comments or suggestions provided.

15. How satisfied are you with the response and follow-up of the Company to questions and requests for information from the committee?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
50 %	50 %	0 %	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied	100 %	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied	0 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion		0 %	

Comments and Suggestions Provided:
The information is sometimes clouded in government politics.
Overall good. Reluctance by Company at times to make major change to current business as usual. This may be due to lack of information, lack of resources, etc.

16. How satisfied are you that the Company responded to requests made by the Committee to bring in speakers from government and other organizations?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
90 %	0 %	10 %	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied			90 %
Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied			10 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

Comments and Suggestions Provided:
Well done.

17. How satisfied are you with the presentations made and the information provided to the Committee by the outside speakers from government and other organizations, in terms of its value to the discussions of the Committee?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
30 %	70 %	0 %	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied			100 %
Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied			0 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

Comments and Suggestions Provided:
Government could have provided more detail on AAC calculations.
Again, lots of information for most people. May have resulted in information overload.

18. How satisfied are you that the input of the committee is reflected in the decision-making process, particularly in the development of the SFM Plan for the Forest Management License Area No. 2?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
20 %	70 %	10 %	0 %

Very or Somewhat Satisfied	90 %	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied	10 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion		0 %	

Comments and Suggestions Provided:
Generally good. As noted above, noted reluctance at times for Company to go too far beyond business as usual.

19. Have you visited the Tolko Manitoba website at www.tolkomanitoba.com?

Yes	No
60 %	40 %

If you have viewed the website:

How satisfied are you with the presentation of information pertaining to forest management planning and Sustainable Forest Management made available on the website?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
20 %	40 %	0 %	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied	60 %	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied	0 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion		40 %	

Comments and Suggestions:
Need more up-to-date information on public consultation. Meeting minutes from public meetings posted no later than 2 weeks following said meetings.
As indicated earlier, “we” can always improve – it is pretty good.

20. How satisfied are you that the opportunity was made available for committee members to participate as an observer, representing the SFM Committee, on the SFM audit for the Forest Management License Area No. 2?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
----------------	--------------------	----------------------	------------------

50 %	40 %	0 %	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied	90 %	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied	0 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			10 %

Comments and Suggestions:
No comments or suggestions provided.

21. Are you interested to participate in the future as an observer, representing the SFM Committee, on SFM or other audits for the Forest Management License Area No. 2 where the opportunity is available to do so?

Very Interested	Somewhat Interested	Not likely to be Available
60 %	20 %	20 %

Comments and Suggestions Provided:
Yes, I will.
Depending on when and where.

22. Please indicate the level of on-going communication that you have with the constituents/organization whose values you represent on the committee?

Regularly following each meeting	Periodically, several times each year	Generally annually	Infrequently	Not Applicable (No organization represented)
30 %	30 %	20 %	10 %	10 %

Comments and Suggestions Provided:
No comments or suggestions provided.

23. What do you feel should be the principal priorities of the SFM Committee going forward? In the space provided, please rank in order of importance with 1 being the highest priority:

For presentation of the results of this question of the survey, the order of priority based upon overall input from the respondents has been compiled by the greatest number of respondents selecting each of the listed priorities as that order or greater. For example, in the case of the review of performance results (indicators), 5 respondents selected this activity as being of 3rd priority or higher, no other activity was ranked by respondents as higher in the order.

Ranked Order of Priority by Survey Respondents	Listed Activity Priorities
1.	Continue to provide input to Company on non-timber and timber values for the Forest Management License Area No. 2
2.	Review of SFM Plan implementation
3.	Review of performance results (indicators)
4.	Review of SFM and Environmental Management System audit summary results
5.	Provide liaison to resource users
6.	Review of Forest Management Plans
7.	Review of Annual Operating Plans
Other priorities added by respondents:	
Educate youth, schools, etc.	
Re-evaluation after audit with a view to tighten up some of the goals that appear to be easily met.	
Periodic review of identified research needs as outlined in the SFM Plan (i.e. how is the Company doing in finding out). (May be part of Review of SFM Plan implementation).	

24. Please identify the three (3) principle strengths of the public involvement process that has been conducted in the preparation of the SFM Plan for the Forest Management License Area No. 2.

Results from the survey are not deemed to have been listed in any priority order. The principle strengths of the process were identified as follows:

Principle Strengths Listed by Respondents
Public volunteer participation.
Committee input recognized.
Committee observing ground rules.
Allows Tolko to know what concerns the various constituents have with regard to their operations.
Allows the constituents to discuss these concerns with Tolko and other concerned constituents.
Allows the constituents to track Tolko's commitment to its plans to see how their

Principle Strengths Listed by Respondents
concerns are treated and to have further input for handling still unsatisfied concerns.
The commitment of committee members.
The commitment of Company representatives to the task.
The combined knowledge of all participants.
Community level involvement.
Recognition of other resource users.
Consideration of local trappers.
Involves local people in determining future of their surroundings.
Is an open “truth to power” process.
Implements a national standard in a locally formatted approach.
The consultation process.
The number of stakeholders at the table.
The opportunity to give voice to stakeholder concerns.
Enhanced public awareness.
Stakeholder buy-in.
Improved incorporation of public values.

25. Please identify the three (3) principle areas in which you feel improvements could be made to the public involvement process, particularly the work of the committee in moving forward to implement and monitor the SFM Plan and implement SFM for the Forest Management License Area No. 2.

Results from the survey are not deemed to have been listed in any priority order. The principle strengths of the process were identified as follows:

Principle Areas for Improvement listed by Respondents
More public education.
More small community involvement.
Educate contract harvesters.
Tolko, to the extent possible, should work with constituents to provide solutions or partial solutions to their concerns.
Tolko should, in concert with the committee members continue to seek out speakers from government or other organizations on pertinent areas of concern.
Tolko should attempt to further educate staff, contractors and committee members on Aboriginal values.
Aboriginal input across the FML.
Follow-up to audit findings.
Re-evaluation of some of the goals that continue to be easily met.
Greater representation at local meetings.
More consideration for local concerns.
Greater concern shown for disruption of wildlife habitat.
SFM Committee should attempt to act as a liaison/arbitrator in areas where

Principle Areas for Improvement listed by Respondents
management of timber is contentious for local people.
SFM Committee should study and make recommendations on pre-active approaches to improving forest management.
SFM Committee should seek academic and professional input from other jurisdictions to help identify improvement opportunities in local practices.
More stakeholder involvement.
We can always do a better job of communicating with the public.
Establishment of additional regional FRACs that provide information on SFM Plan, etc.
Periodic review of the SFM Plan and audits with objective of seeking input for improvement.
Regular correspondence/newsletters that get mailed out to keep in contact with stakeholders and to inform them this is an ongoing process versus just a one time effort.

FML Area No. 2 Interested Parties Survey Results

1. How satisfied are you with the content and presentation of material that has been provided to you including consideration of:

- Information is clear and unambiguous
- Material is in a form that is easy to follow and understand
- Information relates to your values and interests in the Forest Management License Area No. 2
- Relevance of background planning and other information on the Forest Management License Area to decision-making

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
67 %	17 %	0 %	16 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied			84 %
Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied			16 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

Comments and Suggestions Provided:
No community consultation and accommodation for land users effected. Note: Comment appears to be out of context to the survey question which was intended to relate to the satisfaction with the materials provided to interested parties in mail-outs.

2. How satisfied are you with the minutes that have been produced to capture the discussions of the SFM Committee including consideration of:

- Minutes are provided in a timely manners as related to the date of each meeting of the committee
- Minutes are clear and understandable

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
83 %	0 %	0 %	17 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied			83 %
Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied			17 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

Comments and Suggestions Provided:
Too long and redundant, too many formalities and not enough facts.

3. How satisfied are you that the interests/values of the Forest Management License Area No. 2 are adequately represented and considered as described in the minutes of the SFM Committee and through the Tolko Manitoba website and other materials that you have received?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
50 %	17 %	0 %	17 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied			67 %
Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied			17 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			16 %

Comments and Suggestions Provided:
It seems only certain people are aware of Tolko FML – no information is being presented to grass roots people.
Interests and values are represented on the committee but the final CSA indicators and targets did not, in a number of cases, reflect those interests adequately.

4. Have you called upon the Company directly to request information or to follow-up on a concern?

Yes – I have been in direct contact with a Company representative (in person, phone, email, letter, FAX, other)	No – I have not.
17 %	83 %

If you have been in contact with the Company, how satisfied are you with the response of the Company to questions and requests for information relating to your point of interest or concern?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
17 %	0 %	0 %	17 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied			17 %
Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied			17 %

Respondents Expressing No Opinion	66 %
-----------------------------------	------

Comments and Suggestions Provided:
No comments or suggestions provided.

5. Are you in contact or have on-going communication with a representative of the Forest Resource Advisory Committee (FRAC) and/or SFM Committee?

Regularly following each meeting	Periodically, several times each year	Generally annually	Not very often
17 %	33 %	17 %	33 %

Comments and Suggestions Provided:
Only when we see trees being harvested are we then aware of Tolko harvesting. Too much work done in secret. No public involvement. Note: Comment appears to be out of context to the survey question which was intended to relate to the level of contact of the interested parties with representatives of the SFM Committee.

6. Please identify the three (3) principle strengths of the public involvement process that has been conducted in the preparation of the SFM Plan for the Forest Management License Area No. 2.

Principle Strengths
Wide scope of consultation.
Group meetings.
Individual contact.
The follow-up of each meeting.
Keeping involvement.
Professional facilitation, which enabled a thorough canvassing of points of view and productive discussion.
Transparency through minutes and web site.

7. Please identify the three (3) principle areas in which you feel improvements could be made to the public involvement process, particularly the work of the committee in moving forward to implement and monitor the SFM Plan and implement SFM for the Forest Management License Area No. 2.

Results from the survey are not deemed to have been listed in any priority order. The principle strengths of the process were identified as follows:

Principle Areas for Improvement listed by Respondents
More grass roots people involved. More trappers, fishermen, First Nation involvement in the process. Proper consultation process for effected communities.
No recognition for agreements in existence.
No accountability.
Community contact.
In field contact.
Diversity.
Engagement of relevant expertise working with committee and stakeholders for projects such as conducting a High Conservation Values Forest Assessment (see FSC and Tembec)
Developing research appropriate to effective monitoring and improved indicators and targets.

8. Have you visited the Tolko Manitoba website at www.tolkomanitoba.com?

Yes	No
34 %	66 %

If you have viewed the website, how satisfied are you with the presentation of information pertaining to forest management planning and Sustainable Forest Management made available on the website?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
17 %	17 %	0 %	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied	34 %	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied	0 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			66 %

Comments and Suggestions Provided:
No comments or suggestions provided.

9. What do you feel should be the principal priorities for provision of information on the Tolko Manitoba website? In the space provided, please rank in order of importance with 1 being the highest priority the material that should be placed on the website:

For presentation of the results of this question of the survey, the order of priority based upon overall input from the respondents has been compiled by the greatest number of respondents selecting each of the listed priorities as that order or greater, with consideration also given to the overall number of respondents who indicated a priority value to that activity.

Ranked Order of Priority by Survey Respondents	Listed Activity Priorities
1.	Provide liaison to resource users
2.	Review of performance results (indicators)
3.	Updates of Forest Management Planning process
4.	Advisory notices for Annual Plan Information and other meetings to be held across the DFA
5.	Updates of Annual Operating Planning process
6.	Updates of SFM Plan implementation
7.	Review of SFM and Environmental Management System audit summary results
8.	Continue to receive copies of minutes of Forest Resource Advisory Committee (FRAC) and/or SFM Committee meeting minutes
Other priorities added by respondents:	
Archival source of basic planning documents – long term and annual.	
Simplified reader-friendly presentations of material in periodic newsletters (reference LP).	
Web links to other relevant sources and discussion of issues.	