

**Tolko SFM Plan**  
**Report on 2006 Satisfaction Survey**  
**of**  
**FRAC Committee and Interested Parties**

**INTRODUCTION**

To maintain the adaptive management and continual improvement process in terms of the continuing operation of the Forest Resource Advisory Committee (FRAC) for the Forest Management License (FML) Area No. 2 Defined Forest Area (DFA), Tolko Manitoba has commissioned this satisfaction survey. The survey is intended to gauge the satisfaction of participants with the public involvement process for SFM on the DFA and to provide the opportunity for participants to offer input on strengths and weaknesses of the current process.

For this iteration of the survey, a single survey form, which included two components, has been utilized to measure the satisfaction of: (1) the membership of the FRAC Committee, and, (2) of the interested parties (including FRAC members), on the Tolko Manitoba Forest Management License Area No. 2 DFA who have been included in mail-outs of information on the Company's SFM process.

The results will be utilized to provide a mechanism for improvement in the operation of the FRAC committee and the interaction of the Company with interested parties as the SFM Plan continues to be implemented. The results will also be documented within the SFM Annual 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 FRAC Committee members responding to the survey indicate being satisfied (or better) with the public participation process of the FRAC 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 FRAC committee in SFM for the Forest Management License Area No. 2 DFA.

## 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 of those questions. 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 May 31<sup>st</sup>, 2006.

The survey was mailed out to FRAC 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 FRAC 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 total of all Interested Parties component and for the FRAC Committee Members only component of the survey have been captured in this report.

The surveys have been compiled based upon responses received as of June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2006. This allowed for a period of approximately 1.5 months from the time that the surveys were mailed out to FRAC Committee members and to interested parties.

## SUMMARY OF RESULTS

### Response to the Surveys

The total response to the survey was as follows:

- FRAC Committee Members – 9 responses received.
- Interested Parties – 6 responses received.

As such, a total of 15 survey responses were received out of 75 surveys distributed out to the FRAC Committee (46) and to Interested Parties (29) for a response rate of 20% from the committee and 21% from interested parties.

### Combined FRAC and Interested Parties Survey Component

The first component of the 2006 survey was for surveying the satisfaction of all interested parties, including FRAC Committee members, in terms of the overall public consultation process being utilized by Tolko Manitoba in implementation of the SFM Plan for the FML Area No. 2 DFA.

### Summary of Expression of Satisfaction

The overall response from those FRAC Committee members and other interested parties who completed and returned the survey mail-out is summarized in the table below. This summary relates to the first portion of the survey (questions 1 to 9) which pertained to both FRAC members and other interested parties combined. 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
32 %	43 %	10 %	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied	75 %	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied	10 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			15 %

#### Note:

In response to the survey questionnaire, one party provided feedback in the form of a letter with indication that it was felt by this party that there had been insufficient meetings held of the FRAC Committee for the person to provide an informed response. As a result, this party did not complete the survey form, and no entry has been made within the survey results for this survey. This party's comment regarding the frequency of FRAC meetings has been entered as a comment under Survey Question 14.

A second party provided feedback in the form of a note on the front of the survey to the effect that this party felt that there had been insufficient contact from the Company for him or her to “provide useful information” via the survey. This party did not indicate whether or not they were a member of the FRAC.

### **Principle Strengths (Summarized from Survey Question 11)**

Within the FRAC Committee and Interested Parties 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.

- Provides a forum for local people and community representatives to provide input and communicate their concerns to the Company for consideration in planning and operations
- Provides an opportunity for FRAC members to receive information from technical experts from government, Tolko and third parties
- Provides a forum where information is exchanged between the Company representatives involved in planning activities, and stakeholders, where concerns can be presented, and can receive answers from the Company
- Acknowledgement that the Company has made a strong effort to involve the public in the planning process, including the FRAC, public meetings
- Provides a transparent open process for input with timely reporting
- First Nations involvement
- Gives the public a voice in regards to management of the Crown forest resource, owned by the people of Manitoba

### **Principle Areas for Improvement (Summarized from Survey Question 12)**

Within the FRAC Committee and Interested Parties 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, from those suggestions that pertained to the public consultation process. 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.

- Need to maintain regular FRAC meetings
- Would like to see more of the FRAC meetings devoted to specific agenda topics related to elements of the SFM Plan including:
  - Reports on progress toward meeting required monitoring requirements.
  - Provide status of what is being done to address issues raised at audits.

- Would like to see ideas and efforts to broaden public participation, looking for ways to recognize how busy people are and thus, looking for ways to accommodate broader participation
- Would like to see more opportunities to have outside technical experts attend FRAC sessions and lead the group discussion in specific areas
- Would like to see more opportunities for field trips
- Would like to emphasize importance of continuing to communicate through newspaper articles in local and provincial media and the website
- Would like to see more lead time provided for advertising of when public meetings will take place
- Would like to see increased representation from the provincial government

### **FRAC Committee Member Survey Component**

The second component of the survey was utilized for capturing input from committee members in terms of their level of satisfaction with the ongoing FRAC Committee operation for implementation of the SFM Plan.

### **Summary of Expression of Satisfaction**

The overall response of all respondents who completed and returned the survey from the membership of the FRAC 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
49 %	43 %	8 %	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied	92 %	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied	8 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

#### **Note:**

It is noted that the overall results above exclude the survey returned by one party who provided feedback in the form of a letter with indication that it was felt by this party that there had been insufficient meetings held of the FRAC Committee for the person to provide an informed response. As a result, this party did not complete the survey form, and no entry has been made within the survey results for this survey.

### **Summary and Reporting on Indicator 6.3.1.1.1**

This survey has been undertaken in support of ongoing 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 on a regular basis. Initially the survey was to be conducted on an annual basis, however, as the SFM process proceeds, and in the interests of improving efficiencies, while still wishing to maintain this feedback mechanism, the frequency for surveying the interested parties and the FRAC Committee membership is to be changed to a bi-annual basis in the future. This survey is the second such review, and future review will be undertaken bi-annually. 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 FRAC Committee members responding to the survey being satisfied (or better) with the public participation process of the FRAC 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, and to assess the satisfaction of the committee membership bi-annually.

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 FRAC Committee as the process has unfolded. As such, the first component of this 2006 version of the survey was utilized to capture overall satisfaction with the public consultation process from the FRAC membership as well as other interested parties. The overall satisfaction indicated by this broader group in this survey is assessed at 75% as very or somewhat satisfied.

As indicated above in the summary of the responses for the satisfaction component of the survey the satisfaction level of the FRAC Committee members has been reported to be high with 92% of the responses being satisfied (somewhat or very satisfied), with the noted exception described earlier for which no responses were recorded. 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 FRAC Committee. The results of this second satisfaction survey are supportive of the committee and the Company’s efforts thus far in achieving the target established for this indicator.

Overall, the level of satisfaction with the public participation process involving the FRAC Committee has been described as good by the participants of the survey. The organization/documentation, facilitation process, opportunity for participation, Company response and follow-up to questions, Tolko attempts to bring in outside speakers, and the contribution of the FRAC process to decision-making in planning for the DFA were all generally rated as being satisfactory (very or somewhat satisfied) by the respondents.

There were several noted concerns expressed regarding the frequency and regularity of meetings being held for the FRAC committee as several respondents noted a concern with meetings being held too infrequently to maintain sufficient contact and input to the process with the Company (Survey question 14 comments, written submission). Though this survey question still maintained an overall satisfactory rating of 88%, of this total, only 25% indicated being very satisfied, with the remainder indicating being somewhat satisfied. There were also several comments made to the effect that participants would like to see a more regular meeting schedule for the committee. However, overall, the contribution of this component to the overall survey did continue to reflect a satisfactory rating.

### **Trend Assessment of Satisfaction Survey**

To begin the process of assessing any developing trends pertaining to the satisfaction of the FRAC and interested parties with the public consultation process being utilized for SFM on the DFA, this 2005/06 assessment has included a review of the results as compared to those from the previous survey (2004/05). In comparing the results, it is important to note a change that has been made in the survey as compared to last year. In the 2004/05 survey, two separate surveys were made of the SFM Committee (now the FRAC Committee) and the other interested parties. For this 2005/06 survey, a single survey was utilized in which the FRAC and other interested parties provided input as a combined group as the first component of the survey, while the second component measured the satisfaction of the FRAC only in relationship to the FRAC Committee process.

With this being the second year of assessment for the satisfaction level of the FRAC and interested parties, it is noted that this process is in its early stages and as such, changes could not be identified as a “trend”. However, it is useful to begin to maintain a watch on these satisfaction results to begin the process of plotting any trends that may become apparent over time. It can also be useful to review the results from year to year to spot any major changes that could assist Tolko and the FRAC in identifying concerns as they arise and make changes to maintain the functioning and progress of the FRAC and the general public consultation process.

### **Interested Parties 2004-05 Compared to Interested Parties & FRAC 2005-06**

Results indicate that some shift has occurred in the percentage of responses from the very satisfied to the somewhat satisfied category, however, overall the level of satisfaction has generally increased with a move from 57% to 75% being very or somewhat satisfied. There has also been a slight decrease in the number of responses indicating no opinion.

Very Satisfied		Somewhat Satisfied		Somewhat Unsatisfied		Very Unsatisfied	
2004-05	2005-06	2004-05	2005-06	2004-05	2005-06	2004-05	2005-06
47 %	32 %	10 %	43 %	0 %	10 %	13 %	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied		2004-05	2005-06	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied		2004-05	2005-06
		57 %	75 %			13 %	10 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion						2004-05	2005-06
						30 %	15 %

### **SFM Committee 2004-05 Compared to FRAC Committee 2005-06**

The assessment of the satisfaction level of the FRAC indicates virtually no change in the overall satisfaction levels of the respondents to the survey. The responding members of the FRAC have indicated a rating of over 90% being either very or somewhat satisfied for the second year in a row.

Very Satisfied		Somewhat Satisfied		Somewhat Unsatisfied		Very Unsatisfied	
2004-05	2005-06	2004-05	2005-06	2004-05	2005-06	2004-05	2005-06
51 %	49 %	40 %	43 %	6 %	8 %	0 %	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied		2004-05	2005-06	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied		2004-05	2005-06
		91 %	92 %			6 %	8 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion						2004-05	2005-06
						3 %	0 %

### **Detailed Survey Results**

The detailed results of the surveys are presented in the following two sections to describe the responses received from the combined FRAC Committee/Interested Parties and from the FRAC Committee membership itself.

**FRAC Committee and Interested Parties**

**Questions 1 – 12 were to be answered by all parties, including FRAC committee members.**

1. How satisfied are you with the degree to which the goals of the SFM process have been carried out with respect to the implementation of the SFM Plan for the FML Area No. 2, particularly relating to procedures for monitoring the effectiveness of the SFM Plan?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
8 %	84 %	8%	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied			92 %
Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied			8 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

<b>Comments and Suggestions:</b>
Concerned about the resources available to the Company (staff, financial resources) to implement SFM effectively.

2. How satisfied are you that the interests/values of the FML Area No. 2 continue to be adequately represented by the FRAC, as described in the minutes of the committee and through the Tolko Manitoba website and other materials that you have received?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
23 %	54 %	23%	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied			77 %
Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied			23 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

<b>Comments and Suggestions:</b>
No comments or suggestions provided.

3. How satisfied are you that aboriginal interests/values of the FML Area No. 2 continue to be adequately represented by the FRAC?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
31 %	8 %	23%	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied	39 %	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied	23 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			38 %

<b>Comments and Suggestions:</b>
Concern expressed regarding potential for lack of balance by placing emphasis on any one segment of values.
This is very difficult to achieve.

4. How satisfied are you with the information on SFM that you receive from the Company, including FRAC meeting minutes, including consideration of:

- Frequency at which you receive information on SFM from the Company
- Finalized minutes are provided to interested parties in a timely manner as related to the date of each meeting of the committee
- Minutes are clear and understandable

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
62 %	38 %	0%	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied	100 %	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied	0 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

<b>Comments and Suggestions:</b>
With exception of this questionnaire, why not have a map with the areas on?

5. How satisfied are you with the information provided to you by the Company (includes presentations made to the committee), on forest management and the FML Area No. 2?

- 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 FML 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
31 %	61 %	8%	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied			92 %
Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied			8 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

<b>Comments and Suggestions:</b>
Emphasis is primarily on social and economic aspects and site level impacts/influences. Not all of my concerns/values/interests are addressed – but acknowledges that process is to reflect the overall group.

6. 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.
46%	54%

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?

Note: Results pertain to those who answered yes to being in contact with the Company.

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
23 %	8 %	15%	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied			31 %
Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied			15 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			54 %

<b>Comments and Suggestions:</b>
No comments or suggestions provided.

7. How satisfied are you that the public involvement process is maintained as an open process that allows members of the committee and/or interested parties to bring forward and express their views in an open manner?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
62 %	38 %	0%	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied	100 %	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied	0 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

<b>Comments and Suggestions:</b>
It is unfortunate that the public only turns out when an issue raises their concern to an angry level.
Very open – Tolko make people feel comfortable.
Response from the public could be better.

8. How satisfied are you with the information provided by the Tolko Manitoba Newsletter, in terms of communication of information on SFM and other areas of interest for the FML Area No. 2?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
38 %	62 %	0%	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied	100 %	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied	0 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

<b>Comments and Suggestions:</b>
No comments or suggestions provided.

9. Have you visited the Tolko Manitoba website at [www.tolkomanitoba.com](http://www.tolkomanitoba.com)?

Yes	No
62%	38%

If you have viewed the website:

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

The results provided below pertain to those who answered yes to having viewed the website.

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
8 %	39 %	15%	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied	47 %	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied	15 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			38 %

<b>Comments and Suggestions:</b>
More information needed. All minutes from previous public meetings should be presented. Put new meeting minutes on the website sooner.
Should be updated more frequently.
Not entirely up to date. CSA audit report available? Was it on the website?

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

Note that the order identified from the survey responses is approximate as many surveys provided varying degrees of the number of priorities for which they provided ranking.

<b>Priorities</b>	<b>Order of Importance</b>
Advisory notices for Annual Plan Information and other meetings to be held across the DFA	1
Updates of Annual Operating Planning process	2
Provide liaison to resource users	3
Updates of Forest Management Planning process	4
Updates of SFM Plan implementation	5
Proceedings (minutes) of the FRAC Committee posted	6
Review of performance results (results for indicators via the Annual CSA SFM Report)	7
Review of SFM and Environmental Management System audit summary results	8

11. Note: The responses received for survey question 11 regarding the principle strengths of the public involvement process have been summarized in the opening summary of this report.

12. Note: the responses received for survey question 12 regarding the principle areas in which improvements could be made to the public involvement process, particularly the work of the committee, have been summarized in the opening summary of this report.

**Forest Management License Area FRAC Members:**

Please indicate whether or not you are a member of the FRAC for the FML Area No. 2 (percentages reflect the proportion of survey respondents):

Yes, I am a member of the committee	No, I am not a member of the committee
60 %	40 %

**If you are a member of the FRAC, we ask that you fill out questions 13 – 22 on the remaining pages. These questions are only to be filled out by members of the FRAC committee as they pertain to the ongoing operation of the committee itself:**

13. How satisfied are you with the organization and documentation of the FRAC meetings (agenda and minutes), including consideration of:

- An draft agenda prepared and available for each meeting
- Process allows for input by the FRAC membership for new agenda items
- Agenda agreed to prior to commencement of the meeting itself
- Agenda followed and all agenda items addressed
- Minutes are clear and understandable and capture the essence of the discussions of the FRAC
- Minutes are produced and circulated to the FRAC membership in a timely manner
- Minutes are reviewed and revised as necessary at the following meeting of the FRAC

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
62 %	25 %	13%	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied			87 %
Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied			13 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

<b>Comments and Suggestions:</b>
No comments or suggestions provided.

14. How satisfied are you with the frequency at which meetings of the FRAC are held?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
25 %	62 %	13%	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied	87 %	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied	13 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

<b>Comments and Suggestions:</b>
Setting a more rigid series of meetings, 3 to 4 per year, on fixed dates would help.
Concerned that the FRAC has not had a meeting for 6 months.
Meetings could be more frequent.
<b>From individual letter submission:</b> The FRAC cannot be considered to be functional when it meets once per year.

15. How satisfied are you that the roles and responsibilities of members of the FRAC are clear and have been respected and maintained for the ongoing role of the committee in implementation of the SFM Plan, including consideration of the Operating Ground Rules for the FRAC as follows:

- Continuing the work done to update identification of local values, objectives, indicators and targets that relate to the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers SFM criteria and critical elements for the Tolko Manitoba FML Area No. 2
- Involvement in developing procedures to monitor 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
13 %	74 %	13%	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied	87 %	Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied	13 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

<b>Comments and Suggestions:</b>
A summary of this process, how it works, and what we have contributed would be beneficial.
Think there is always room for the Company and FRAC members to improve.

More effort should be directed toward bullets 1 and 2 above. For bullet 2 – report on how Tolko is accomplishing this would be useful. Expert assistance/advice to the committee would be a good thing to help guide the committee on how we are doing?

16. How satisfied are you with the facilitation process, chaired by Tolko Manitoba, that is now being utilized for the operation of the FRAC in its work including consideration of:

- Meeting facilitation to follow the agreed agenda and meeting objectives
- Organization of efforts of the FRAC
- Tolko Manitoba Chairman focused on running the meeting and achieving the objectives of the agenda as set out and agreed to by the FRAC
- Chairman promotes a consensus approach to the proceedings

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
49 %	38 %	13%	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied			87 %
Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied			13 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

**Comments and Suggestions:**

Well done.

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

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
63 %	38 %	0%	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied			100 %
Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied			0 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

**Comments and Suggestions:**

Meetings are well run. Information is timely. It is an open forum and all points of view are listened to respectfully.

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

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
62 %	38 %	0%	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied			100 %
Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied			0 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

<b>Comments and Suggestions:</b>
No comments or suggestions provided.

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

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
49 %	38 %	13%	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied			87 %
Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied			13 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

<b>Comments and Suggestions:</b>
Comment expressed that it would be useful to see further input from government to FRAC deliberations.
It would be valuable to see more external speakers to talk about specific issues as they relate to issues of concern to the FRAC.

20. How satisfied are you that the input of the FRAC is reflected in the decision-making process such as review of Annual Operating Plans and in following through on the monitoring and reporting process (i.e. review of Tolko Manitoba Annual CSA SFM Report) for the ongoing implementation of the SFM Plan for the FML Area No. 2?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
38 %	49 %	13%	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied			87 %
Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied			13 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

<b>Comments and Suggestions:</b>
Report back to FRAC on how, when, where and how much this is done.

21. How satisfied are you that the opportunity was made available for FRAC members to participate as an observer, representing the FRAC, on the SFM audit for the FML Area No. 2?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
75 %	25 %	0%	0 %
Very or Somewhat Satisfied			100 %
Somewhat or Very Unsatisfied			0 %
Respondents Expressing No Opinion			0 %

<b>Comments and Suggestions:</b>
I was contacted.

22. What do you feel should be the principal priorities of the FRAC going forward?  
Please rank in order of importance with 1 being the highest priority:

<b>Priorities</b>	<b>Order of Importance</b>
Continue to provide input to Company on non-timber and timber values for the Forest Management License Area No. 2	1
Review of Annual Operating Plans	2
Review of Forest Management Plans	3
Review of performance results (results for indicators through review of the Annual CSA SFM Report)	4
Review of SFM Plan implementation	5
Provide liaison to resource users	6
Review of SFM and Environmental Management System audit summary results	7