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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To be viable into the future Canada’s Model Forests are going to have to document the new ways that they have "encouraged stakeholders to work together" and the effective results of this work as seen through forest management policy, program, and/or project changes. This is critical since conventional wisdom now envisions the path to "change" involving as many stakeholders as possible in decision making. It is critical, therefore, for Model Forests (MFs) to demonstrate that their decision making and the communication techniques they practice are leading to sustainable forest management (SFM) and are on a futuristic path, rather than just creating shelves full of reports.

The purpose of this research was to identify the various approaches to multi-stakeholder decision making and communication developed in a selection of Canada’s eleven MF organizations and to assess the impact of the results of programs and projects resulting from working together on the policies, programs, and/or projects of stakeholder groups. The specific objectives that guided the research were:

- To review the distinctive organizational structures that have been established for each MF;
- To identify the stakeholder groups represented on the program management Board of each MF;
- To review and document the process through which the program management Board and project manager(s) make decisions about the operations of the MF;
- To establish how the findings of the programs and projects undertaken in each MF are communicated to stakeholder groups;
- To assess the extent to which the findings of individual MF programs and projects are resulting in policy, program and/or project changes aimed at achieving sustainability in forest practices among stakeholder groups;
- To establish the essential components of multi-stakeholder participation that results in policy, program, and/or project changes aimed at sustainable forest management.

The purpose of this report is to communicate the findings of the interviews carried out with the Foothills Model Forest (FHMF). A separate report comparing and contrasting the findings of each of the Model Forests studied will be available later in the year from the Manitoba Model Forest.

The study was empirically based, involving structured interviews with General Managers (GMs) and Program Management Board members and observation of a Board meeting of four case study model forests, all part of the Canadian Model Forest Program. The interview schedule used was developed by the study team of Dr. John Sinclair, Dr. Doreen Smith and Ms. Angela Bidinosti. Specific questions for the survey were established through input from the literature, MF documentation, the previous experience of the study team, the specific objectives of the research and feedback on draft questions from key informants involved in the MF program. The final survey, titled "Survey of Views on Model Forest Activities Aimed at Achieving Sustainable Forest Management"
had three main theme areas, including: decision making and communication processes, change and social values.

The study team visited the FHMF for seven days in December of 1997. The report outlines the data obtained in each of the three theme areas of the survey. The interviews took anywhere from 1.5 to 3 hours for each individual respondent to complete. In total, eleven interviews took place with Board members. Of those interviewed, nine had been involved in some capacity with the FHMF since its inception. The exact questions and detailed responses can be found in Appendix 1. The following is a brief summary of the findings documented in relation to each of the questionnaire’s theme areas.

In general, the respondents thought that there was a good representation of different partner/stakeholder groups involved in the FHMF. However, the representation of seventy partners in the Partnership group by two Board seats was called into question. Although they welcome a “broad base of partners”, the term stakeholders is reserved for those who invest time and money into the process. Clearly, while somewhat cognizant of significant gaps in representation (e.g. an environmental voice, aboriginal participation and oil and gas representation), the Board remains selective with respect to who it invites to join them at the table. Preserving a unified focus is a fundamental Board concern.

Formal Board meetings are governed by Robert’s Rule of Order, but the Board members noted that matters are discussed thoroughly and candidly until some level of comfort with the decision was achieved. This level of comfort did not necessarily indicate consensus but rather a decision that most could abide. Their descriptions approximate “majority rule” rather than conventional definitions of consensus. FHMF Board members were not striving for consensus and did not deem it essential for progress. In fact, the opposite opinion (i.e. that a consensus process might be detrimental to efficient decision making) seemed to prevail. Current decision making was considered to be timely and effective. On the whole, the Board has characterized itself as “extremely progressive” and well connected nationally and internationally. Critics would contend that the relatively small Board comprised of like-minded individuals although effective and efficient with respect to decision making does not represent the diversity of stakeholder views about the forest in the area.

Concern was expressed that the Board is comprised of very busy individuals and, thus, there is a tendency to lose contact with the working level of decision making. On the other hand, it appears that a concerted effort is made when it comes to long term planning and that documents such as the workplan, are reviewed and updated on a regular basis so as to reflect what is timely and relevant. There is room for improvement, however, with respect to the review and analysis of the findings of the projects and programs once they are completed. To date, project sponsors have been more concerned with ensuring completion of projects in a timely fashion.

A clear majority of the Board members also concurred that the Board did not formulate recommendations regarding sustainability in forest practices based on their discussions and study findings. Moreover, there appeared to be a general reluctance to do so.
Foothills regarded themselves as a “research board” whose findings should be analyzed by those who find them useful. Highlighting this, projects were referred to as “successful” if they were clearly defined, yielded substantial data, and if there has been some implementation of the results such as the natural disturbance work. Waste of money, inferior or incomplete work earmarked less successful projects such as the watershed and fisheries projects and the ecotourism endeavor.

Despite insisting that the Board was relatively conflict free, three major sources of conflict were identified, namely: allocation of funds, decision making as it pertained to funding priorities and misunderstandings due to lack of communication. No written or formal conflict resolution procedures are used by the Board. A more informal means of dialogue and discussion was employed. The perception prevails that many of the Board members have conflict resolution training within their own organization and, thus, the Foothills Board need not engage in such an exercise, at least not at the present time. Future issues may prove more challenging.

Communications, both internally and externally, is recognized as an area in need of improvement and some steps (i.e., allocation of time, effort and funds) have been taken to improve the Phase II performance. However, communication flow is still top down and obtaining feedback is still problematic. Inadequate participation by the Partnership Group was a definite concern. Newsletters and annual reports had achieved a modicum of community recognition but, by and large workshops and conferences were considered the most effective outreach activities. All of the Board members feel that recognized community leaders demonstrate support for the FHMF program. Half of the Board members felt sufficiently informed about the operations of other Model Forests across Canada to learn from their experience. Limited exchange with respect to research is the norm. It is expected that activities in communications at the network level will improve information exchange.

In terms of the policy, program and project changes among stakeholder groups aimed at achieving sustainability in forest practices, the programs and projects of the FHMF have had a negligible effect. Board members were, however, very clear and candid about forest management policy issues and the sorts of policy changes needed to achieve SFM. This is evident in the responses given in the change and social values components of the survey. These were focused around two theme areas: the problem of developing policy that incorporates a range of forest values into the decision making mix; and, lifting up the foundation of forest policy to recognize new concepts such as SFM. One respondent noted in regards to this latter point that, “it is a real tragedy of the commons because public land is managed by the Provinces who do not have a long-term view of resources management”. While strong opinions such as this were evident in a number of comments, there is an obvious undercurrent of opinion that keeps the FHMF out of policy issues - “we don’t set provincial policy”.

All Board members felt that the FHMF is in a position to offer advice to those more influential in the policy community and many felt that the FHMF had, or would have, an impact on their policies. In fact, respondents were very up-beat about the potential
impact of FHMF activities on forest management policies and programs. All identified the same player as being the critical link to the forest management policy community - The Alberta Department of Environmental Protection. Formal links have been established with this department. It is interesting that respondents also identified a good array of other groups that they recognized as being part of the forest management policy community. The FHMF links with some of these other groups are not as clear. Respondents felt that they had worked most closely with the Provincial Government and the forestry industry. In fact, the Board recognizes a great strength in having senior representatives of the major land managers in the area on the Board. While this is a very positive aspect of the FHMF in terms of effecting change, it also raises two fundamental concerns: 1. the major land managers are on the Board but those that are affected by their decisions, i.e. many of the other stakeholders they note as being part of the policy community, do not seem to have a voice. These same stakeholders will try to get involved in land management decisions in the region and should have the benefit of the MF activities; 2. some may be left with the impression that the FHMF is being driven by those who have traditionally set forest management policy, i.e., Provincial Government and industry, which might be seen as stifling innovation.

In addition to having influential Board members, all respondents noted at some point in the questioning on change that advice from the FHMF would most likely come through communication and education about the research carried out. As one respondent noted “if we operate together we could have a significant influence with our research in regard to policy”. How this will occur, in the case of the FHMF, is not as evident. No process has been established that identifies an effective means for this to occur outside of having influential Board members take project results back to their sectors - “we have some senior people...who have connections with policy makers”. Currently the Board does not require contractors/researchers to suggest where their research findings might best plug into the existing forest management policies, programs and processes. Some, in fact, do not see it as appropriate.

The respondents were fairly clear about the types of policy change that they felt were needed to “accelerate the implementation of sustainable development in the practice of forestry”. Unlike other MFs, only one respondent noted what could be identified as a major change, that being, tenure reform. Others saw the work on criteria and indicators as important for future changes in forest practices. One respondent felt that the FHMF was working on these “bigger policy issues such as SFM, while the Province works on more immediate problems”. This is an interesting insight, which if true establishes a vital role for FHMF research. A number of respondents did not see the FHMF affecting provincial policy, but rather the plans that result from the policy. This is likely a very realistic approach and means should be identified to be sure it occurs.

In regards to social values, a large majority of the respondents affirmed that FHMF has made a sound effort at trying to understand the complexity of this issue. Through its efforts Foothills has been effective in bringing together people that hold diverse values. All respondents attest to this fact and it is apparent in the operation of the Board. For example, the coalescing of different groups has enabled some partners to bridge gaps that
previously existed between them (e.g., Jasper and Weldwood), and has allowed them to work together to achieve the objectives of the MF program.

Foothills has not only helped bridge differences, it has also helped develop commonalities amongst its members. One of the most prevalent commonalities is the set of values that the Board shares. This is evident in the responses that were given by respondents when they were asked to identify the values held by Board members. Many of them responded using collective terms such as “we”, “all”, and “us”, indicating that there is a set of values present amongst the Board that many, if not all, of the members respect and agree to. While many of the other respondents identified values that they thought were more characteristic of specific groups, rather than the Board as a whole, they were quite adept at identifying them. This indicates that there is a strong awareness of values at all levels of the Board.

Understanding and sharing values has been a fundamental part of the Foothills’ Board and organization and should remain part of it. It would not be inappropriate for FHMF to do this since many respondents felt the MF had been a good vehicle in assisting partner groups in translating their values into action, and it was through research projects of the MF that they were attempting to do this. These research projects have the potential, in turn, to inform policy makers about the diversity of forest values, and can influence them in making appropriate decisions with regard to SFM. As half of the respondents have indicated, present policy is outdated and government is unable to effectively adapt policy to adequately address forest values and related management issues. The following statements highlight this point:

The legislation we are dealing with is archaic and it largely focuses on a sustained yield basis... it has not progressed to include different facets of resource management (e.g., flora and fauna).

Moving from sustained yield to SFM... there have been no guidelines, it has been a wide open playing field and there are huge issues to deal with when moving from one to the other.

However, it is questionable to what extent the FHMF will affect change given the composition of the Board and hence the values represented. The FHMF Board consists of only seven different groups with representation predominantly being from the Province and the Weldwood Company. Three representatives from each group sit on the Board. Given the fact that several respondents felt that it was land managers, such as Weldwood, whose values were often given, or perceived to be given, greater consideration in the decision making process of the MF, it will be interesting to see how vigilante the Board will be in incorporating different values into the program.

As a consequence of this situation, many respondents recognized the need to attract other groups to the FHMF. Including such groups from the oil and gas, and mining industries, as well as from Aboriginal and environmental groups. However, several other respondents were opposed to such an occurrence. They believed that the addition of new partners might “turn over the apple cart” or “diffuse the focus of the program.” Granted
there is some validity to this perspective, since the addition of new members might hinder the progress of certain developments or slow down the endeavours of the Board. However, this calls into question the integrity of the Board in dealing with diverse value issues. Especially since the Board is streamlining its focus as it moves to more of a “top down” approach in Phase II, from a previous “bottom up” approach used in Phase I.

As many Board members indicated, they felt that values research and the incorporation of such research could accelerate the implementation of SFM. Other members also mentioned that even though values research undertaken in FHMF has not yet influenced decision making outside of the MF it could in the future. However, given the limited representation of values that reside at the Board it may be difficult for these things to come to actual fruition. Status quo forest management has already been dominated by many of the same players and their values that are present amongst the MF Board. The bottom line for FHMF, therefore, is whether it has the conviction to seriously affect decision making and change policy to adopt SFM practices. The results remain to be seen. As one respondent summarized: “We are dancing right now. It is early in the game and things are going good, but we have big issues to tackle and that is when the MF will be tested; when we have really gotten involved in these issues.”

Conclusions are drawn, in relation to each of the established objectives, in the final section of the report. Specific recommendations for action are beyond the scope of this work, since this was not an intended or stated consequence of the research. The summary comments for each of the three sections of the report, highlighted above, outline in more detail many issues that the FHMF may want to consider in the future.
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Preamble

The study team of Dr. John Sinclair, Dr. Doreen Smith and Ms. Angela Bidinosti carried out interviews with members of the Boards of Directors of the Manitoba Model Forest, the Long Beach Model Forest, the Lake Abitibi Model Forest, and the Foothills Model Forest between June and December 1997. The interviews covered three theme areas including: decision making and communication processes, change and social values. The broader purpose and objectives of their research are discussed below. The purpose of this report is to communicate the findings of the interviews carried out with the Foothills Model Forest. A separate report comparing the findings on each of the above Model Forests will be available later in the year.

Background

It is now difficult to find a government publication regarding resources management that does not consider “stakeholder” participation. For example, the often cited Canadian Council of Forest Ministers (CCFM) report entitled, “Defining Sustainable Forest Management...”, notes that to achieve the goal of maintaining sustainable forests, “local, provincial, territorial, and national programs have been designed to provide incentives and encouragement to all stakeholders in the forest to work together to ensure that our forests are sustainably managed...” (CCFM 1995:4).

The Canadian Model Forest (MF) Program was established under the Partners in Sustainable Development of Forests program of Canada’s Green Plan. As such, the MF program is an initiative designed to accelerate the implementation of sustainable development in forestry through emphasizing “working together” in a climate of “multi-stakeholder participation” (Natural Resources Canada 1994/95).

From a national perspective, the MF program was conceived amid rapidly evolving questioning of prevailing forestry practices by numerous parties. Pressures and conflicts were regularly being encountered. The way in which forest management was being conducted, both by corporate entities and government agencies, was clearly out of phase with the emerging values of
ecological sustainability, bio-diversity and integrated planning, as well as institutional issues relating to stakeholder participation in planning and decision making.

The MF program, nationally, is designed to respond to the above concerns by establishing a series of representative situations within which such issues can be addressed and, hopefully, resolved at a local and regional level. In this regard, the operation and effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder management structures of each MF has become a very critical aspect of the MF program. The Canadian Forest Service highlights to interested groups that each MF has a management structure that:

- represents input from several organizations and agencies including government, academia, environmental groups and other interested stakeholders;
- is administered by a Partnership Committee consisting of the principal interested parties and representing a wide range of views about forests;
- incorporates public consultation and involvement in its ongoing decision-making processes;
- will support new programs of research and technology transfer, and will share the results with other forest managers and stakeholders.

This multi-stakeholder aspect of the MF program is particularly significant since the MFs themselves have no decision-making authority regarding the use of the forest resource. Each MF, therefore, relies on its multi-stakeholder partners to take up and implement the good ideas that result from the studies undertaken in each MF. This means that each MF must not only have a broad array of stakeholders on their respective Partnership Management Board (Board), but also that these stakeholders communicate the results of studies undertaken to a wider constituency.

It is only through effective and efficient multi-stakeholder decision making and communication processes that the MF program will be successful in challenging conventional wisdom to achieve sustainability. Each MF has thus far been very good at identifying individual projects and deliverables - the traditional approach to business. They have not been good at documenting their respective multi-stakeholder decision making processes, or at evaluating the success of
individual projects through program, policy or project changes among stakeholder groups, whether individual, government, industry or non-government organization.

To be viable into the future, MFs are going to have to document the new ways that they have “encouraged stakeholders to work together” and the effective results of this work as seen through stakeholder policy, program, and/or project changes. This is critical since conventional wisdom now envisions the path to “change” involving as many stakeholders as possible in decision making. It is critical, therefore, for MFs to demonstrate that the decision making and communication techniques they practice are leading to sustainable forest management and are on a futuristic path, rather than just creating shelves full of reports.

**Purpose**

The purpose of the research is to identify the various approaches to multi-stakeholder decision making and communication developed in a selection of Canada’s eleven Model Forest organizations and to assess the impact of the results of programs and projects resulting from working together on the policies, programs, and/or projects of stakeholder groups.

**Objectives**

Guided by the purpose and aspirations of each MF regarding the continuation of Canadian Model Forest Program, the specific objectives of the project included the following:

- *To review the distinctive organizational structures that have been established for each MF;*

- *To identify the stakeholder groups represented on the program management Board of each MF;*

- *To review and document the process through which the program management Board and project manager(s) make decisions about the operations of the MF;*
• To establish how the findings of the programs and projects undertaken in each MF are communicated to stakeholder groups;

• To assess the extent to which the findings of individual MF programs and projects are resulting in policy, program and/or project changes aimed at achieving sustainability in forest practices among stakeholder groups;

• To establish the essential components of multi-stakeholder participation that results in policy, program, and/or project changes aimed at sustainable forest management.

Study Approach

The study was empirically based, involving data collection from stakeholders involved in the Canadian MF program/network. The first phase of the data collection process began with a letter introducing the research to the General Manager (GM)/Board of each of the ten MFs in the Canadian MF program at the time the research was undertaken. This letter also requested baseline information regarding the organizational structure of each MF organization, a list of the immediately involved stakeholders, and the basic models of decision making that have been established by each group. There was also a request for documentation including annual plans, five-year evaluation reports, recent MF newsletters, etc. All ten MF responded to this request for information. In addition, a review of the literature was carried out to provide background information into decision making models including integrated decision making and into decentralization (e.g., Howlett and Ramesh 1995; Lindblom 1959), forest management policy development (e.g., Wellstead 1996; Beckley et al., 1995; Brand et al., 1995; Bengston, 1994; Canadian Council of Forest Ministers, 1992; Grant, 1990; Coleman, 1990) learning organizations (e.g., Wishart et al., 1996; Senge 1991/1996; Garvin, 1994; Kofman and Senge, 1993; ) and social values (e.g., Abramovitz, 1997; Brandenburg, 1995; Clark, 1995; Moss, 1992; Robinson, 1990, Gluck, 1987).

The second phase of data collection involved structured interviews with GMs and Program Management Board members and observation of a Board meeting of four case study MFs. The
study team chose to work with four case study MFs to ensure that a range of activities were considered, while at the same time recognizing the time available to the study team and the financial constraints of the project. The four MFs chosen for study were the Manitoba Model Forest, the Long Beach Model Forest, the Lake Abitibi Model Forest, and the Foothills Model Forest. These were chosen based on input from Canadian Forest Service (CFS) representatives, other MF personnel and the experience of the study team through their direct involvement in the program and previous research (Sinclair and Smith 1995; 1998). The interviews were carried out between June 1997 and December 1997.

The interview schedule used was developed by Drs. Sinclair and Smith and Ms. Bidinosti. Specific questions for the survey were established through: input from the literature noted above; MF documentation; the previous experience of the study team; and the specific objectives of the research. Once a draft survey was put together, a scoping exercise was initiated. This involved getting feedback on the draft questions from key informants involved in the MF program including CFS researchers and other government personnel, MF Board members and two GMs. The survey was again modified slightly after use in the field. The final survey, titled “Survey of Views on Model Forest Activities Aimed at Achieving Sustainable Forest Management” had three main sections, including: decision making and communication processes, change and social values.

The study team traveled to each of the four case study MFs, attended a meeting of the Board, spent time with staff discussing MF reports and activities and carried out personal interviews with Board members. The study team visit lasted seven to ten days at each site. The individual personal interviews took anywhere from two to three hours to complete. A compilation of the responses was then distributed to the GM of each MF for feedback and for any use they might be put to in MF planning activities. In the case of the Foothills, this document was given to the GM in January of 1998.

The third and most difficult phase of this study involved the analysis of the robust and extensive quantity of qualitative data collected from each MF both through the interviews and documents collected. This report focuses specifically on the survey results obtained from the Foothills MF.
As such, the report outlines the basic structure of the Foothills MF, considers decision making and communication, change and social values activities and draws conclusions in the objective areas of the research based on the data collected. As noted, comparative analysis of the results obtained from all of the case study MFs is contained in a separate report.

The Foothills Model Forest

The Foothills MF (FHMF) is the one of the largest in the network with over 2.5 million hectares. It is located in west-central Alberta and contains such well-known parks as Jasper National Park and William A. Switzer Provincial Park. The MF covers a number of forest regions encompassing boreal, montane, subalpine and alpine ranges. The study team visited the FHMF for seven days in December of 1997.

The FHMF partners established an agreement with the Canadian government in July of 1992 and formally began operations at that time. The initiating partners of the FHMF involved largely government and industry interests but a commitment to broader involvement was agreed to early on. The Board is currently made up of partners from the following groups: Jasper National Park, Weldwood of Canada (3 seats), Canadian Forest Service, Provincial Government (3 seats), Local Government, Nova Corporation and the University of Alberta. These last two organizations were chosen by the FHMF Partnership Advisory Committee, a group of some twenty individuals and organizations that represent a broader Partnership Group of some seventy individuals and organizations. The Partnership Advisory Committee has met up to twice annually and has chosen the same two groups to represent them since the inception of the Advisory Committee. It should also be noted that representatives from Jasper National Park did not join the Board until September of 1995. The offices of the FHMF are located in Hinton, Alberta.

To the point of the time of interviewing, partners attend monthly meetings of the FHMF Board. As discussed below, the Board makes decisions through following of Robert’s Rules of Order. Each representative on the Board is expected to report to, and hold meetings of, individuals members of their sector to convey the business of the Board and to bring their views back to the Board.
In the course of the research, ten Board members were interviewed. The General Manager was also interviewed for a total of eleven interviews. Given the nature of the survey questions, the study team focused on those partner members who had participated in the FHMF, in some capacity for at least one year or more. In fact, all but two of those interviewed had been involved in some capacity, with the FHMF since its inception. All of those interviewed felt that they would stay involved in some capacity with the FHMF during Phase II.

In describing their experiences with the FHMF over the time they had been involved, respondents indicated both positive and negative states. Many noted that the experience had so far been “very positive” or “positive”. Of interest, most of those who felt positive about their experiences did not qualify this position. This is unlike other some of the other case study MFs where respondents often qualified their positive feelings. Two respondents noted that the experience had been both “rewarding” and “frustrating”. Neither of these noted, however, the source of their frustration and were not prompted to do so. In considering the lessons they had thus far learned, there was considerable variance in responses from “nothing totally new” to “a great deal”. A common theme that ran through responses was mention of “partnerships” and how “we are learning to work with other people”. As one respondent noted, “independent agencies, when isolated, tend to have views that are critical of other groups, but when you form partnerships you understand the views”.

**Decision Making and Communication Processes**

This major section of the interview schedule was designed to elicit views on the types of decision making, communication and conflict resolution processes that characterize each of the case study MFs. Interviewees were told that the study team was aware that each MF is a dynamic and ever-changing entity, but they were asked for their thoughts on how these processes presently proceed and how they might be improved upon in the future. Interviewees were also asked to think carefully about how the stakeholders in their MF make necessary decisions, how and what they communicate to one another and the general public and how any conflicts are dealt with. In
particular, they were asked to comment on the processes that pertain to the projects and programs that have had an impact on the MF and sustainable forest management.

The first question in this section asked Board members if they thought there was a good representation of different partner/stakeholder groups involved in the FHMF. Nine out of eleven respondents answered in the affirmative with one noting that "there is a broad base of partners and it is growing all the time". Another respondent was not as enthusiastic, he replied that the representation was "adequate" but "you always think there should be more". Four respondents qualified their affirmative responses. One qualification questioned the meaning of involvement and noted that "If you look at the partnerships we have a broad representation. We have a broad spectrum of partners that are interested". Along the same lines, another respondent pointed out that "there are seventy partners in the Partnership group and the extent to which they are represented at the Board level is questionable. There are only two representatives for seventy partners". Even those that said "yes" were able to identify gaps, most noticeably the environmental voice, Aboriginal participation and oil and gas participation.

Although they welcome "a broad base of partners", the term "stakeholder" is reserved for those who invest time and money into the process. Mention was made of an evolution between Phase I and II, which resulted in a clarification of definition and direction. Decision-making was considered "better in Phase II than it was in Phase I". A concern voiced was that the inclusion of other groups would diffuse the focus of the FHMF and make decision making more difficult.

Six respondents suggested missing groups. These included environmental groups, Aboriginal groups, the energy sector, coal miners, general recreation users, and professionals other than "forestry types and "park types". One respondent pointed out that although certain groups were not represented at the Board level they would still have their say at the working level. Another respondent suggested that these groups are missing "not because they have not been offered to take a chance but because they have refused". It is noteworthy that with respect to the inclusion of an environmental voice it was deemed important "to find the right person and bring them to the Board. By implication, the "wrong person" (i.e., a representative of extreme environmental groups) would adversely affect the Board and the existing decision making dynamics. Although
one respondent felt that Aboriginal people should have more opportunities, most felt that the current level of involvement was probably appropriate for the region and that additional involvement was problematic because a new reserve had recently been created in the area by the Federal Government for a Band that comes from a different area in the Province. The reserve was created without dialogue with the Model Forest and Weldwood, but is situated in Weldwood's FMA. One Board member commented that "there is concern by the Board in working these people in". Clearly, while somewhat cognizant of significant gaps in representation, the Board remains selective with respect to who it invites to join them at the table. Preserving the Board's focus appears to be a fundamental concern.

Descriptions of the decision making approach were asked for. It is clear that formal Board meetings are governed by Robert's Rules of Order, but the Board members characterized decision-making as using "a modified Robert's Rules of Order". Although definitions of consensus varied, most felt that some combination of consensus and Robert's Rules of Order was operative. Given that a good number of the Board members have business backgrounds, they tended to be more accepting of Robert's Rules of Order and downplayed any alienating tendencies. The majority seemed to be entering the discussions with the attitude that "you win some and you lose some" and that is the very nature of Board decision making. Although the above can be considered an underlying attitude, most agree "it is closer to a consensus organization". It is clear that a lot of discussion precedes actual voting and that voting is considered to be "a finalization of the discussion process". As one Board member put it:

We have very few actual votes at the Board level. Issues tend to be put on the table and you discuss them until there is a pretty high level of comfort. You usually have majority favor before you move anything ahead.

Or another states:

We have a majority vote, which mostly ends up being unanimous. If we have a split vote then sometimes things are looked at again, we have a discussion, and then we vote again.

As evidenced in the following quotation, discussion is a key component of the process, but a specific kind of consensus is being advanced.

The Board thrashes through issues and will talk it out until each one is comfortable with it. It is more of a consensus process because the Board finds out why someone won't endorse something and will thrash it out.
The definition of consensus being advanced at Foothills does not constitute total agreement.

The meaning of consensus is conveyed in the following three quotes.

To me it (consensus) means that everyone may not agree with a decision in its entirety but we can all live with the decision.

My definition is that everyone may not agree on something but they will go along with a decision anyway and support it.

It depends on how you describe consensus. If you describe it as the greatest good for the greatest number then yes, it is consensus.

This latter description appears to come closer to "majority rule" than conventional definitions of consensus. Furthermore, reaching decisions on the basis of consensus raises some concern for at least one Board member. He feels that reaching consensus is good but, in his words, "it means we have not dealt with some tough decisions yet". The use of either approaches (i.e. Robert's Rules of Order or consensus) tends to be issue specific and also can be influenced by the presence of certain strong personalities that prefer one approach to the other. Apparently, style of decision making can depend on who is driving an issue.

Next, respondents were asked to comment upon the satisfactory and unsatisfactory elements of the Board's current decision making processes. On the satisfactory side, a number of elements were identified. Two respondents spoke of the forthright nature of Board members' participation. One Board member commented that "Everyone speaks up. There are no shy people on the Board" and a second suggested that everyone was "willing to speak their mind". Two Board members noted that "there are no hidden agendas" and thus "the group can speak frankly and openly, which aids in the quality of projects and decision making". Repeated mention is made of mutual respect, both for people's ability" and for the process per se. For the most part the interaction is amiable and the climate is one of congeniality. As one Board member phrased it: "The group dynamics are there and we work well together". The Board has characterized itself as "extremely progressive" and well connected nationally (e.g., with the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers) and internationally. Decision-making is said to be timely and efficient. As one Board member sums it up "We make decisions when we have to and don't dither on them". It should be noted, as several Board members themselves noted, that Foothills had "a relatively small Board" who were "on the same wavelength". One Board member said, "There are a lot of
commonalities on where we want to go and, therefore, it is easier to make decisions". This same Board member was cognizant of the fact that some critics had contended that this was not a good thing because they weren't getting "the full spectrum of views".

One Board member categorically stated that there were no unsatisfactory elements with regards to the Board's current decision making processes. Others felt that there was some room for improvement with respect to communications, both internally and externally. Internally, there is a need to improve on how information is supplied to the Board in preparation for decision making. Initially, at least one Board member felt inundated with "hundreds of pages of supporting documents". Now, apparently, the documentation has been streamlined somewhat. One Board member also expressed "a concern that everyone on the Board is very busy "and he wondered about their ability to put time into discussing very complicated issues like criteria and indicators and cumulative effects. Another Board member felt that there was uncertainty as to whether the Board was a higher order of authority or a working board. This same individual was of the opinion that the "Foothills MF is at a higher order of decision making and loses contact with the working level of decision making".

In the next question respondents were asked whether, other than the five-year plan, the Foothills' Board routinely engage in long term planning. Eight respondents replied "yes", with one qualifying his response with respect to routinely. Two other Board members restricted their comments to the five-year plan focusing on the fact that it would test the MF's long range planning ability. One respondent replied "No" and contended that once the strategic plan was finished the Board reverted back to annual planning.

When questioned about the results of long term planning, the responses varied. There was a tendency, however, to emphasize that the Board was "forward looking" and that long term planning helped them "look at the bigger picture" and "put issues on the table for discussion". Long term planning helps the Board remain "adaptive and dynamic". As one Board member states: "all plans are living documents and indicate what is timely and relevant". Apparently, a concerted effort is made to review the annual workplan twice a year and relate it to the five-year plan.
The respondents all replied in the affirmative when asked whether Board members worked together in developing a vision for the Phase II proposal. One respondent added that Board members worked together "clearly, strongly and effectively" and this resulted in the plan being completed "six months before the Phase II process".

To develop the proposal for Phase II a series of facilitated workshops were held and, at least, two two-day retreats took place. The retreat environment was conducive to review and reflection. Although a consultant was hired to lead the Board through its discussion and give direction, most of the writing of the proposal was left up to the Model Forest staff.

The responses were mixed when the Board members were asked whether the Board routinely reviews and analyzes the findings of projects and programs once they are completed. There were four affirmative responses; four qualified affirmative responses and three negative responses. One of the affirmative respondents stated that during the research process and at the completion of projects the Board receives presentations. The four qualified "yes" responses concurred that some, but not enough review and analysis had been done. Among the negative responses, one Board member acknowledged that people give presentations to the Board during and towards the completion of a project, but the Board tries not to discuss "operational level issues". Another respondent in the negative category also asserted that "the Board primarily deals with principles and fiscal responsibilities".

Specific analysis is not done by the Board. As one Board member pointed out:

Most people are at a senior executive level and staff under them analyzes research results. They are briefed by staff in their own organizations and then we discuss it as a Board. All partners sign off the intent of the plan and endorse the results when they come out. There is no peer review procedure, but a sponsor review procedure to make sure people in their own organizations are comfortable with it.

The Board is kept apprised by presentations from researchers or from the FHMF staff. FHMF has a Board member champion in each strategic area of engagement. One or two Board members are directly connected with a project team and these teams keep the Directors informed through presentations and written reports throughout the year. The main analysis of what
projects have achieved is done by the Project Steering Committee. There are specialist groups in
the committee that deal with particular projects. The Board, as a whole, does not have the time
to look at individual projects. As noted by one respondent:

We leave it up to the Board sponsor to take a stake and see where the project is coming
from and going to.

When asked whether their Board formulated recommendations regarding sustainability in forest
practices based on their discussions and study findings, a majority (9 out of 11) said no. Two
Board members noted that, although there are land managers on the Board, Foothills does not
manage the land. As further stated by one of these Board members; "we collect the science and
encourage managers to use it". Similarly, another Board member asserted that "we are a research
Board and our philosophy is that those that can benefit from them should analyze how they
should use them". One Board member felt, however, that they were "heading down this road".
More explicitly, he stated that:

Phase I was information and research gathering. Phase II will help us establish goals and
recommendations (e.g., for criteria and indicators)...

In the next question Board members were asked to identify a significant project, or projects,
carried out by the FHMF that they regard as a success. Board members identified a number of
projects that they deemed successful. Leading the list, with five mentions, was the natural
disturbance work. The fisheries habitat area study and the socio-economic studies came second
with three mentions each. Wildlife studies and the caribou research were mentioned twice.
Rounding out the list with a single mention each were decision support systems, the ecological
classification program, the mixed wood trials, the carbon budget study, the hydrologic modeling
and aquatic habitat research and projects that forged links with the International Model Forest
Program.

The projects listed above were considered successful for a variety of reasons. One Board
member suggested that "they all have been successful largely because of the commitment of the
major partners". Projects are also deemed successful because they are "well defined", "strong"
and yield "substantial data". As a result of having data available, better decisions can be made.
As one Board member stated: "...these projects are informing decisions so we can move ahead".
Projects are also considered successful if they yield results and, in turn, there has been some implementation of results. Projects are also considered successful if they increase understanding and give "definite conclusions". More specifically, the socio-economic project was considered to be "well-rounded" and relevant because it is concerned with issues that face resource managers.

Next, respondents were asked whether they could identify a project, or projects, that they regarded as a failure. Three respondents felt that failure was a strong word and said that they would rather refer to some projects which were "less successful" or had "shortcomings". Six respondents identified difficulties with communications. Two respondents felt that the watershed and fisheries projects were less successful and two other respondents suggested that the ecotourism project was "an utter failure". The following three had one mention each: aboriginal participation, the environmentally significant areas project and the Environmental Training Centre.

The entire communications program was critiqued. It seems that difficulties were encountered right from the beginning. As one respondent indicated "it stumbled and started out of the gate". Fault was found with both internal and external (i.e., to the general public and abroad) communication. Personnel turnover and lack of expertise/specialization in the area were blamed for some of the shortfall. In Phase II, more effort and money were being put into communication in the hopes of realizing more "awareness, appreciation and support".

The watershed and fisheries projects were labeled "less successful" because the management of these projects was considered to be expensive and because some of the work was less than satisfactory. Despite a considerable infusion of money and encouragement the ecotourism project remained incomplete and, consequently, did not produce results. Once respondent reported that aboriginal participation had fallen short of the mark, but cautioned that "political circumstances may have been important there, rather than any shortcomings of the Board". Similarly, one Board Member classified the environmentally significant areas project for the Foothills forest as "another poor project" because "there were adverse consequences to the Company from that project". Apparently, the Company had set out an area (Sundance Canyon)
but when the official nomination came back from the Province they made it a larger area than what had been in the original proposal. One respondent deems the Environmental Training Centre to be "a complete failure". From his perspective, it is a failure in terms of trying to generate interest for people to take courses to learn about SFM and Model Forest projects.

Ten affirmative responses dominated the answers to the question of whether they thought any of the stakeholder groups do anything differently since the FHMF has come into existence. When asked what is done differently and by whom, two general and eight more specific responses were given. In the general category mention was made of "levels of awareness triggers and sensitivity" and "a greater consideration and understanding of the impacts on the land". One respondent asserted that:

Everybody faces their land management mandate with the findings of the Model Forest in the back of their mind. I feel we have not moved enough with taking the findings and applying them to policies and procedures, but everyone thinks of them when they are doing their job.

Also mentioned in the general category is that "there is more partnering for on the ground things". For example, in the process of doing joint research the park (Jasper) and the Province (Alberta) are "defining the methodology together and defining science together".

When specific identification was made, the Provincial Government of Alberta led the way with seven mentions; while the company (Weldwood) and the park came in second with six mentions each. The Federal Government was mentioned twice. One of the biggest changes, noted by a respondent, is that "the Federal Government, the Provincial Government, Jasper and Weldwood are all spending more time talking to each other". Apparently, all these entities are communicating and cooperating more. This is noted in the following quotation:

The research is being used and is having an effect on Weldwood's approach to things. It has affected different partnerships in on the ground planning. Jasper and the Province are now working off the same song sheet with regard to GIS. The cooperation on all projects is significant.

Respondents note that Weldwood has achieved some changes in operation and planning. For example, their management plan in 1998 will be based on work done in the Model Forest. More specifically, Weldwood has realized some of the impacts that timber harvesting has on caribou and are changing some of their practices (i.e., they are changing culverts to bridges). Given that
the operations at Weldwood are large and dynamic, one Board Member stated that it was hard to know if it is the Model Forest or management in the Hinton area that has caused change. Another respondent characterizes Jasper as being "more outward looking and...networking more". Jasper has taken and distributed some work with regard to planning and disturbance work and how things are done on the ground. Moreover, Jasper is re-examining their approach to management in the Park. Another respondent suggested that the Province has also changed. This is evidenced by the amount of overlap between their Forest Conservation Strategy document and Model Forest work. Yet another respondent maintained that the Province is also doing things differently with regard to environmentally significant areas.

Summary

In general, the respondents thought that there was a good representation of different partner/stakeholder groups involved in the FHMF. However, the representation of seventy partners in the Partnership group by two Board seats was called into question. Although they welcome a “broad base of partners”, the term stakeholders is reserved for those who invest time and money into the process. Clearly, while somewhat cognizant of significant gaps in representation (e.g. an environmental voice, aboriginal participation and oil and gas representation), the Board remains selective with respect to who it invites to join them at the table. Preserving a unified focus is a fundamental Board concern.

Formal Board meetings are governed by Robert’s Rule of Order, but the Board members noted that matters are discussed thoroughly and candidly until some level of comfort with the decision was achieved. This level of comfort did not necessarily indicate consensus but rather a decision that most could abide. Their descriptions approximate “majority rule” rather than conventional definitions of consensus. FHMF Board members were not striving for consensus and did not deem it essential for progress. In fact, the opposite opinion (i.e. that a consensus process might be detrimental to efficient decision making) seemed to prevail. Current decision making was considered to be timely and effective. On the whole, the Board has characterized itself as “extremely progressive” and well connected nationally and internationally. Critics would contend that a relatively small Board comprised of like-minded individuals although effective
and efficient with respect to decision making does not represent the diversity of stakeholder views about the forest in the area.

Concern was expressed that the Board is comprised of very busy individuals and, thus, there is a tendency to lose contact with the working level of decision making. On the other hand, it appears that a concerted effort is made when it comes to long term planning and that documents such as the workplan, are reviewed and updated on a regular basis so as to reflect what is timely and relevant. There is room for improvement, however, with respect to the review and analysis of the findings of the projects and programs once they are completed. To date, project sponsors have been more concerned with ensuring completion of projects in a timely fashion.

A clear majority of the Board members also concurred that the Board did not formulate recommendations regarding sustainability in forest practices based on their discussions and study findings. Moreover, there appeared to be a general reluctance to do so. Foothills regarded themselves as a “research board” whose findings should be analyzed by those who find them useful. Highlighting this, projects were referred to as “successful” if they were clearly defined, yielded substantial data, and if there has been some implementation of the results such as the natural disturbance work. Waste of money, inferior or incomplete work earmarked less successful projects such as the watershed and fisheries projects and the ecotourism endeavor.

Clearly the Board is of the opinion the FHMF is making a difference particularly with respect to land management and partnering efforts. Identified as the most affected were the Provincial Government, Weldwood and Jasper National Park.

Conflict Resolution

As a preamble to the first question in this section, respondents were asked to reflect upon the history of their Model Forest. More specifically, they were asked to describe some of the most serious conflicts or challenges that have arisen over the course of their program. Two respondents replied that "there are not major conflicts at the Board level". One other respondent suggested that conflict was too strong a word and three other respondents preferred to speak
about challenges faced. Those that described challenges singled out managing expectations within the bounds of limited funding. Initially it seems that the Model Forest was challenged to implement all research. It appears that there was an expectation of endless funding. Inevitable trade-offs had to occur with some projects being scaled down. Considerable discussion and debate centred on the watershed and the socio-economic projects. Moreover, there is said to be constant dialogue over "how much comes to the Board and how much doesn't. How much should come to the Board and how much should be left to the Executive and Steering Committees".

Three major sources of conflict were clearly identified: allocation of funds; decision making specifically as it pertained to determining priorities for project funding and misunderstandings due to lack of communication. The lack of communication also stemmed, according to one respondent, from not having a common understanding of where they were going with the budget. All eleven respondents stated that there was no written or formal conflict resolution procedure used by the Board. A more informal means of dialogue and discussion was usually employed. Sometimes this requires splitting off into smaller groups or working on things one on one. One Board member characterized the situation as follows:

There are no real processes in place for conflict resolution. We discuss things until we get resolution. People who are most opposed to something are to go and talk to the people they are opposed to or to the people who represent what they are opposed to (e.g. proposal proponent). There is nothing telling us how this is to be done.

Or as another respondent put it:

There is no defined process. It is a matter of keeping the discussion alive and open to where perceived differences can be clearly understood and respected.

The Board also strives for "greater education and awareness" with respect to the views of the various partners. A facilitator is hired on occasion (e.g. for the Phase II proposal) and they also use social events (e.g., the Christmas party) to do business. The consensus is that "conflicts have been at a minimum" and that the informal process "works fairly well".
There has not been any formal training, or discussion, of conflict resolution at the Board level. The perception is that many Board member have been through conflict resolution training within their own organizations and they could draw on that training. For example, it is known that the Province and Weldwood have training with regard to conflict resolution and one other Board member has had a negotiation course. One thing to remember is that this is a sophisticated Board, in terms of background and expertise, given that it is comprised of senior level managers and executives. The conflicts that do arise are considered to be "the normal types of doing business". Only one Board member thought that some form of conflict resolution or facilitation might be needed in Phase II because the Board was currently "working with goal setting now through the criteria and indicators, as well as with cumulative effects" and these were deemed to be "tough issues". All of the other Board members felt confident that at the present time there is "a supportive and common vision of all the Phase II pieces and that they would be able to cope with conflict should the need arise.

Summary

Despite insisting that the Board was relatively conflict free, three major sources of conflict were identified, namely: allocation of funds, decision making as it pertained to funding priorities and misunderstandings due to lack of communication. The Board uses no written or formal conflict resolution procedures. A more informal means of dialogue and discussion was employed. The perception prevails that many of the Board members have conflict resolution training within their own organization and, thus, the Foothills Board need not engage in such an exercise, at least not at the present time. Future issues may prove more challenging.

Communication

When asked whether the FHMF communicates effectively with stakeholder members/groups regarding the findings of completed projects and programs, eight said "No", two said "Yes" and one said, "I don't know". The majority opinion is summarized in the following quote:

It (Communication) was identified as a shortfall in our evaluation and it was suggested that we try to overcome this by committing a significant amount of money to communications,
hire a communications manager, and develop a communications strategy and have it endorsed by the Board. This is all in the process of implementation.

Most concur that communication with the Partnership group and with the public needs to be improved. In addition, the area of technology transfer has been of concern and one Board member felt that the MF Network as a whole should be putting more effort into it. The two Board members who felt that the MF was communicating effectively felt that it was doing so through "newsletters, annual reports, compendium of reports and partner representation". However, the flow of communication is considered to be "outward and downward" and feedback is still problematic.

Board members were also asked how they provided feedback to the member organizations that they represent. Reporting back takes many forms and most convey a variety of information (minutes of Board meetings, newsletters, flyers and brochures) on a regular basis. One definite area of concern was the Partners group. There appears to be a need for "far better linkages with the partnership advisors".

When asked whether their organizations regularly send comments back to the Board, most replied "No". Apparently, there is a lack of feedback and when it does occur it occurs irregularly and usually only upon solicitation. The exception seems to be with respect to project teams. People on project teams raise issues for the Board to deal with.

Workshops, symposiums and conferences were identified as the most effective outreach activities to stakeholder or community groups. Also mentioned were open houses, information sessions and field tours through the Model Forest with local groups and groups from abroad. Clearly, the work done with teachers and the local high school has been "very positive, upbeat and rewarding". Also working with the Friends of the Environmental Education Society of Alberta (FEESA) has been good. Effective communication with the rest of Alberta (beyond the local area of Hinton) has been lacking because the FHMF is not well connected with the news media. One Board member concluded that communication had been ineffective because from the outside he rarely heard of the effects of the projects that were going on in the Model Forest. He also considered the one newsletter he got once per year to be ineffective. Another Board
member thought that more time an money should be spent educating forestry staff on what's going on, but the money has been spent, according to him, "on things like tours and other frills". On the other hand, the work with FEESA has been considered effective because "it helps provide a balanced perspective of forestry for grade school and high school teachers and their students". One Board mentioned that "the Internet is effective because of its timeliness and easy access". Unlike the newsletter, one can monitor hits and determine where people come from. Presentations are considered to be effective because they are "personalized and ... leading edge". The workshops have been deemed successful because they've been well attended. The attendance is taken to be indicative of interest and values.

All eleven respondents replied that recognized community leaders demonstrate support for the FHMF. Most did not elaborate on their affirmative responses. The two that did elaborated suggested in their comments that communities should be more involved in determining how the forest resource is going to be used because it affects local people's lives.

The Mayor of Hinton was identified as "a great defender of the (MF) program" because he Chairs the FHMF Board. The mayors of other forestry-based communities (i.e. Edson and Grand Cache) as well as the townsite manager of Jasper were also identified as having given support verbally and in writing. Also, there are senior and regional representatives from the Province on the MF Board as well as the local representative from Jasper.

Six respondents felt that the Board is sufficiently informed about the operations of other Model Forests across Canada to learn from their experience. Two replied "yes and no" with one stating that the General Manager and the Chair keep Board members apprised of complimentary projects but that he had never seen a mailout from another Model Forest. He commented further that this might reflect negatively on their communication efforts. One respondent simply replied "No", one replied "no comment" and one replied "I don't know". The latter two respondents agreed, however, that there was sufficient opportunity to access information on other Model Forests if one was so inclined. One of these respondents went on to say "I don't know if I want to be informed because we have enough on our own plates".
Typically the General Manager and, to a lesser extent the President inform the Board about pertinent activities and research projects from other Model Forests. Information also comes directly to the Board. Anytime there is a major research review the researchers are asked to go talk to the Model Forests individually. For example, Foothills has dealt a lot with Fundy and they have looked at the MacGregor Model Forest and some of the projects there. Similarly, Foothills has information about criteria and indicators and have been considered leaders in the socio-economic area. They have had people contact them about their socio-economic program and have given information and direction to people doing socio-economic work. It is anticipated that activities in communications at the network level (e.g. national and individual MF websites) will improve the exchange of information. There is general agreement that due to the diversity of "size, issues and dynamics" of the various Boards there should be a sharing of information. Further it was suggested that the Model Forests should rotate opportunities for Board members (other than the GMs, presidents and communications personnel) to attend annual network meetings. It was suggested that this rotation of participants might facilitate more frequent and regular information exchange.

Summary

Communications, both internally and externally, is recognized as an area in need of improvement and some steps (i.e., allocation of time, effort and funds) have been taken to improve the Phase II performance. However, communication flow is still top down and obtaining feedback is still problematic. Inadequate participation by the Partnership group was a definite concern. Newsletters and annual reports had achieved a modicum of community recognition but, by and large workshops and conferences were considered the most effective outreach activities. All of the Board members feel that recognized community leaders demonstrate support for the FHMF program. Half of the Board members felt sufficiently informed about the operations of other Model Forests across Canada to learn from their experience. Limited exchange with respect to research is the norm. It is expected that activities in communications at the network level will improve information exchange.
Change

The MF program is operating in a very dynamic and rapidly changing policy environment. The set of questions asked in the context of change were meant to explore the ways in which each respondent felt that their MF had thus far impacted, or may in the future impact, policy change directed toward sustainable forest management. Respondents were asked to think of "policy" in the broadest context possible, and in regard to the policies and programs of government, industry, non-government organizations and other organizations and individuals who have an interest in forests and/or forest management. As well, the following definition was provided at the outset of questioning: "A policy is a guideline(s), position statement(s), directive(s) or formulation, of a principle designed to focus decision making processes toward achieving specific goals and objectives. A forest management policy may, therefore, be written or unwritten, formal or informal and be held by any group, or individual, with interest in forests and/or forest management".

This component of the survey proved the most difficult to administer and answer in each of the case study MFs. While the respondents in each MF had little problem identifying policy, policy communities, and policy issues surrounding sustainable forest management, they had greater difficulty articulating and agreeing on the role MFs have had, and should have, in the policy process. The following discussion is based on the comments received in regard to questions contained in the "change" section of the interview survey.

Initially respondents were asked to consider discussions amongst Board members about the role of the MF in effecting policy change. Previous research (Sinclair and Smith 1995) indicted that MF Boards may in fact not be considering existing forest management policy in their deliberations. Of the eleven interviewees only one said that there had been no discussions of how the FHMF might effect policy change, although two others were unsure. The nine respondents who indicated that their had been such discussions did not, however, identify any specific polices or programs that had been targeted by the FHMF for attention. One respondent noted, in this regard, that "everything is on the table": while two other referred to "interpreting how policy can be applied at a landscape level". The respondent who felt that there had been no
discussions indicated that the “Board is structured with land managers at the table - they are guilty by implication and will hopefully implement changes based on what they learn”. It is interesting to note that in an earlier survey question one respondent said, “we have also been trying to work with environmental groups... they wanted us to guarantee that we would change policy and we could not do that”.

Despite the lack of discussion of policy change at Board meetings, FHMF Board members provided very detailed opinions about policy and policy problems regarding forest management. The policy problems identified ranged from the specific, “reforestation policy is a problem”, to the more general, “the legislation we are dealing with is archaic and focuses on sustained yield”. No strong common themes emerged from the responses given. Three respondents did note that one of the main problems was incorporating values in decision making - “conducting forestry business in relation with other values”; “the tradeoff of values”; and, dealing with “conflicting land uses”. Three other respondents noted that the biggest policy issue was “moving from sustained yield to sustainable forest management (SFM)”. One of these noted that achieving SFM will require different government departments (e.g. Energy, Trade, Tourism) to work together to look at the big picture. Respondents were virtually evenly split in their feeling about whether their perception of the policy problems had changed as a result of involvement in FHMF. None could be said to have changed their perception fundamentally with most noting that their “understanding” and “knowledge” of existing policy issues had improved.

In relation to these policy problems, all respondents felt that the FHMF was in a position to provide advice to those individuals most involved in influencing the policy setting process. Two themes were evident in the responses to this question. In the first, a group of respondents felt that FHMF would be in such a position since “we have some senior people involved in the program who have the connections with policy makers”. The second group felt that the FHMF would be able to influence the policy process through communicating the results of their “research”: “we have acquired some excellent in-depth information in areas that are useful for knowledge based decisions in policy”. One respondent noted that the FHMF research would have an influence on policy “through working together”.
Respondents identified a very interesting range of “main players” in the forest management policy community in the region. All respondents mentioned the Provincial Government and, in particular, the Department of Environmental Protection as being a main player. After this, a great variety of players were noted. A number noted both Jasper National Park and Weldwood as well as other players such as: “other industry stakeholders (oil, gas, mining)”; “the public”; “local government”; and, other stakeholders such as “outfitters”, etc. One respondent even noted the FHMF as being a main player. Conspicuous by their complete absence was the identification of First Nations and the environmental community as main players in the policy community by respondents. Linking with the players noted has occurred most directly by having representatives on the Board or involved in the “sub-committee levels”. A number of respondents also noted that the FHMF partners and Board members sit on a number of other important committees such as the “Yellowhead Regional Planning Committee”. Respondents recognized direct involvement “at all levels” as being important. One respondent also noted that the FHMF makes presentations to other organizations whose practices might be affected. With the exception of one respondent, all noted that the FHMF had worked most closely with the Provincial Government and forest industry. Some of these also noted Jasper National Park and local government.

Nine respondents felt that the significant projects, which they had identified earlier in the survey, did have implications for forest management policy. For the most part, their responses as to why these projects were successful was fairly clear and in some cases quite specific. Two respondents were very specific in noting that changes resulted due to research findings, e.g. “...Aquatic habitat project... and more stringent regulations for water body crossings”. Another noted that the projects were successful because they were initiated at the request of Weldwood who “took the results and applied them”. Other reasons for success included reasons such as “the work identifies the real land management issues”, “...they have broad support from stakeholder groups, they are scientific in nature, and they are applied on the landscape”, etc. The two respondents who were not as sure if the projects had policy implications saw the Province as the only agent of policy change.
Five respondents indicated that the FHMF Board did not require “contractors” to identify the policy implications of their research, while a further five were not sure if they did or not. One respondent indicated that they were not really sure if it “was their preference to ask that” while another noted in response to an earlier question that, “it is dangerous for researchers to stand up and preach”. Others noted that they thought such an approach was a “good idea” or that it was already “on our minds”. Despite the fact that policy issues are not identified by contractors, no clear theme emerged in response to whether the Board discussed policy issues in relation to specific projects. Some felt it did happen, some felt it did not, while others felt that it occurred at another level in the organization such as the sub-committees. Clearly, there is not a lot of discussion in this regard at the Board level.

Most respondents felt that the FHMF program has thus far had an impact on their particular organizations policies or programs. All respondents qualified this positive response in some way, most often noting that the impact had been “indirect”. For example, one respondent noted that there has been no influence on their “actual policy book...but it has had an impact on our actions”; while another noted that there has been an impact through “better awareness and understanding of how natural disturbances might be integrated into policy and operational decisions”. Two respondents were quite specific about the impact, one noting that the MF has had an influence “on policy documents... the Forest Conservation Strategy and the Timber harvest Ground Rules document”; while another noted that “...harvesting practices have been modified for habitat and wildlife”.

All but three respondents felt that the national evaluation of the Canadian MF program was fair in concluding that “MFs have not had a major impact on forest policy”. Most who answered in the affirmative did, however, qualify their response with comments such as: “at the time that statement/ evaluation was made”; “you need more context to substantiate yes or no... we need more time to substantiate our research”; and, “I would have to qualify that because these policies are changing every day through other changes in provincial policy”. Of those who felt the evaluation was not fair only one indicated why, noting that the FHMF had gone “through the provincial Forest Conservation Strategy document... we were ahead of the wave”. In terms of how the FHMF might impact forest policy in the next five years, all but one respondent felt this
would occur through the research that the FHMF carries out. This is perhaps best captured in the following comment: “by taking the research findings and applying them to the model forest landbase”. One respondent noted a more direct route to effecting policy change, that being through the Forest Conservation Strategy.

All respondents felt that the FHMF would some day have an influence on forest management policy and procedures, although one did say that he was “not going to hold his breath”. Most felt that this would occur through research carried out by FHMF and the transfer of knowledge gained to partners - “through applied science and education”, “through research knowledge and the diversity of partners”. Two other respondents also indicated that it would be up to the “responsible managers” on the Board “to apply what we are doing”.

In terms of their integration with the Provincial Government the FHMF has worked most closely with the Department of Environmental Protection, Land and Forest Service and Natural Resources Service. Further to this, respondents were split in opinion over the issue of the FHMF working cooperatively with the Provincial Government to develop specific aspects of their forest management planning. Those that felt that the FHMF has not been working cooperatively with the Province all qualified their answers with comments such as: “No not formally... the closest we get is working on the criteria and indicators working group”; “Indirectly, probably. Directly we don’t work with the Province to develop policy”; and, “With regard to policy, no. With regard to plans, yes”. Of those that felt the FHMF was working cooperatively with the Province on policy issues, mention was made of the “Forest Conservation Strategy”, in particular, and applying research findings to the landbase, more generally.

With respect to affecting local forest management practices, respondents were evenly split in terms of their opinion of whether the FHMF had any effect on federal lands. Those that felt there was an impact mentioned Jasper National Park, but did not identify specific activities. Most felt that the FHMF has had no effect on First Nations Land, although one respondent indicated it was too early in the program to assess. Views were split on whether there had been an impact on the use of available wood supplies, with four respondents indicating they were not sure and another noting “I would hazard to say yes...”. Only one concrete example of a direct
impact was identified: “through the chipper project...”. Most respondents felt that the FHMF had impacted environmentally friendly logging but were not in agreement as to how this had occurred. Various projects were mentioned by respondents in this regard: “work on riparian areas and caribou habitat”; “the Shelterwood project”; “Disposal of chipper residue project”; “research on carbon budgets”; “understory protection treatments”; and, “mixed wood trial and ecological classification”.

Not surprisingly, there was only limited consensus among respondents on the sorts of policy change that is needed to “accelerate the implementation of sustainable development into the practice of forestry”. Interestingly one respondent indicted that there “was already sustainable development in the FHMF and another noted that “this is assuming we don’t already have some sustainable development - we are articulating the concept of sustainable development”. Only one respondent advocated for what might be considered a major change in policy by noting the need for “more confidence and security of the landbase and tenure”. Most respondents identified the need for much more modest changes such as: “developing planning processes to formally use the information collected”; “a willingness to hear and debate the views of all parties”; “implementation of the tools that let you quantify policy”; and, work on and implementation of “criteria and indicators”. One respondent also noted that there is going to be an increased debate in this “era of the devolution of responsibilities of the Province to industrial operations... it is up to the Province to devolve a greater range of resource management responsibilities with commensurate rewards”.

On the whole, respondents did not think that the FHMF should be advocating directly for the sorts of policy change or action that they advocated. Most did not indicate why they felt this was the case, with the exception of two respondents who felt that “responsibilities and decision making have to remain with the Province” and one other that noted, “No, during Phase I. In the second phase very judiciously. We have to be careful”. The sorts of mechanisms suggested for advocating change ranged from getting Board members to write letters to “making recommendations”. One respondent noted that “There is written policy and a type of understanding of what we can do with it. It is changing that attitude to policy that we can assist in”.
Summary

The interview schedule made the assumption that the bulk of change in forest management practices caused by MFs would occur through the consideration of existing stakeholder groups’ policies, programs and practices in MF activities. Clearly, the Board of the FHMF has had some discussions on policy issues, although they have not identified any particular policy or programs that they might attempt to effect through MF projects. It is interesting that the ENGO groups that FHMF have attempted to get on the Board wanted a guarantee that forest management policy would change as a result of MF activities. Since FHMF does not set provincial or industry forest policy it is obvious why such a promise could not be made. It is curious, however, that some compromise could not be reached between the parties involved on the types of policies FHMF might attempt to address through their programs and projects that could eventually result in suggestions for policy modification.

Despite the lack of discussion amongst the Board on specific policy issues, most respondents identified quite specific forest management policy problems that the FHMF might address. These were focused around two theme areas: the problem of developing policy that incorporates a range of forest values into the decision making mix; and, lifting up the foundation of forest policy to recognize new concepts such as SFM. One respondent noted in regards to this latter point that, “it is a real tragedy of the commons because public land is managed by the Provinces who do not have a long-term view of resources management”. While strong opinions such as this were evident in a number of comments, there is an obvious undercurrent of opinion that keeps the FHMF out of policy issues - “we don’t set provincial policy”.

All Board members felt that the FHMF is in a position to offer advice to those more influential in the policy community and many felt that the FHMF had, or would have, an impact on their policies. In fact, respondents were very up-beat about the potential impact of FHMF activities on forest management policies and programs. All identified the same player as being the critical link to the forest management policy community - The Alberta Department of Environmental Protection. Formal links have been established with this department. It is interesting that
respondents also identified a good array of other groups that they recognized as being part of the forest management policy community. The FHMF links with some of these other groups are not as clear. Respondents felt that they had worked most closely with the Provincial Government and the forestry industry. In fact, the Board recognizes a great strength in having senior representatives of the major land managers in the area on the Board. While this is a very positive aspect of the FHMF in terms of effecting change, it also raises two fundamental concerns: 1. the major land managers are on the Board but those that are affected by their decisions, i.e. many of the other stakeholders they note as being part of the policy community, do not seem to have a voice. These same stakeholders will try to get involved in land management decisions in the region and should have the benefit of the MF activities; 2. some may be left with the impression that the FHMF is being driven by those who have traditionally set forest management policy, i.e., Provincial Government and industry, which might be seen as stifling innovation.

In addition to having influential Board members, all respondents noted at some point in the questioning on change that advice from the FHMF would most likely come through communication and education about the research carried out. As one respondent noted “if we operate together we could have a significant influence with our research in regard to policy”. How this will occur, in the case of the FHMF, is not as evident. No process has been established that identifies an effective means for this to occur outside of having influential Board members take project results back to their sectors - “we have some senior people...who have connections with policy makers”. Currently the Board does not require contractors/researchers to suggest where their research findings might best plug into the existing forest management policies, programs and processes. Some, in fact, do not see it as appropriate. A more active communication of the implications of the findings of FHMF research between researchers and the Board on policy, program and procedures would stimulate discussion amongst the Board on policy issues and may help the Board to identify the best target audiences for completed work. This could be done without having researchers “preach” to the Board. This would be a more active approach to trying to effect change rather then the passive approach of finishing research and hoping change results. This view is evidenced in the following quote: “it is not up to us to advocate our research it is in the public domain and they can use it to advocate their views”.

The respondents were fairly clear about the types of policy change that they felt were needed to “accelerate the implementation of sustainable development in the practice of forestry”. Unlike other MFs, only one respondent noted what could be identified as a major change, that being, tenure reform. Others saw the work on criteria and indicators as important for future changes in forest practices. One respondent felt that the FHMF was working on these “bigger policy issues such as SFM, while the Province works on more immediate problems”. This is an interesting insight, which if true establishes a vital role for FHMF research. A number of respondents did not see the FHMF affecting provincial policy, but rather the plans that result from the policy. This is likely a very realistic approach and means should be identified to be sure it occurs. It seems also fair to say, however, that the FHMF might be more effective in directly causing change if they focus their efforts by identifying the issues that they want to tackle and hence the groups that should be involved in, and informed of, their research findings. It appears that the FHMF Board hopes that this will be achieved in part through working with the Province on the Forest Conservation Strategy and through involvement with the Yellowhead Regional Planning Committee. If the Board agrees to consider bigger issues, such as tenure reform, they need to figure out what role they might play in trying to effect change.

Social Values

This component of the survey was to determine what, if any, research has been undertaken or proposed in the Model Forests with regard to social values. In simple terms, social values are aspects of society that people deem to be worthwhile or desirable. In terms of forest environments, the aspects that people regard as desirable can be defined as forest values. Within Canadian society a variety of forest values exist. Some of these values have been prevalent for years, whereas others have only recently emerged. Understanding and sustaining all these values has become problematic for forest managers as former practices and strategies have grown out of synch with societal changes. The shift to SFM has attempted to ameliorate some of the deficiencies that presently plague forest management in an effort to better attune the values of Canadians with appropriate management practices.
Accelerating the implementation of SFM practices is one of the main objectives of the MF program. As microcosms of Canadian society the Model Forests contain a subset of the nation’s forest values, and have the potential to influence and inform this process. The purpose, therefore, of soliciting respondents' views on this topic was twofold:

1. to determine if the forest values of the MF Boards, partner groups, and community members had been identified and shared; and,

2. to determine the effectiveness of incorporating identified values into decision-making processes both within and outside the MF organizations.

As the MFs were designed to represent the local context in which they are located, the composition of the Boards tend to include a variety of stakeholders that reside in and around the MF areas. These stakeholders define the decision making process of the Board and set the stage for the development of projects and programs. As many of these Board members represent and hold different forest values, conflict can arise as expression and integration of these values compete for inclusion into the Boards' processes. The design of the MF Boards thus becomes a testament to their integrity and conviction to deal seriously with diverse forest values and management issues.

By examining how the MF Boards have identified and incorporated forest values into their processes and programs gives insight into how they have dealt with such issues. To ascertain this information, respondents were initially asked if formal attempts had been made to identify the forest values of Board members. Of the eleven Board members interviewed in the FHMF, nine respondents indicated that formal attempts had been made. Several respondents indicated that it had been done through various strategic planning initiatives, whereas others felt it had been done through either the socio-economic or the criteria and indicators projects.

Subsequently ten of the respondents felt that they could identify the forest values held by other Board members. The following list outlines the values and views that individual Board members thought were shared by, and characteristic of, the Board as a whole.
Values Shared by the Board:

- All Board members share the desire to sustain wildlife species that we have on the landbase and that we are working with. We also do not want to inflict any environmental damage on the landscape. We also want to maintain the flow of fiber to the plant in Hinton and continue to provide benefits to the community and the government. We all value Jasper and what it represents to Alberta and Canada.
- Collectively we share similar resource management objectives. We have all signed on that collectively we agree that we should aspire to the criteria and indicators through our research, targeting to work to the goals and objectives set by CCFM.
- This Board swings more toward community development and the economic side of things (e.g., lifestyles, communities).
- Most of us are pretty traditional; most of us are foresters and biologists.
- There are an amazing variety of values. Some are concerned about cumulative effects; others value wildlife, and others, jobs at the mill.
- There is a clear understanding of economic values with timber and the utilization of fiber. There are also mineral resources, coal and petroleum. There is a strong understanding of a lot of values in wildlife, recreation, hunting, fishing and guiding. There is a lot of value in birds. Clearly, there is an understanding of the inter-relationships between these values and the fact that you end up with highly managed areas. You also have broad values with access and reforestation. The public values the use of the forest for many things defined and undefined.
- Value of fiber, value of a mix of age stands across the landscape, values of individual species of wildlife, natural disturbance models. There is any number of held values out there.

While it appears that there is a strong sense of shared values at the Board, some members also acknowledged and identified values that they thought were more characteristic of specific partner groups. The following list reveals what partner representatives identified as being specific forest values for their own group as well as for some of the other partner groups.

**Canadian Forest Service:**

*Forest Values Identified by Partner Representative*
- The MF is a great place to take research to an applied level, and with support of partners it [research] stands a far better chance of being taken up at the other end of it’s life.

*Forest Values Identified by Other Partner Representatives*
- N/A.
Department of Environmental Protection:

*Forest Values Identified by Partner Representatives*

**Land and Forest Service**

- It encompasses every wishy washy value you can think of. It includes people, prosperity and preservation. There is a value around representing unique sites, and there is also a value around economics and ecological prosperity. There is both yin and yang through all the staff.

**Natural Resource Service**

- That we have a legacy for parks for our children and our grandchildren. We all have our motherhood goals and we should all be measured by them by the end of the day. Our mission is; “As proud stewards of Alberta’s renewable natural resources, we will protect, enhance and ensure the wise use of our environment. We are a dedicated and committed team, responsible for managing these resources with Albertans. We are guided by a shared commitment to the environment and are accountable to our partners, the people of Alberta.”

*Forest Values Identified by Other Partner Representatives*

- The Province has certain policies and authorities that are in place and are recognized. They [policies] will remain in place until higher authorities denounce them.

- The government has a holistic approach to resource extraction and communities.

- The Province manages the land and is responsible for all people’s values.

**Foothills Model Forest Partnership Group:**

*Forest Values Identified by Partner Representatives*

- Nothing.

- Nova - how developers look at things once the trees are out of the way. We want to start enhancing and building processes to do things jointly. We want to partner relationships to look at issues timely and with knowledge of the broader landscape level. The magnitude of finding the answers is out of reach of any one partner. We have to look at the landscape level and look at the frameworks of what communities, government and industry expect. We have to dovetail what everyone expects.

*Forest Values Identified by Other Partner Representatives*

- The University has an academic point of view. They have a different value system.

**Jasper National Park:**

*Forest Values Identified by Partner Representative*

- The values Jasper provides. Jasper has ecological, spirituality, escape, recreation and leisure values. It has value for experiencing and learning about the Park. Our values are reflected in the National Parks Act; “The Parks are hereby dedicated to the people of Canada for their benefit, education and enjoyment, and shall be maintained and made use of so as to leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.”

*Forest Values Identified by Other Partner Representatives*

- Jasper is preservation minded and natural disturbance is the chosen way of bringing change on the landscape.

- Conservation ethic, ecological integrity (mandate is to preserve the ecological integrity of the Park).

- Jasper values non-resource extraction management.

**Town of Hinton:**

*Forest Values Identified by Partner Representative*

- The research that is going on. For example, the work on criteria and indicators and the socio-economic side of sustainability. Those things are going to drive our ability to determine our future. Right now it is outside forces and organizations that drive our future.
Forest Values Identified by Other Partner Representatives

- The Mayor of Hinton reflects the views of the local people who expect they should have a say in how the forest is managed and the activities that affect their lives.
- The Mayor values community values, a stable community, and a good quality of life in the community.

Weldwood of Canada Limited:

Forest Values Identified by Partner Representatives

- Environmental stewardship, economic values of timber and utilization of fiber, values of wildlife, recreation, hunting, fishing and guiding, biodiversity, access, and reforestation.

Forest Values Identified by Other Partner Representatives

- Profit motivated and value economics and employment.
- Weldwood types are resource extraction oriented.
- Weldwood values job creation and the economic contribution of the forestry industry.
- Weldwood would like to stay in business and be a profitable company.

All of the respondents indicated that their partner organization was attempting to translate their individual values into action (i.e., make them recognized/legitimized). The majority of respondent’s (10) in turn felt that the MF was a viable vehicle to assist them in doing so. Some representatives stated they were attempting to put their values into action either through the work of their individual agencies or in conjunction with research endeavours undertaken by the MF.

In addition, all respondents believed the MF had served as a good means for bringing people together that hold diverse forest values. Some individuals gave strong affirmation to this question by giving statements such as: “Yes, absolutely, that is the strength of the MF.” The majority of the respondents indicated that it was through meetings and discussions of the Board or various committees that most partners were able to gain an understanding of each other’s values. Some individuals mentioned that it also happened through various means such as social extravaganzas (e.g., Christmas party), workshops and tours of the MF.

While the FHMF has been effective in drawing forth a commonality and sense of shared values amongst the Board, it has also been a good forum for the expression and appreciation of individual values. As nine respondents have indicated, it has been the consideration of these values that have caused changes in both the decision making process of the MF and the operations of some of the partner groups. It appears that the relationships between several organizations (e.g., Weldwood and Jasper National Park) have grown as their individual
perspectives have been heard and better understood. In turn, the operations and practices of some partner groups have changed and been adapted to accommodate new values and views. It also appears that the decision making process of the MF has grown due to the inclusion of partner values. As one respondent stated: “The decision making context, hearing and listening has changed. It changed when Jasper and Willmore Wilderness Park came on because they have a different approach and perspective of things. The coordination is much better now. I give credit to the MF program for bringing groups together.”

Despite these changes, however, ten of the eleven respondents believed that the values of some partner groups were given more consideration than others for inclusion into the decision making process of the MF. Several respondents felt that the values of those groups vested with land management authority were given more consideration than others. This was due to the fact that these agencies were the ones with the responsibility to ultimately implement changes on the ground from the outcomes and influence of the MF’s research, and were thus the ones setting the direction with how the MF money was being spent. Many other respondents felt that it was Weldwood, specifically, who got most consideration. Some respondents indicated that this was more of a perception than an actual reality though. Conversely, others felt consideration was given to Weldwood because of the influence of their landbase in the MF area, as well as their funding of, and commitment to certain projects. The following quote demonstrates this idea: “It is based on the golden rule [he who has the gold, rules]. It is the name of the game. The squeaky wheel gets the grease. For example, if Weldwood puts in a million dollars for funding, they’ll get more achievements and say”.

In contrast, there have been little to no effects on forest management decision making outside of the MF organization due to the consideration of the forest values held by the Board. Eight of the respondents felt the Board has discussed how this might happen, but there has been little action done in this regard as of yet. Many respondents felt this could happen slowly and indirectly in the near future with the use of MF research, the process of technology transfer and the influence of the organization to inform other agencies (e.g., the Land Manager’s Forum). Essentially, respondents believed it could happen by having the MF disseminate their information (i.e., research) to stakeholder groups and resource managers. They could then bring these groups
together to find common ground in dealing with forest management issues and accelerating the implementation of SFM.

In order to accelerate SFM, however, the implementation of certain practices must be applicable on the landscape. This requires an understanding of the broader issues that persist at the local level and influence community values. As eight respondents indicated the FHMF has considered these issues and has focused on doing research that encompasses the values of community members that are not directly involved in the MF organization. Much of this work has been done through the socio-economic program, but many of the results are still pending. Thus most respondents could not indicate whether this research had induced any changes in their perspectives of other people’s values or whether the Board could use this information to influence forest management decision making outside of the MF. A few respondents did mention though, that this research process had shone some light on other issues. For example, they now realize the magnitude of forest economics, how uninformed people are about the MF, and the need to attract other groups to the FHMF program.

Even though the results of the socio-economic research are still forthcoming, half of the respondents believed that the MF, in general, has increased Board members’ appreciation of the ways in which other people value the forest. This has been done by broadening their scope on the players, issues and values that are present in the region. Some respondents, however, indicated that it had only increased their appreciation of the values of the partners participating on the Board, and not those of any outside groups.

The majority of Board members (7) felt that values research and the incorporation of such research into various processes could accelerate the implementation of SFM. Most respondents believed that if there was a better understanding and awareness of diverse forest values then forest management practices could be developed to better integrate and sustain these values at the landscape level. As one respondent summarized:

“It is difficult to change forest management practices and policy if you only work from your point of view... but things are like a moving goal post and you have to stay on top so your value set has to be current. You can’t have knee jerk reactions. It could throw things off.
You should use a crystal ball for looking at lasting values and then tinker around the edges for values that are not as long lasting.”

Summary

In light of these responses, it is evident that FHMF has attempted to grapple with the issue of forest values. While much work remains in this area, Foothills has made a sound effort at trying to understand the complexity of this issue. Through its efforts Foothills has been effective in bringing together people that hold diverse values. All respondents attest to this fact and it is apparent in the operation of the Board. For example, the coalescing of different groups has enabled some partners to bridge gaps that previously existed between them (e.g., Jasper and Weldwood), and has allowed them to work together to achieve the objectives of the MF program.

Foothills has not only helped bridge differences, it has also helped develop commonalities amongst its members. One of the most prevalent commonalities is the set of values that the Board shares. This is evident in the responses that were given by respondents when they were asked to identify the values held by Board members. Many of them responded using collective terms such as “we”, “all”, and “us”, indicating that there is a set of values present amongst the Board that many, if not all, of the members respect and agree to. While many of the other respondents identified values that they thought were more characteristic of specific groups, rather than the Board as a whole, they were quite adept at identifying them. This indicates that there is a strong awareness of values at all levels of the Board.

This awareness of values may, in part, be implicitly understood “in the organization’s representation” at the Board, but likely has developed from the formal planning exercises (e.g., criteria and indicators) whereby partners’ values become readily identifiable amidst discussion. However, as many respondents indicated it was both formal and informal encounters of the Board that enabled the partners to gain an understanding of each other’s values. It appears thus that an initial awareness of values occurs through formal meetings, but the subtleties and nuances of these values only become thoroughly understood once the Board interacts in a more social and informal sense.
The act of sharing values, regardless of how it was done, has had an obvious impact of the organization and the functioning of the Board. As one respondent noted: "the demonstration of values is reflected in the Phase II document" and "there is a subset of values embodied in the Board." In review of the Phase II document, there are four primary issues that FHMF is attempting to deal with and each of these issues is highlighted by a statement of values held by the Board. For example, the Board believes in "well-represented, strong, mutually-beneficial and supportive partnerships" in attempting to build a solid organization. From this information it can be construed that there is truly a strong cohesion and awareness of values amongst the FHMF Board. The projects and planning exercises (e.g., criteria & indicators) have obviously drawn out the values of the Board members enabling them to not only condense them into "living" documents that reflect their views, but to "embody" them so that they are implicitly understood and shared by the members.

Understanding and sharing values has been a fundamental part of the Foothills’ Board and organization and should remain part of it. For such an endeavour could not only continue to propel the MF forward, but it could also give members insight into the chronology of changing forest values.

It would not be inappropriate for FHMF to do this since many respondents felt the MF had been a good vehicle in assisting partner groups in translating their values into action, and it was through research projects of the MF that they were attempting to do this. These research projects have the potential, in turn, to inform policy makers about the diversity of forest values, and can influence them in making appropriate decisions with regard to SFM. As half of the respondents have indicated, present policy is outdated and government is unable to effectively adapt policy to adequately address forest values and related management issues. The following statements highlight this point:

The legislation we are dealing with is archaic and it largely focuses on a sustained yield basis... it has not progressed to include different facets of resource management (e.g., flora and fauna).

Moving from sustained yield to SFM... there have been no guidelines, it has been a wide open playing field and there are huge issues to deal with when moving from one to the other.
If senior resource managers who preside at the MF can objectively see the shortcomings of forest management policy and realize that the research undertaken in the MF can incorporate values into legitimate actions, then it is important that the MF remain as the crucible to test these actions and continue to draw forth new perspectives from the Board. The MFs were developed to accelerate change aimed at achieving SFM, and the FHMF has effective processes to instigate this change with Board members who recognize that change is needed.

However, it is questionable to what extent the FHMF will affect change given the composition of the Board and hence the values represented. The FHMF Board consists of only seven different groups with representation predominantly being from the Province and the Weldwood Company. Three representatives from each group sit on the Board. Given the fact that several respondents felt that it was land managers, such as Weldwood, whose values were often given, or perceived to be given, greater consideration in the decision making process of the MF, it will be interesting to see how vigilant the Board will be in incorporating different values into the program.

As a consequence of this situation, many respondents recognized the need to attract other groups to the FHMF. Including such groups from the oil and gas, and mining industries, as well as from Aboriginal and environmental groups. However, several other respondents were opposed to such an occurrence. They believed that the addition of new partners might “turn over the apple cart” or “diffuse the focus of the program.” Granted there is some validity to this perspective, since the addition of new members might hinder the progress of certain developments or slow down the endeavours of the Board. However, this calls into question the integrity of the Board in dealing with diverse value issues. Especially since the Board is streamlining its focus as it moves to more of a “top down” approach in Phase II, from a previous “bottom up” approach used in Phase I.

To overcome this deficiency “the door has been left open” for other agencies to join the FHMF Board. It appears though that no new members have joined as of yet. With the representation of values from the Foothills Partnership group being, as one respondent indicated, “a sham,” it appears the mix of values at the Board will remain relatively homogeneous for the time being.
The Foothills Partnership group consists of approximately seventy different organizations from within Alberta and their values and views are represented by only two members from the MF Board. The Partnership meets once or twice a year to discuss the happenings of the MF, but it is obviously inadequate to establish proper ties and representation. Both representatives to the Partnership did not feel confident in representing the Partnerships views, and when other Board members attempted to identify the values of the group they could only identify the values of the organizations in which the representatives belonged to, not those of the entire group. Injecting diverse values into the Board and program presently seems to be somewhat problematic, as access and legitimate representation are limited.

Coupled with the fact that only half of the respondents believed the FHMF had increased their appreciation of the ways in which other people value the forest, it becomes apparent that the insular representation and motives of the Board may have already stymied the process of SFM before it has had a chance to begin. With a slow start in their communications strategy it may be difficult for the results of the MF projects and programs to be accepted by agencies not directly involved in the organization. Exclusion from decision-making processes can also breed distrust amongst outside groups. Thus, limited representation and few linkages to the FHMF program may eventually impede the implementation of some well-intentioned management strategies that develop out of the program.

As many Board members indicated, they felt that values research and the incorporation of such research could accelerate the implementation of SFM. Other members also mentioned that even though values research undertaken in FHMF has not yet influenced decision making outside of the MF it could in the future. However, given the limited representation of values that reside at the Board it may be difficult for these things to come to actual fruition. Status quo forest management has already been dominated by many of the same players and their values that are present amongst the MF Board. The bottom line for FHMF, therefore, is whether it has the conviction to seriously affect decision making and change policy to adopt SFM practices. The results remain to be seen. As one respondent summarized: “We are dancing right now. It is early in the game and things are going good, but we have big issues to tackle and that is when the MF will be tested; when we have really gotten involved in these issues.”
Conclusions

As stated at the outset, the purpose of this report is to communicate the findings of the interviews carried out with Board representatives of the FHMF. As such, this document does not compare the findings of the research done with the FHMF to other case study MFs considered in the research. The following conclusions are drawn in relation to each of the objectives established at the outset of the report. Specific recommendations for action are beyond the scope of this work since this was not an intended or stated consequence of the research - the interview schedule was not meant to be an evaluation. The summary comments for each of the three sections of this report highlight in more detail many issues that the FHMF may want to consider in the future.

Board members recognized two weaknesses with respect to representation. Clearly, two Board seats do not adequately represent seventy partnership organizations and, in turn, the Partnership Advisory Committee is not representing the Partnership group adequately. As well, there are other significant gaps in representation on the Board such as an environmental voice, Aboriginal participation and oil and gas representation. While recognized as somewhat problematic, there are no immediate plans, nor even a firm resolve, to rectify the situation. Preserving a unified focus remains the uppermost concern.

At the present time, Board members are content with Robert's Rules of Order formally governing their decision-making process. They are striving to achieve "a level of comfort" rather than "consensus" with respect to significant decisions. Candid discussions within a context of respect were the order of the day. The alienating affects of majority rule were discounted in favor of what was perceived to be timely and efficient decision making.

The Board already recognizes that both internal and external communication warrants improvement. Time and money has been allocated for improvement in this regard. It is noteworthy that documents are regarded as "living entities" insofar as they are reviewed and updated on a regular basis and this assists the MF in being flexible and adaptable. However, there is room for improvement with respect to the review and analysis of findings of projects and
programs once they are completed. The Board does not formulate recommendations regarding sustainability in forest practices based on their discussions and study findings. The Board feels confident in letting the research results speak for themselves. They are equally confident that the results of their projects are having an impact on actual land managers. The Province (Alberta) the park (Jasper) and the company (Weldwood) are seen as doing things differently. Most notably they are partnering in planning and research.

The Board is depicted as being relatively free of conflict. Conflict, when it does arise, seems to be centered on the allocation of funds, project priorities and misunderstandings stemming from a lack of communication. Informal rather then formal means of conflict resolution predominate with no perceived need for additional training.

Workshops and conferences were considered the most effective outreach activities. Although Board members felt that recognized community leaders support the MF, they are concerned that citizens in the local communities remain relatively uniformed about the MF projects and programs despite the potential impact on their lives. Exchange of information with other MFs across the network was limited but access to information was said to be improving with improvements at the network level.

The extent to which the findings of FHMF programs and projects are resulting in policy, program and project changes aimed at achieving sustainability in forest practices among stakeholder groups, is currently negligible. Board members were, however, very clear and candid about forest management policy issues and the sorts of policy changes needed to achieve SFM. This is evident in the responses given in the change and social values components of the survey. In addition, the Board has members who occupy senior management positions that could effect change and all Board members feel that the FHMF is in a position to offer advice to other influential organizations in the policy community. As well, at least one Board member sees the FHMF as a main player in the forest management policy community. While this all bodes well in terms of the future impact the FHMF might have, attention should be paid to the stakeholders that have a voice at the Board table so that the impression that the FHMF is dominated by the traditional decision makers - government and industry - is alleviated. Additionally, most
currently see change occurring through the research that is carried out by FHMF, yet there is no clear path for how this will occur.

The majority of respondents felt that social values research and the incorporation of such research into decision making could accelerate the implementation of SFM practices, thus causing change to occur. In fact, Board members were very clear on the need to incorporate a greater range of values into forest management decisions. It was also evident that the FHMF Board shares a set of values, unlike most other MFs. Understanding and sharing values has been a fundamental part of the Foothills Board organization, which is critical to achieving their SFM aspirations. Since all respondents recognized the FHMF as a good means of bringing people together and a viable vehicle to assist sector groups in putting their values into action, agreement amongst the Board to pursue the aspirations of various sector groups may provide an avenue for change to occur.
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APPENDIX 1

Responses to the survey of views on
Foothills Model Forest activities aimed at
achieving sustainable forest management\textsuperscript{1}

\textsuperscript{1} The following documents the survey responses obtained from the Board members interviewed at the FHMF. The introductory portion of the survey and some background questions are not included. The survey responses have been edited to the extent that we feel is necessary to maintain the anonymity of the respondents. In some cases this may not hold true for people who are more familiar with those we interviewed. The responses have also been mixed under the various questions, so bullet one under question 3 is not the same respondent as bullet one under question 5. I would warn against trying to make any guess who the respondent is - you would be very surprised what some people will tell strangers.
BACKGROUND DATA

1a. For how long, have you been on the Board of the MF in your region? Do you expect to stay involved in Phase II?

1b. Have you participated in other capacities with the MF? Please specify.

2. How did you become involved in the MF?

3a. How would you describe your experience with the MF over this time (rewarding, frustrating, fulfilling, good, bad, etc.)? Give reasons why.

- Before the Model Forest, forest management was organized in the old stove pipe fashion (government, industry and communities), but there were not a lot of linkages. The Model Forest was a timely initiative to bring linkages to the table and to address competition. We knew we could build linkages through the Model Forest.

- It has been fairly positive. It has allowed us to do a number of things in a thorough and timely a fashion. We built initiatives that we would have embarked on anyway, but it allowed us to do things better and faster. The relationships we have developed through the Model Forest with other organizations have been positive. For example, our relationship with Jasper before was at arms length and not very cordial at times.

- It has been rewarding and frustrating, but there has been growth in the process. The Model Forest is set up to look at fiber based management systems. If we are going to look at answers for the future you need something like the Model Forest. The Model Forest has been evolving in this area and, therefore, it has been rewarding and frustrating.

- It has been very positive. I think it is time to get more research done because most of it is applied and we should get it on the ground to practitioners. The Woodlot Association in Alberta is reinventing the wheel. Woodlot associations in other Model Forest should be linking together. I have not seen enough tech. transfer and getting common goals back on the ground. I would like to see that happen.

- It has been very positive. There has been a lot of good will, intentions and desire among all the partners because they recognize we all have the same pressures from public expectations and a lot are challenges to us all and we all see the benefit of getting and working together. We trust each other. We are well
positioned to do some exciting things.

- It is a very positive board structure. We have a wide range of interests and collective experience at the table. There are a lot of strategic thinkers. Because we are focusing more on ecosystem based management rather than a fine filter basis as resource managers and it is where we are heading in the future we have to have a broader focus and have to cross boundaries and think of cumulative impacts of resource management. We have to look at complementary resource initiatives and not reinvent the wheel. I think the Board structure we have allows us to do things we cannot necessarily do with government. We can be more on the leading edge of research which allows for flexibility. I think we have an excellent structure.

- Rewarding, frustrating, and fulfilling. [prompted for responses].

- That’s a tough question. It is rewarding and you can see the progress that has been made. For myself there has been an increase in the level of understanding with regard to applied science. My understanding has gone up in a year.

- Upbeat, positive, rewarding, and exciting.

- Very positive and a real challenge. I have found the concept or idea way ahead of anything else. The Province initiated a similar thing a year after the Model Forest began. The Province went through a massive public process, and it took four years to draft their proposal. After all that it’s philosophy and ideas were the same as what the Model Forest was based on. We have already been doing some things the Province tried starting three years ago. It is a good vote of confidence for where our program decided to go and where the Board steered it.

- With any large funding thing there are always bumps. As a researcher I was not frustrated with things that were put in place. For example, the fact that quarterly reports have to be done. By doing this we are trying to get researchers to state what they are going to spend quarterly, like a private company. I am used to this kind of stuff. At the partnership level, however, we have had difficulty communicating with partner groups.
3b. What lessons have you learned through your involvement?

- Any time you do business with the Federal Government it becomes very complicated.

- Don’t bite off more than you can chew. For example, when choosing to conduct research through the university with graduate students. It is a crap shoot, a gamble, because you don’t know the outcome you are going to get. For example, one student whom we heavily assisted never completed her thesis or the work we had set out for her to do. They are still cheaper than consultants though and it is still a good way of doing things.

- I have always felt the forestry industry was willing to talk to other people about certain things and issues, but other people were not always willing to participate and talk to them. And now, because of the Model Forest, people are willing to do this. For example, it is good that Jasper National Park has come together with Weldwood and the government, as they are all land managers for sustainability.

- In a partnership it is important that when you go to the table with your organization’s view it is important to first get them endorsed by your organization. When you speak, you speak for the organization and people should know you are. You have to have the authority to speak on behalf of the organization and you have to earn that authority. It is also important in a partnership to bring money/funding to the table because it gives you influence and some weight. It is interesting to see how much organizations have in common especially of those organizations that never really spoke before. This has dramatically changed as a result of the Model Forest (e.g., Jasper and Weldwood did speak to each other very much before).

- Nothing totally new other than to respect views and opinions of others in attempt to reach compromise and consensus.

- On the natural side of things I have a greater awareness of natural disturbance regimes. It’s a big part of science we are in, and we are finding out how we might change policy in forest management in the Province. On the social side of things it is interesting to see how the Board functions and to see people at work.

- Scientific lessons. I have also learned about partnerships. As the largest Model Forest we are learning to work with other people. For example, the Yellowhead Working Group has been a real learning experience. We have seen different agencies working together.
• That independent agencies, when isolated, tend to have views that are critical of other groups. But when you form partnerships you understand the views of other agencies and the conflicts tend to be gone. For example, Jasper and Weldwood managed disease, insects, etc. differently and there tended to be animosity between the two groups. However, through the Model Forest they are working more cooperatively and understand each other better. We all realize that the landscape level has to be addressed by all groups.

• There are lots of lessons to be learned. I don’t know how to be specific on that.

• With all the different partners, issues and media people are a lot closer than you think they are. For example, Jasper and Weldwood have similar objectives but the tools they use to get there are very different. Jasper struggles with the same forest issues as do industry managers. It is important to talk to people and listen to the issues. Once you hear the issues you realize we all are not that different.

• You have to be a good listener with that many players at the table. You need good listening and good communication skills. You have to think strategically. You have to be prepared to represent interests well and issues that are important to those areas and be able to focus on a broader scale of topics of discussion and bring value to the topic. You have to be able to work under a consensus decision making framework.
DECISION MAKING AND COMMUNICATION PROCESSES

6a. Do you think there is a good representation of different partner/stakeholder groups involved in your Model Forest? (Y/N)

- In general, yes, there is a good representation of stakeholders that reside in our area. At the Board level, the evaluation indicated that we should have a stronger environmental voice, Aboriginal participation and oil and gas participation. We have a good representation of from land managers that have legislated authority. The Model Forest has no land management authority, therefore, it is important to have those managers at the table. Our Board representation has worked real well to add more people as much as possible and our proposal leader has left the door open for that. I have a concern about a lack of Aboriginal involvement, but to get involved with them at this time while they are in the middle of a land claim issue would have been viewed as political leveraging. We have to remain non-partisan. We are trying to get them involved in the national strategic initiative out of Ottawa. We are trying to figure out a way to get Aboriginal groups involved. We are evaluating a number of options. For example, Jasper is looking at the Native use of fire in the Park. We have also been trying to work with environmental groups. I have been after the Alberta Wildlife Association to be a partner for four years but they are comfortable with where our program is going. They have other issues they want to deal with now. They only have a limited number of people and resources. They wanted us to guarantee that we could change policy and we couldn’t do that. We told them they could have access to all our information and they could use it how they saw fit. We couldn’t guarantee there would be a change on the ground. They are still considering our offer. I hope to have at least one member on the project team. They are certainly interested in the cumulative effects, socio-economic and criteria and indicators work.

- Involvement is a relevant term. If you look at the partnerships we have a broad representation. We have a broad spectrum of partners that are interested. The answer is yes, depending on how you define involvement.

- It is adequate. You always think there should be more.

- No, I think there are significant gaps.

- No.

- Yes, but [qualified] there are seventy partners in the Partnership group and the extent to which they are represented at the Board level is questionable. There are only two representatives for seventy partners. Going from seventy to two is quite a drop.
• Yes, I do. However, we are having a lot of discussion with NGO’s, Aboriginal groups and the Oil & Gas sector (wondering about how Oil & Gas might have more representation because they are the biggest sector in the Province). The strength of our Board is that it has a fairly well defined focus. A drawback of including other groups is that they will diffuse the focus and make it more difficult.

• Yes, there is a broad base of partners and it is growing all the time. The structure of partners are working better now than in the past. We have strong stakeholders who invest time and money into the process. Others like to provide input, but they don’t invest time or money. It is clearer now what partners do and what views are taken into account. We have evolved between Phase I and II. The direction with the Board with decision making is better in Phase II than it was in Phase I.

• Yes, there is a good representation of partners, but a lot of stakeholders represent a small number of people and have a little say in comparison to others. There has been good representation in the working groups.

• Yes, there is good representation from industry and government. The only representative we don’t have is an environmental group. We talked about it at the Board and whose role it is. Should they be at the project committee level or at the level of the Board of directors. We haven’t decided what role they would play. It is an excellent group of people though. There are some strong personalities but they see the need for teamwork.

• Yes.
6b. If No, who is missing?

- At the Board level, however, we don’t have environmental groups, but they can have their say at the working group level. I can see we have more say in provincial and national policies. I would like to see more Aboriginal involvement. We have to be tied in more with them. Ten percent of Hinton have Aboriginal background. The owner and operator of the Company also works with Natives and I think they should have more opportunities.

- One group that is not involved in the Model Forest is the energy sector. Their absence as a partner in the Model Forest is a void. If you look at the management of the landscape they are a key player and the policy making in relation to the energy sector influences the landscape. [This information was stated later in the interview while answering question]

- Stated in 6a.

- The coal mines were invited and I think they regretted not getting involved.

- The environmental voice is lacking and it concerns me. As a protected area we can’t bring an ecological voice to the table in a broad sense. We can only speak from our organization’s position. It is important to have an environmental voice because the landbase has environmental concerns. I would like to find the right person and bring them to the Board. I would be concerned how it would be affect the Board, but if you had the right person it would be good. Also the Model Forest doesn’t include significant mines or at least those people brought into the mining project yet. General recreation use is also lacking a voice in the Model Forest.

- There are lots of groups missing. They are missing not because they have not been offered to take a chance but because they have refused. For example, extreme environmental groups (i.e., those opposed to cutting) are missing. It would be good to have their input into the compromised decision making that comes out. There is also a lack of involvement from Aboriginal Peoples. The involvement we have is probably appropriate for the region though. There has been a new reserve that has recently been created in the area by the Federal Government for a Band that comes a different area in the Province. It was created without dialogue with the Model Forest and with Weldwood, but it is situated in Weldwood’s FMA. There is concern by the Board in working these people in, and there is also concern of the government about squatters and camps that are being set up by the Band. There is good involvement though from the Fox Creek Development Group that has four people with some Aboriginal background. They have a successful logging contract with Weldwood. They send representatives to Weldwood’s Public Advisory Group and to the Model Forest Partnership Group. I sense we don’t have wide, active involvements as other Boards have. We have Weldwood, Jasper National Park, the Province and the Environmental Training Centre (for tech. transfer). Our Board is made up of predominantly “forestry types” and “park types”. Our professional expertise is not well represented of what should represent SFM.
7a. We understand your Board uses ...... approach to decision making. Could you please describe how it works?

- Consensus has different meanings to different people. To me it means that everyone may not agree with a decision in its entirety but we can all live with the decision. Those people involved or impacted by the decision are key players to the decision, and those periphery players add value to the decision. You have to be aware of the key players at the table and add value to reach consensus at the end and everyone should be able to live with the decision.

- Generally decisions are made on the basis of consensus which does raise some concern for me. We usually reach consensus, which is good, but it means we have not dealt with some tough decisions yet. An example of how decisions are made, is when the Executive Committee we had a major discussion going around the table. One person did not agree with the decision that was made. We discussed it and eventually brought it to a vote and he agreed. He didn’t totally agree with the decision but was willing to support it. It showed the willingness of everyone to speak their mind a willingness of everyone to examine options and eventually change minds.

- In my opinion it is some of Robert’s Rule of Order, but it is closer to a consensus organization. A lot of discussion goes on. A vote is a finalization of the discussion process. At the Executive level we have a debate and have cross votes. We have motions, etc. at the Executive Committee as well.

- It depends on how you define consensus. My definition is that everyone may not agree on something but they will go along with a decision anyway and support it. I believe you go around and discuss things until everyone agrees. If you have voting that isn’t consensus.

- It is a combination of consensus and Roberts Rule of Order. It depends on the issue though, because it can be a combination of both (consensus and RRO).

- It is a combination of Roberts Rules of Order and consensus. Formal Board meetings are governed by RROO. The Board has also been engaged in other meetings which represent more consensus based agreements.

- It is a modified Roberts Rule of Order. If we were to go through the Board minutes the votes would largely have been consensus. The Board thrashes through issues and will talk it out until each one is comfortable with it. It is more of a consensus process because the Board finds out why someone won’t endorse something and will thrash it out. We were late out of the starting blocks because the Board spent approximately two years discussing issues. It was not until they reached consensus did we draft a process plan.
• It varies. At times we want a motion on record and other times we discuss issues and decide on a course of action and direct the General Manager to take action without a motion. It depends on the Chairman a lot of times. It depends if we really want it on record or not.

• We have a majority vote, which mostly ends up being unanimous. If we have a split vote then sometimes things are looked at again, we have a discussion, and then we vote again.

• We have very few actual votes at the Board level. Issues tend to be put on the table and you discuss them until there is a pretty high level of comfort. You usually have majority favor before you move anything ahead.

• We use a consensus approach to undertake business and functions of the Board. In the minutes of the meetings decisions would be indicated by a vote and that a motion was taken. It depends on how you describe consensus. If you describe it as the greatest good for the greatest number then yes, it is consensus.
What are the satisfactory and unsatisfactory elements of the Boards current decision making processes?

Satisfactory:

- Everyone speaks up. There are no shy people on the Board. There is respect for everyone even though there may not always be an agreement. There are no hidden agendas which makes it easier to come consensus or to reach a decision. The group dynamics are there and we work well together.
- It is hard to say because we are a relatively small board. We do lots of things and we are giving lots of things for the Model Forest to go on. The Board makes policy decisions. Other decisions are at a level below us. At the lower level that is where most disagreements occur and we [Board] tell them to go and work it out. We have also brought in more outside money then we are given from the Feds.
- It is timely and efficient on a day to day process. There is recognition of the broadness at the table and in the area. Over the last two years we have moved to the bigger picture by including Jasper National Park and the Willmore Wilderness area. We have taken on a course filter approach which helps us look at other resource users. Considering the resources at hand it is hard to do certain aspects of research, but we are covering off and doing very well. If there were fewer resources you may have to say we may not be doing well.
- Mutual respect in terms of everyone willing to speak their mind. No one has been marginalized because of their views. People respect other people's ability and opportunity to speak their mind. We have a Chair but we don't always rely on the Chair to look after people (e.g., have a voice or clarify a position). We step in to help the discussion and clarify issues. The Board is amiable in that sense. (JA)
- The addition of Jasper and the Willmore Wilderness Park into the Model Forest land base. To bring those two groups in helped communicate to the public and community what the Model Forest is all about. It helped us look at a larger land base area.
- The Board is extremely progressive. Everyone has insight. We are connected well nationally and internationally with the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers (CCFM) and the direction they are taking. We are on side with that philosophy. It is not a narrow focus but a broad focus. The group is dynamic and we have learned to trust. There are no hidden agendas and the group can speak frankly and openly which aids in the quality of projects and decision making.
• The decision making process lets me understand where the Board stands. It is easier when they discuss things than if they just have a vote. If it was just a vote I would be left in the dark.

• There is a good cross-section of primary stakeholders. We also have good communication with the Federal Government in Edmonton and in Ottawa. The Model Forest now has a good communication strategy as well.

• There is an understanding of the natural landscape and biodiversity and how it effects the landscape. That is most gratifying. What is at stake is what people will think on the landscape. We are on track with criteria and indicators, the Board is on the same wavelength.

• They [Board] are well guided by staff and the Executive Committee in deliberations leading to decision making. It is good at strategic decision making.

• We make decisions when we have to and we don’t dither on them. Issues come up and we put it to bed quickly at the Board level. There are not a lot of conflicts within the Board. There are a lot of commonalties on where we want to go, and therefore, it is easier to make decisions. There are not a lot of dissenting views and from our perspective that is good. Some say it is not good because we are not getting the full spectrum of views. Some might think this, but I don’t agree. A lot is dealt with at the Partner Steering Committee level and the Board expects a lot will be dealt with at that level. The Model Forest is dominated by resource management agencies. We are land managers here and feel comfortable as a Board that we represent different business interests (e.g., provincial, federal - national park, and forestry industry). We take the interests of agencies to the Board and decisions at the Board level allow us to continue these interests and do better.
Unsatisfactory:

- There are no unsatisfactory elements.

- We need to improve on the information the Board gets to make decisions. We need to improve on how it is supplied and how to prepare us to make decisions.

- How the Board has handled the communications aspect. We had difficulty in hiring a communications person. We’ve tried to raise the profile [of the Model Forest] and work on the communications but it hasn’t been very successful. When I lived in the area people would ask me what the Model Forest was.

- When you are not living at Hinton (headquarters for Model Forest) the time between Board meetings is long. You also tend to get out of touch when you are not living in the area and it is hard to stay on top of things. In the earlier days we over reacted to accounting for things in a financial sense as well. We had a huge amount of paper for the financial business of the Model Forest. We had hundreds of pages of supporting documents. We have made it much narrower and better now.

- The Board is not yet certain if it is a higher order of authority or a working Board. It could do more at the working level. Some boards are good at the working level and some are good at “rubber stamping”. The Foothills MF is at a higher order of decision making and loses contact with the working level of decision making.

- I don’t think there are many unsatisfactory elements, but I do have a concern that everyone on the Board is very busy and I wonder about their ability to put time into discussing very complicated issues. For example, issues like criteria and indicators, and cumulative effects which are un-chartered waters. We need their input but it is tough to pin everyone down.
9a. Other than the five year plan does your Board routinely engage in long term planning? (Y/N)

- No, I don’t think so. It is more annual planning after the strategic plan is finished.
- The five year plan is a very good plan that tests our long range planning horizon. It is the meat of the plans in the Model Forest and the issues we are tackling are on the cutting edge and are not very easy. It is challenging and exciting. It affords us the opportunity for more science and research in the future locally, nationally and internationally.
- We have mostly concentrated on the five year plan. We sometimes will take a few days to get into direction and process of the larger agenda.
- Yes. At almost every Board meeting we are talking about how this will be in place in five, ten or twenty years from now whether we have federal funding or not. We are looking at how this can continue. Foothills Model Forest has no authority over land management, but we are coming up with ways to develop SFM and it is up to Jasper, Weldwood, etc. to adopt these processes.
- I don’t know about routinely. Yes, I would say so.
- The five year plan would drive it but it would also have to be flexible with new issues that come up (e.g., Aboriginal issues) so we would change.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.

9b. If yes. What have been the results?
• Every time we meet we are looking to long-term plans or how we need to take a new direction. It is an iterative process. The most intense part was setting the stage for Phase II and the way we were going to do things. The Steering Committee looked at communications. The Board did some focus group studies around Alberta and the local area. People didn’t understand what the Model Forest was, therefore, the Board said communications will be a big leg in Phase II. This caused some consternation with the technical crew. The Board realized without communications the Board could die. The Board now sets the direction (e.g., how we spend money and allocate resources) and takes feedback from communities on how to spend the money. We are moving from bottom up to top down.

• It is done annually at a retreat.

• The whole thing is adaptive and dynamic, especially from an executive perspective. For example, if we decide to hire another staff member it changes the decision making and structure subtly.

• The Yellowhead Regional Planning Group have made strides in this regard. Weldwood, however, has been derelict in adopting certain things, whereas Alpac, on the other side of the province, have adapted things. Weldwood has not adopted things as a routing practice. They also have not communicated well to the Board or to the public about what they have been doing.

• We are forward looking.

• We establish a schedule and structure of what should be on there which helps with the budget and approval process.

• We had a number of retreats. They have been excellent. It helped us look at the bigger picture.

• We have a long-term plan. We have done a lot of long-term planning. When you do a long-term plan you put issues on the table and discuss them. We have been successful with that.

• We looked at the annual workplan twice a year and related it to the five year plan to tighten it up. All plans are living documents and indicate what is timely and relevant. For example, in Phase I we looked at single species which is more of a fine filter approach. Half way through the project there was a shift to add a course filter element to complement the fine filter. Before we put in a workplan we will discuss and look at things.
9c. Did Board members work together or share in developing a vision for the Phase II proposal? (Y/N)

- Yes, clearly, strongly, and effectively. It was done six months before the Phase II process.
- Yes, there was strong input. Rick is a strong communicator and efficient and effective. There has been good communication between the Board to develop solutions and gain input.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.

9d. If Yes. How was this achieved (e.g. was a consultant hired to develop proposal)?

- A consultant was hired and we held three workshops. The consultant led us through and gave direction.
- It was fully facilitated in a retreat environment. All baggage was left at the door. It was an unencumbered process. There were two distinct workshops and one feedback session from the consultant. There was one process of working with the consultant and the proposal - reviewing and reflecting.
- Through a structured exercise. A consultant was hired to facilitate the meeting. I have to give a caveat though, because the funding that came from CFS came with a fair amount of direction. I don’t know if the Board would have chose the same direction.
- Through workshops with a facilitator. It was expensive if I remember.
- We had a retreat (2-3 day retreat) with a facilitator. We reestablished the directions and visions for Phase II.
- We had a series of workshops in which a facilitator was hired. We had a couple of two day workshops. We left most of the writing of the proposal up to the Model forest staff though.
- We had a two day session with a facilitator.
- We had four workshops held with the Board and a facilitator before writing the Phase II proposal to clarify people’s intentions.
- We had workshops with a consultant that we hired.
- We had workshops with a facilitator. We had two, two day retreats.
10a. In your MF organization does the Board routinely review and analyze the findings of projects and programs once they are completed? (Y/N)

- No, no peer review occurs. Others would have to do that, given my background for example. People give presentations to the Board during and towards completion of a project. We try not to discuss operational level issues.
- No, not to the same extent as others do. The Board primarily deals with principles and fiscal responsibilities.
- No.
- We do some of it, but not enough of it.
- We’re inconsistent on that. I’ve been away from the Board for a year, so I don’t know for sure, but I have been in touch.
- Yes and no.
- Yes, but there hasn’t been a lot of that. Results are presented though.
- No.
- Yes, during the research process and at the completion of them we receive presentations.
- Yes, we do.
- Yes.

10b. If Yes. How do they carry out this work and reach decisions on any action to be taken?

- Analysis is not done by the Board. This is an element of the Board’s position I am not involved in. I am not too familiar with that. It is mostly wrapped up by the project steering committee.
- Officially we [Board] do. We have presentations from researchers or from the Foothills Model Forest staff. If someone has met the requirements of the contract there is nothing for us to approve. We look at if it fits our vision. If it doesn’t, then we determine how we are going to get it there. For example, the Hydrology side to things didn’t match with what we got. To get what we wanted we needed more money, but we didn’t have enough because we would have to sacrifice other things.
- The Board is kept in tune through personal presentations. Foothills MF has a board member champion each strategic area of engagement.
- The project team heads up every project and we have a strong connection with the team. One or two Board members are directly connected and the teams keep the directors informed in the writing, presentation and status of the reports. It happens throughout the year.
- We do it on an ongoing basis. Most people are at a senior executive level and research results are analyzed by staff under them. They are briefed by staff in their own organizations and then we discuss it as a Board. All partners sign off the intent of the plan and endorse the results when they come out. There is no peer review procedure but a sponsor review procedure to make sure people in their own organizations are comfortable with it.
10c. If No. Does anyone else (i.e. person, committee or working group) review and analyze the findings of projects and programs once they are completed?

- It is mostly wrapped up by the project steering committee.

- The main analysis of what projects have achieved comes from the Project Steering Committee. They are the ones telling us if things have been met. There are specialist groups in the committee that deal with particular projects (e.g., wildlife, etc.). A Board member is usually with one of these specialist groups, and the groups are made up of experts in the area.

- The Project Committee does that. We can go to their meetings and get involved if we like.

- We do try to ride and herd on them as they are progressing. The agencies will take the results and see how they fit with their partner mandate. It has been difficult for us to bring some projects to final conclusion and get the results out. The Board has spent a lot of time with project leaders. The results are now coming in and the agencies are seeing how they fit. As a Board we haven’t sat down and looked at individual projects. We don’t have the time.

- We leave it up to the Board sponsor to take a stake and see where the project is coming from and going to.
11a. Does your Board formulate recommendations regarding sustainability in forest practices based on their discussions and study findings? (Y/N)

- From my experience the project team and the recommendations go to stakeholders and we put the practice on the landscape. As part of the Model Forest I need to run things past the corporate structure in Edmonton because some things challenge policy and we have to determine if it is the government’s or industry’s responsibility. For example, with cumulative effects we have to run things by the executive committee so we are in harmony with the Model Forest.

- I don’t know how to answer that. As a Board we have never approved that “thou shalt not do this”. From that point of view, no, we don’t make recommendations. But we do look at how things were done before and how they are done now and take note of the change.

- In a formal sense, no. We discuss what our landbase authority is though. We are heading down this road. Phase I was information and research gathering. Phase II will help us establish goals and recommendations (e.g., for criteria and indicators), but we haven’t established it formally.

- No, I don’t know. I haven’t been a part of that at the Board level.

- No, not that I know of because we are a research Board and our philosophy is that those that can benefit from them should analyze how they should use them.

- No.

- Per se, no, the board does not, but where it will occur in Foothills case is through two main bodies (The Yellowhead Ecosystem Working Group and the Land Managers Forum). The Yellowhead Ecosystem Working Group is made up of land and resource managers from BC, Alberta, and federal and provincial lands. They can do on the ground implementation. They are a multi-jurisdictional group of managers of resource uses. The Land Managers Forum constructs principal land owners and managers to come to a common understanding of policy and procedures of SFM. It includes the Province, the Feds and the Company. These are two avenues extended from the MF program that can and will make recommendations.

- The Foothills Model Forest does not manage any land. Though there are land managers on the Board, Foothills does not manage the land. Each of the constituents/representatives that deal with a respective area of land deal with sustainability and standard operating practices to deal with sustainability. The Model Forest becomes a round table for discussion on sustainability and those issues. There is a difference between a round table and managing resources.
• Yes.

• Yes.

• You hit our achilles tendon. At every step we have to affirm we are not the land managers. We collect the science and encourage the managers to use it, so I’d have to say no.

11b. If Yes. Please indicate how these recommendations were formulated. Give examples of such recommendations and indicate to whom they were conveyed?

• Jasper, Weldwood, and the Forest Service have taken the results to influence policy or operating documents in their own organization or they have put the results into practice.

• Stated in 11a.

• The workshop we had last week is a break through with regard to natural disturbance. The workshop had eighty people at it. Sustainability was the theme of the workshop. I was proud we had eighty people at the workshop and they were driving the workshop. There was a lot of expertise there.
Can you identify a significant project, or projects, carried out by your MF that you regard as a success. According to you, why was this project a success?

- The Decision Support Systems on the forest management areas of Weldwood were developed through the Model Forest and have been successful. The ongoing studies with socio-economics have become quite revealing. The whole series of studies have been good. The West Yellowhead Economic Committee has been dealing with landscape planning and the cross-over with the whole Model Forest area has been a great success. They have all been successful largely because of the commitment of the major partners.

- The ecological classification program was successful. We looked at developing an ecological site class for forests in the area. Before we didn’t have the proper ecological classification in the area so harvest was done in a manner that didn’t have enough information for managers to attain site impacts and proper reforestation strategies. We weren’t as successful as we could have been with the ecological classification system, because we didn’t classify all of the FMA but we have classified 300 000 hectares already. Now all planners work as a team and will develop a prescription before a tree is cut. We can determine the best means of harvest and what fits best for that area and reforestation. It is a huge step forward in sustainable forest planning in this area. We are leading the pack in Alberta. Another good project was the mixed wood trials which are based on trials and wildlife studies. We have a river valley in the FMA and we have classified the whole riparian influence in the area. It is now set up as a separate landbase and has a separate management approach. We are managing the corridors having prime value other than timber. We are managing them for recreation and aesthetics. We are also modifying our techniques for harvesting in these areas and maintain other values.

- The fisheries and the fisheries habitat area study as well as the caribou research were good. Also the natural disturbance work is very critical to landscape management and how we manage forest management and model it with natural disturbance regimes. We are doing the research now. Research is being put into Weldwood now with caribou habitat zone. We are looking at fire disturbance and are tying with the landscape. These projects are successful because they are well defined, they are strong projects and they have substantial data. We have data for some areas we didn’t have before so we can make better decisions. For example, by looking at the effects of culverts on the landscape Weldwood is now putting in bridges to reduce ill effects. These projects are informing decisions so we can move ahead.

- The fisheries work has moved forward. The work with fine filter indicator species has been okay but it has to be more integrated on the landscape. We haven’t use it that much. Phase II will involve this more in the future. These were a success
because we got results and it brought the project forward.

- The fisheries, the natural disturbance, the carbon budget, and some parts of the socio-economic project were successful. The socio-economic project is extremely important and I'm glad the Model Forest is doing something like that. The International Model Forest Program and the caribou study have also been good.

- The Hydrologic Modelling and Aquatic Habitat Research and Recommendations have been a success and have been implemented by land owners and managers (government and company). They have been a success because they weren't originally envisioned as they were and the partners stood firm on what they wanted. Also there has been some implementation since.

- The most gratifying has been the Natural Disturbance regime because it has increased the understanding of fire history and the impact on the landscape. It gave us definite conclusions and is fundamental to how we manage forests.

- The natural disturbance project got a good peer review from the University of Calgary from a person who is an expert in the field. It is a success because it has a very broad appeal to the sponsor base and all the sponsors plan to hang future management processes off of it. It will be good for future management plans. The socio-economic project is well rounded and is looking at issues that face resource managers. It is a success because it has brought the three circles of sustainable development into the equation. Things traditionally have been argued from an economic or an ecological view point but this brings in the social sphere. For example, with the Cheviot mine I wish we had done some socio-economic work in Phase I because it would have made the hearings a lot less painful. There was nothing to refute different points of view and substantiate the arguments. Without information local people are polarized and it makes decision makers jobs more difficult when you are only making a decision with 50% of the information.

- The natural disturbance workshop was successful because it is leading companies, universities, and the government. The Model Forest chairperson of this has been good.

- The work on natural disturbance regimes has been successful and it is still ongoing. We have good people, skills, knowledge, capability and competence involved in the work. There are a diversity of sponsors involved as well. The research covers a lot of things we want to do (e.g., biodiversity). It has an ecological and economic contribution.
There was support of a project for finding out what fish are in what streams so this can be taken account of in management [forestry]. The government has no money for this and it is not a mandate of Weldwood to do it, but someone has to do it if we are to have SFM. Another project was the fine filter for wildlife habitat. The system is in place to predict total habitat supply over time. It can quantify the amount of habitat for different species for present and future projections. We also need a course filter to accompany this so that we can maintain diversity with natural disturbances. Determining a list of endangered species and what really is endangered and should be on that list has also been a good project. We are also looking at the social and economic interaction of Weldwood and Jasper and the nearby communities. There have been new changes in what they can do to communicate with and involve communities in management issues. All these projects and programs have been “successful” because they were contributing to knowledge that was needed. Based on the input given from the MF Network of what Model Forest’s had to do, plus the vision of the Board, is what made these projects a success. It was recognized that they were needed to be done and this top down approach has made them a success.
12b. Can you identify a project, or projects, carried out by the MF in your area that you regard as a failure? According to you, why was this project a failure?

- Failure is a strong word, I would use less successful. The programs are all value added with regard to the watershed and fisheries aspect. The whole hydrology aspect of forestry has been value added. Management of these projects is expensive so you have to net it down, but when you do that, what do you leave it? In that aspect these projects, therefore, have been less successful.

- Failures is a strong word and if I was to use that word I couldn’t point to any projects, but I could if they were considered to have “shortcomings.” Our communications fell short of the mark. This has been recognized by the Board and has been looked at for Phase II. Aboriginal participation has also fallen short of the mark, but political circumstances may have been important there, rather than any shortcomings of the Board.

- I have not been around from many projects but I hear the ecotourism project wasn’t too good, because the shortfalls with the work and researcher never got resolved at the end of the day.

- I wouldn’t say any are failures. My concept was that the Model Forest was to be at the leading edge of research and to move stuff ahead nationally and internationally. We realize we are cornerstones. As a result, we failed to effectively communicate internally, to the general public and abroad (which was one of the objectives). In Phase II we are going to put more money into communications.

- Our communications. We have not done enough communications. We are on our fourth person managing the communications area. It is one area we should all be doing more of. With regard to our fisheries projects some work was less than satisfactory.

- Our ecotourism project was an utter failure. We had high hopes and had been given lots of promises. We had given a lot of money and encouragement and had hired a graduate student through the Model Forest to work at Weldwood to run the recreation project but she gave us nothing in the end. The environmentally significant areas project for the Foothills forest was another poor project. There were adverse consequences to the Company from that project. Alberta has the Special Places 2000 project and it is based on what are environmentally significant areas in the Province for protection. We have evidence that Weldwood was singled out of these areas. Some classification in our area wasn’t done to the same level of detail as the rest of the Province. The Company had set out an area (Sundance Canyon) and when the official nomination came back from the Province they made it a larger area than what we had put in our proposal.
• The entire communications program. It stumbled and started out of the gate. We had a difficult time keeping and finding a person. In Phase I the real focus was on research projects instead of communications. Even in Phase II we have put in substantial amounts of money but it is still painful finding a qualified person. We are still playing catch up. This will make us or break us in Phase II. We can’t get awareness, appreciation and support without communications. Also if we can’t transfer reports to the end user then they are no good. We are getting better though. We had 80 people at a recent workshop. Q - What about the logo change? A - The communications group felt the network logo didn’t really tell people anything or why we are here. The new tag line shows a growing understanding of resource issues as well as partnership groups. We needed to show our individual work as well as being part of the network.

• The Environmental Training Centre has been a complete failure. It is part of the Model Forest because we viewed it as being a tech. transfer unit. However, it has been a bust. It is a failure in terms of trying to generate interest for people to take courses in to learn about SFM and Model Forest projects. However, the courses that have been offered are pretty basic. For example, there is a course on how to use Arc Info, which doesn’t really have anything to do with the Model Forest. This has been the fault of the Board and the Environmental Training Centre. We have also had problems trying to communicate our results to the public. Our own employees don’t know what we are doing. Our communication is off the mark. We needed a communications specialist in part of phase I. We got a good communications specialist, but she has moved on and it is too early to tell how the present specialist is doing.

• We did not have a lot of emphasis on communications. We hired a forester to take this on but the person did not have the specialization to do communications. It was not the person’s expertise. The other person we hired did not end up staying very long. Communications is not creating posters, etc., but about relaying success stories and news.

• We have had some challenges with projects that have been incomplete. I would have liked completion but for a number of reasons they have remained incomplete.
13a. Do you think any of the stakeholder groups do anything differently, since your MF has come into existence (on the ground, in their planning activities, on the books, etc.)? (Y/N)

- I can't answer that from a forest based management process which is an original part of the Model Forest. There are certain levels of awareness of triggers and sensitivity, but if they have been implemented on the ground I am unaware of that.
- Yes, because there is a greater consideration and understanding of the impacts on the land.
- Yes, certainly.
- Yes, I would hope so.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
13b. If Yes. What is done differently and by whom (on the ground, in their planning activities, on the books, etc.)?

- Everybody faces their land management mandate with the findings of the Model Forest in the back of their mind. I feel we have not moved enough with taking the findings and applying them to policies and procedures, but everyone thinks of them when they are doing their job.

- Jasper is more outward looking and are networking more. Before they were an island and managed as such. The government has benefited from the program and Weldwood has a better bigger picture view of management activities.

- One of the biggest changes is that the Federal Government, the Provincial Government, Jasper and Weldwood are all spending more time talking to each other. This has been a real benefit. Before they didn't talk to each other very much. The whole landscape planning acts (e.g., fish, wildlife, habitat modeling, etc.) are now being done differently then they were years ago. The operations at Weldwood are large and dynamic, so it is hard to know if it is the Model Forest or management in the Hinton area that has caused change.

- The Province is doing things differently by coming up with a management plan for the E4, E9 areas (buffer strip between Weldwood's FMA and Jasper National Park). Jasper, Weldwood and the Wildwood Unit are also communicating and cooperating more now that before.

- The research is being used and is having an effect on Weldwood's approach to things. It has effected different partnerships in on the ground planning. Jasper and the Province are now working off the same song sheet with regard to GIS. The cooperation of all projects is significant. For example, the caribou study involves a lot of people.

- There is more partnering for on the ground things. For example, with prescribed burns on the park boundary with the Province we are doing joint research. We are defining the methodology together and defining science together.

- Weldwood does a large amount different. Some partners' perceptions is that they have not done a lot different, but that outward perception is difficult to change and show that things have changed. Weldwood has done some operation and planning changes. Their management plan in 1998 will be based on work done in the Model Forest. The Province has also changed. With the Forest Conservation Strategy there has been a lot of overlap between that document and Model Forest work. They have also gotten some of the Model Forest staff to comment on some things. Jasper has taken and distributed some work with regard to planning and disturbance work and how things are done on the ground.
• Weldwood has actively employed some of the achievements of the Model Forest into their long-term planning documents, and the Alberta Government is employing some of the products of the Model Forest into their inventories. The government has also acquired more knowledge and made adaptations with regard to integrated resource management.

• Weldwood has realized some of the impacts that timber harvesting has on caribou and are changing some of their practices. For example, they are changing culverts to bridges.

• Weldwood is doing things differently as stated in question. Jasper is re-examining their approach to management in the Park. Communications are also better between the Park and Weldwood. The Province is also doing things differently with regard to environmentally significant areas.
CONFLICT RESOLUTION

14a. Referring to the history of your MF, please describe the three most serious conflicts (e.g., single biggest challenge, conflict of interest) that have arisen over the course of your program.

- Conflict in the socio-economic programs. The root of the problem was due to misunderstandings or lack of communication. Our largest problem is straight communication. Communication in the Model Forest is only as strong as our weakest communicating partner. When you have a group of different partners you will all view communications differently and it is difficult to deal with.

- Conflict is too strong a word. The Board has gotten along and has shared a common vision. The watershed and the socio-economic projects have caused a large amount of discussion and debate around framing the questions properly. What is going to help us to do what we need to do? We had several watershed proposals that were grandiose (e.g., one million dollars) and we said we can’t do this. There was then debate about what we can do and how much will it cost. With the socio-economic project the Board didn’t dispute they needed it but they didn’t know what they needed. We have had a two year education process with Tom Beckley to discuss what the Model Forest should consider and what is needed. It took two years to make the Board feel comfortable. Now that this has been done they embrace the social issues whole heartedly.

- Conflicts at the Board level have mostly been about what the Model Forest wants to do and the allocation of funds for doing these things. For example, funding to communications and the social side of things was too low. Funding was also low to Watershed project work. The Board predominantly saw what was achievable and put other proposals on the back burner.

- Establishing direction for Phase II for project elements. When it got to allocating resources we had more requests for funding than we had funding. We decided to delegate this to the Executive Committee because we didn’t have the funding or enough information. The Executive gave recommendations to the Board. One Board member had sponsored a project and what he originally though was going to happen had changed with the recommendations from the Executive. We had to clarify that it was decided by the Board to have the Executive make the recommendations.

- We have tough decisions on how to handle cumulative effects projects because it has certain implications. We have just had challenges and no real problems that I am aware of.
Initially the biggest challenges were with the various partners’ expectations of limited funding. There was an expectation of endless funding. This expectation led to interesting challenges. For example, the watershed project took up 25% of the Model Forest budget. We had to re-look at the size and scope of the project.

One of our big challenges is managing expectations (e.g., researchers, graduate students). A lot of research done in the Model Forest has been single species research. Reports often talk of species and their relation with their habitat but it’s not placed in context. The Company has been here 40 years and a lot of research has been done and they have taken the research and incorporated it into their land management. As a result, they have embraced research and have rolled it into practice. With some other research we haven’t been able to employ it. Inevitably we have to have a trade-off. The challenge with the Model Forest is that it is expected that we should implement all research. People will ask why it hasn’t been done. The challenge for us is to figure out how to implement it. We also had a bit of blow up over the socio-economic research. There was a misunderstanding and communications were not so good. It caused strife at the Board level. What happened was we had various Board members assigned to champion various projects. One Board member had a different view of how to use funding and the other Board members had a different view. The one Board member had expectations and put a lot of effort into what we couldn’t ultimately use.

The budget has been a challenge because the original Model Forest proposal was scaled up because of dollars, but we had to scale it down. Therefore, we lost some interest in the process and lost the ability to challenge the watershed project. We also had a hard time keeping good staff (e.g., communications person). There have been no conflicts at the Board level. We have had great debates and healthy discussions. We have also had some sensitivities.

There are no major conflicts at the Board level, but there are certainly problems. For example, there have been differences between Jasper and Weldwood. They are at odds with transboundary issues (e.g., caribou, insects, disease, carnivores, etc.). They have directly opposed management processes. However, there is a willingness between them to discuss and overcome their differences. They are still at the table and are working collaboratively without prejudicing their individual jurisdictions. There have also been some differences between federal park land and provincial park land. They both have distinct mandates with some differences, but again, there has been more awareness of each other’s mandates made through the Model Forest and they are working together (e.g., recreation). The Board members have matured and have stayed at the table, and they now no longer draw a line in the sand between themselves.
• There have been none that I am aware of.

• Tough question. We constantly have dialogue over how much comes to the Board and how much doesn’t. How much should come to the Board and how much should be left to the Executive and Steering Committees. Blackwood finds this frustrating. We’re [Board] is trying to move to a little more hands off.

14b. What do you feel was the source of these conflicts?

• Allocation of funding and the process of decision making.

• Allocation of funds and determining priorities for project funding.

• Scarce resource dollars and local expectations around public wants of the forest.(CE)

• The root of the problem was due to misunderstandings or lack of communication.

• There was a lack of communication, we did not have a common understanding of where we were going with the budget.
How have you attempted to resolve the conflicts? (Are there any processes in place? Has closure been reached on these issues or are they ongoing and yet to be resolved)

- Conflicts have been at a minimum. I would question if we need conflict resolution as a formal process. Many of us have been through it in our own organizations and through our processes conflict has gone away.
- Depending on the issue we would use a certain process based on the background and expertise of those individuals involved. Most of us have had this type of training within our own organizations and we would draw on that training.
- Greater education and awareness. Bringing back views of the partnership in terms of other users (e.g., fisheries group). We realized Board members were ignoring the major part of the policy documents with regard to social issues. We needed an awareness process of other partner’s views.
- I don’t know about conflict resolution policy at the Board level. If there is a problem we work with various groups about the visions and directions and bring it back to the Board to discuss.
- I’m not aware of any process around this table. If we couldn’t work to consensus it would be personal biases that stood in the way so we would bring more facts to the able so we could make informed decisions. It is good to play devil’s advocate and to have healthy discussions.
- No, there are no conflict resolution or facilitation processes in place. There is nothing at the Board level.
- There are no real processes in place for conflict resolution. We discuss things until we get resolution. People who are most opposed to something are to go and talk to the people they are opposed to or to the people who represent what they are opposed to (e.g., proposal proponent). There is nothing telling us how this is to be done.
- There is no defined process. It is a matter of keeping the discussion alive and open to where perceived differences can be clearly understood and respected. The Foothills Model Forest will not get involved with the land use [management] of groups.
- There is no written or formal procedure that I am aware of. We usually have discussions and talk things through. It is more of an informal mechanism.
- Through dialogue. We throw stuff back to the Executive for recommendations. We have also hired a facilitator, for example, with helping us through our proposal. We also do it through socializing together (e.g., Christmas party) which forces us to do business. I am not aware of a formal process.
- We try to talk through issues. It doesn’t always work though. It didn’t work in the above case (i.e., socio-economic case). Generally what happens is other Board members will work on things one on one. It is more informal but it works fairly well.
17a. Has there been any formal training, or discussion, of conflict resolution at the Board level? (Y/N)

- I don’t know if it has been discussed. I’ve had training within my own service and others probably have as well. It may have been done earlier at the Board.
- I don’t know.
- I’m almost sure there hasn’t been.
- I’m not aware of any.
- No nothing formally as a Board. The Province and Weldwood have training with regard to conflict resolution and Colin Edey has had a negotiation course. The Board has never gotten to the point where they have hit the wall and needed such a process. We have always talked things through.
- No training. I have never heard conflict resolution being discussed as a desired undertaking. It has not been proposed, and it has never come up. The Board is hierarchical and the responsibilities are embodied in the land management representatives and what they are to do.
- No, not at the Board level that I am aware of.
- No, not at the Model Forest Board. We have had training at our own organizations.
- No, we haven’t had a big enough conflict. The conflicts we have are the normal types of doing business.
- No.
- Stated in Many of us have been through it in our own organizations and through our processes conflict has gone away.
17b. If Yes. Describe

If No. Might there be in Phase II? If Yes in Phase II, by what means (workshop/seminar)?

- Our backgrounds (i.e., individual training) are still sufficient. These are senior people and managers at that level are aware.
- There might be in Phase II. We are working with goal setting now through the criteria and indicators, as well as with cumulative effects. These are tough issues so we may need some form of conflict resolution or facilitation.
- I don’t think so. There have been no major conflicts here. We put priorities where we think they should go. If conflict would arise I think we would deal with it accordingly at the time.
- I doubt it. We have enough conflict. I have participated in negotiation courses at Weldwood but not any conflict resolution courses.
- I would be surprised if we had it for Phase II. We don’t have it as one of our elements.
- In Phase II, no. Now there is a supportive and common vision of all the Phase II pieces. We wouldn’t preclude it because something may come from a research project that may throw a wrench into their machine. There may be a time when we need it but not now.
- There has been no discussion for Phase II. Some of us have had various levels of training within our individual work.
COMMUNICATION

19a. Does your MF communicate effectively with stakeholder members/groups regarding findings of completed projects and programs? (Y/N)

- I don't know. I tend not to spend a lot of time looking at projects. I look at the future and how they could communicate that material to other stakeholders. I know they have mailing lists that have been effective. The Model Forest should be communicating with the public better.
- In Phase I we did an abysmal job of communicating our findings. We are now being proactive and trying to emphasize our communications effort in Phase II.
- In the communications area we could do better. We have set a strategy for Phase II in hopes to do better.
- No, I don’t think so. We [two representatives for the partnership group] have no time to communicate back to our partner groups. We have asked the Model Forest to help us do this. They have put out a newsletter but it is not effective.
- No, I wouldn’t give it a gold star. Eventually things get delivered at CIF (Canadian Institution of Forestry) meetings, but we need venues where we can get a higher profile.
- No, not as well as we could. The communications person is to improve our partner communications.
- No, not at the moment.
- No, that has been identified as a shortfall. It was identified as a shortfall in our evaluation and it was suggested that we try to overcome this by committing a significant amount of money to communications, hire a communications manager, and develop a communications strategy and have endorsed by the Board. This is all in the process of implementation.
- No. We have newsletters though. Tech. transfer is an area of concern and I think there should be more effort put into it, especially in the Network as a whole. The Model Forest Network is doing a lot of good work and we should be getting it out there. The University of Alberta’s Centre of Excellence has done well communicating but it has not done enough work or projects. We [Model Forest] need to do an improved job of communicating and tech. transfer. Why do it [projects/programs] if you cannot get it on the ground.
- Yes, from the point of view from newsletters and annual reports and their distribution, as well as from a compendium of reports and partner representation. There is an outward, downward flow, and from that perspective I would have to say yes. However, from the feedback side of things I would have to say, no.
- Yes, we communicate, but again there is a broad base between communications and what people want to hear. When we looked at what we were doing with the public we realized there were things that had to be done. It will be awhile yet before we answer that question.
19b. **If Yes. How are findings communicated to stakeholder members/groups?**

- Newsletters, annual reports, compendium of reports, and partner representation.

21a. **How do you provide feedback to the member organization that you represent regarding MF decisions, programs and projects?**

- I send information back to them. It didn’t work very well in Phase I because the research work was long-term and there was no solid information to get back. Now that we have generated some information we have created stronger links at the regional and provincial levels.

- I am an executive of the department so I am able to table study progress and renewals. We have had the minister out to Model Forest on visits to maintain the profile.

- I do a lousy job. I talk about it though. There have been odd presentations done to include service groups in the community (e.g., Chamber of Commerce, etc.), but this is an area that has to be improved. There is more talk about the Model Forest outside of the area than in it.

- I receive and circulate minutes of the Board meetings and newsletters. Occasionally I provide briefings to the management committee. I inform my immediate supervisor of news and good news stories, etc. It is through verbal dialogue and distribution of written information.

- I take the minutes of the meetings back and I send them to staff internally. I give the rationale for certain thing, ask for input and what information I should take back. We have a discussion so I know what key components I should be taking back. Flyers and brochures are circulated in the region to staff.

- I work out of the Head Office and I report to the Chief Executive Officer. I report regularly on the Model Forest. I also report to the Chief Forester.

- It is written and verbal. It depends on the level of decision. I am most concerned with the impact of policy decisions. It has to get to the Minister and staff. We are actively trying to get people who have policy influence to get involved in the Model Forest. For example, trying to get someone involved in the Criteria and Indicators Working Group in the Model Forest. We don’t want to get saddled with criteria and indicators we can’t compromise or deal with.
Many of Weldwood's people are on project teams already. Dennis Hawkesworth and I are on the Board. Another fellow is on the Executive Committee of the Model Forest. Many senior people meet at Weldwood to talk about significant things that are happening. Rick attends and provides information about the Model Forest.

The Partners Group, no. We need far better linkages with the partnership advisors.

We do not communicate well with the other organizations in the partnership group. We do have good communication with our individual organizations that we belong to though.

We have regular meetings amongst the resource specialists at the Park. We meet weekly. Other staff are involved with projects with the Model Forest. Meetings help us touch base and find out what is going on.

21b. Do they regularly send comments back to the Board? (Y/N)

- No, not regularly. I send my comments in though.
- No, that has been poor. Unless I target individuals there is a lack of understanding of what the Model Forest is and can do. Therefore, there is a lack of feedback.
- No, the partners are not well linked unless it is through a project or staff. They don't look for strong links.
- No, the Partnership Group is a sham. We meet once a year to do a presentation of Model Forest projects. The Model Forest has tried to help with this communication because Colin and I don't have time to do it.
- They give input into certain areas by discussing issues with me and I take it back to the Board. If they have concerns of a project they are involved with then I will work with staff on that. If it is with value added then they take it back to the work team.
- They send comments back to the Board irregularly through me.
- Comments are carried back to the Board.
- Upon solicitation, yes, through e-mail, letters and through the research and development community we represent. I also interface with the Management Committee here [CFS]. There is lots of discussion and dialogue here. We go to the person directly.
- Yes, staff feed things to me to take to the Board. People on project teams raise issues for the Board. We have done somethings because of the feedback we've gotten. For example, the idea of project sponsors was raised because of a concern of a gap of feedback for the Board member responsible/overseeing a project(s).
- Yes, they send comments through me. With the renewal of the Model Forest the Department put in $750 000.
22a. What are the most effective outreach activities to stakeholder groups, or community groups, that your MF has undertaken (e.g., conduct conferences, workshops, or information sessions for stakeholder groups - e.g. speakers for events - for community groups)?

- It depends on who the public is, but clearly it has been the work we have done with teachers. We are finding a lot of benefit there. We are bringing these folks out and they are finding out about forestry 101.
- Open houses, information sessions, field tours through the Model Forest with local and abroad groups. We encourage the tours with groups from abroad.
- Our working relationship with the local high school. It has been very positive, upbeat and rewarding in developing participation with the high school. In the future we will also be doing this with the Friends of Environmental Education of Alberta [NGO].
- Some conferences. I'm not sure, I don't get involved with the day to day activities of the project steering committees or work of the staff. I know they have and are holding conferences and activities and they are quite successful.
- The newsletter wasn't bad. Our relationship with FEESA (Friends of the Environmental Education Society of Alberta) has been good.
- The newsletters were good when we did them. Now the internet site is good because all he documents are on it. It is very good for outreach.
- Working with FEESA has been good.
- Workshops (e.g., workshop on natural disturbances), conferences, national tours, public involvement, and guest speakers.
- Workshops (either stand alone or with the Canadian Institute of Forestry) and symposiums.
- Workshops and the programs that have been done in the high school in Hinton. We do not have effective communication with the rest of Alberta though and we are not well connected with the news media. Alpac has done a better job than we [Model Forest] have. It takes a lot of time and money to do this though.
22b. Why have they been effective or ineffective? (If ineffective try to find out how this may be improved upon)

- Because they are a good organization and have good qualifications. It is a good investment because it is geared toward a particular audience. It shows we are investing in the long-term.
- Because we are bringing well educated people from a state of ignorance to a state of understanding and appreciation. I think we should be spending more time and money educating forestry staff on what’s going on, but the money has been spent on things like tours and other frills.
- FEESA bring teachers here. FEESA is also developing a module for us to target grade school and high school teachers so they can bring kids out to look at the activities in the area. It presents both sides of the picture to them (e.g., industry, government, research, etc.). It helps provide a balanced perspective of forestry.
- Our communication has been ineffective for the most part though because from the outside I rarely heard of the effects of the projects that were going on in the Model Forest. I got one newsletter a year and it wasn’t very effective.
- The internet is effective because of its timeliness and its easy access. You can get a document very quickly from it. We can monitor hits and determine where people come from. The newsletters were fairly ineffective because we have no mechanism for monitoring success from them.
- They are current and do not require any reading. The presentations are personalized and are leading edge. You see it face to face as well. Our communications has been disappointing. We have had interest but no debate. For example, with the recent wildfires (December 14-20) the Model Forest should get some profile with urban-rural interface at this time and get the Model Forest to appear as important to the community.
- We don’t measure them, but I think they are effective because we have been able to bring people in to attend workshops, which shows they have values.
23b. Do recognized community leaders demonstrate support for your Model Forest? (Y/N)

- Yes, but do they know much about it? No. They support it because they see it as necessary to support the community. The message isn’t there. Simple things like placemats in restaurants or newspaper articles might help. We need something for a benefit to the community. We need information to develop critical mass for resource based communities. Communities should be involved as to how we are going to use this [forest] as a resource.
- Yes, clearly.
- Yes, there has been strong support from community leaders. There has been strong support of external stakeholders and an awareness of projects because they are in people’s lives locally.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.

23c. If yes, who?

- Mayor of Hinton [Ross himself].
- Ross is the mayor of Hinton and is our chairperson.
- Ross Risvold (mayor) is a greater defender of the program.
- The Mayor of Hinton is on the Board so I guess that helps. We have had focus groups because we were not well heard of in the area.
- The Mayor of Hinton is our Chair and he is very active with other mayors of forestry based communities.
- The Mayor of Hinton is our Chair.
- The Mayor of Hinton is our Chairman. The Mayor has gotten letters of support from Edson and Grand Cache as well. The townsite manager of Jasper is also in support of the Model Forest.
- The mayor of Hinton sits on the Board of Directors. We also have senior and regional representatives from the Province on the Board, and we have the local representative from Jasper.
- The Mayor of Hinton. Also there has been a letter from our MLA sent to the other MLA’s about our program.
- The Mayors of Edson and other communities have given support verbally and in writing.
24a. Do you feel the Board is sufficiently informed about the operations of other Model Forests across Canada to learn from their experiences? (Y/N)

- I don't know if I am sufficiently informed and I don't know if I want to be informed because we have enough on our own plates.
- In a reasonable sort of way, yes.
- In a word, yes, through our GM.
- No, probably not.
- Personally I can't comment on that. The Secretariat is working on that and there seems to be an opportunity there.
- There is sufficient opportunity for Board members to be informed. For example, I went to a conference on woodlots and how Model Forests are dealing with them, and it was very informative. It is difficult as a Board member to attend conferences, however, because of time.
- Yes and no.
- Yes, I think so. (qualified in b)
- Yes, Rick and the Chair have provided information about projects in other Model Forests that are complementary to ours. If they are parallel and we can apply to our Model Forest then we will look at them. But generally speaking, no, I have never seen another mailout from another Model Forest. This may speak of their communications as well.
- Yes.
- Yes.
24b. **If Yes. How has your Board successfully learned about other Model Forests?**

**If No. What should be done in this regard? (How could the network be improved? What could be learned from other Model Forests in the network?)**

- Activities in communications at the network level will improve that. The national website will have individual sites (Model Forests) to get to. There will also be a compendium of Model Forest projects. Every project will be catalogued with an overview and some structure. Ongoing activities will also be categorized.
- At almost every Board meeting we have a presentation from Bob Uddell or Rick Blackwood about the Network. Information also comes to the Board. Independent of that, any time there is a major research review the researchers are asked to go talk to the Model Forest individually. For example, we deal with Fundy a lot. We find they have been a leader in a few things we want to do so we get information about what they are doing so we don’t have to reinvent the wheel.
- At Model Forest Network meetings or conferences it is usually the General Managers, presidents and communications personnel that go. We should rotate opportunities for other Board members to go. We have to recognize the need and opportunity for other stakeholders to go.
- I believe Rick Blackwood has been key there. The international component has been good for the Foothills Model Forest as well.
- The General Manager provides briefings of other Model Forests to the Board. It also happens through individual participation (e.g., the federal representative sits on the Criteria and Indicators Network). I don’t know for all individuals per se.
- Through our GM and to a lesser extent through our President.
- Typically our Board hears stuff through Rick or the president and typically it was about things that happened elsewhere [other Model Forests]. This was a weakness of Phase I, we didn’t function as a network. In Phase II there are initiatives to bring the network closer together, to make it easier to access people and information. For example, our Board has information about criteria and indicators and we have had people contact us about our socio-economic program. We have been considered leaders in the socio-economic area and we should give information and direction to people doing socio-economic work.
- We have looked at the McGregor Model Forest and some of the projects there. I am not sure I can comment on that. The GM and President have done more on that.
- Yes, we could learn from other Model Forests. There is a diversity with size, issues and dynamics of the Board. We should and could share information but I don’t know how you would do it. Perhaps at annual network meetings.
CHANGE

25a. Has there been any discussion among Board members, or the partnership, about the role of the MF in effecting policy change in government, industry, NGO's, etc. in regards to achieving sustainable forest management? (Y/N)

- Certainly the mandate of the Model Forest is to provide recognition for landscape management to include more values in management. In that sense it has and will affect policy. There are other things out there that do affect policy though. For example, the energy sector is the number one economic generator in the province and it largely affects policy.

- No, there has not been a formalized discussion. That is why the Board is structured as it is with land managers at the Board. They are guilty by implication and hope people will implement changes based on what they know. The Board is open to change and what we do will hopefully facilitate change. The Province will take a hard look at what is going on and the Model Forest helps facilitate that.

- The cumulative effects issue is new and emerging and the Board is dealing with it. That has implications for the government (federal and provincial) as well as the Company. We have to incorporate the oil and gas industry into this more formally though.

- The first thing you have to wrestle with is what is SFM. There are misconceptions in this country about SFM and they are fairly large misconceptions. People don't know what it is. The FMA in Hinton (industry's part) has been in operation since 1954 and it has been managed sustainably since then. In the late seventies, early eighties Weldwood got involved in wildlife issues. That is a huge area out there to manage when you incorporate other values such as wildlife. There has been a huge effort to manage for other values on the part of industry. The Canadian public hasn't spend much time defining values. It is not a black and white issue, but gray, and there are trade-offs to be made. Our socio-economic work has been trying to define values. In a Canadian sense this is a mammoth task and a very complicated one that opens up a huge area of discussion. Jasper, the Provincial Forest Service and Weldwood are driving the sustainability process but it is somewhat less than a perfect process and it has not been well defined. There are a whole lot of other issues to deal with as well (e.g., certification). How do you register and certify for SFM? There is also the development of criteria and indicators which is being driven by the CCFM and by industry. In a broad sense we have deal with a number of environmental issues.

- Yes, continually.
• Yes, there has been discussion and action by individual partner organizations. There has been some frustration though. For example, the forest company is taking strides to incorporate findings of the Model Forest, but there is some frustration that the Province is not taking equal responsibility. The uptake and conversion of policy has been slower at the provincial level.

• Yes, there has been discussion, but discussions occur locally. Weldwood has a Resource Advisory Group, which has a cross section of stakeholders (e.g., Aboriginals, clergy, etc.) on it. They have meetings once a month and at that time questions come to us in how information and research can or are being used. The Feds aren’t taking the research and talking about it with locals to determine local forest strategies. I’m very critical of this. There is a role locally. Under the auspices of the West Yellowhead Community Futures Development Corporation (WYCFDC) we are raising issues for the Federal Government to know what’s going on.

• Yes, there has been lots of discussion about what our role is in effecting change.

• Yes.

• Yes.

• Yes.
25b. **If Yes. What kinds of forest management policies, in particular, were targeted for change?**

- Everything is on the table as far as I am concerned. When you get the research you have to start adapting. We have to adapt. For example, the management of natural disturbances is important. Our forests are here because of fire disturbance. For example, the Barred Owl have more habitat here then we thought.

- For example, with some things we have been involved in with Jasper with current policy. Because of the results we have come up with [i.e., from projects] it has caused the Model Forest and other groups to go back and change things [i.e., planning, action, etc.].

- I don’t know if specific ones have been targeted. It’s not just forestry issues we are dealing with. We recognize we [the Model Forest] don’t have any land management authority, but we can’t stop there. We have had discussions about the Land Managers Forum as a forum to discuss appropriate issues that come out of the Model Forest program. For example, how the goals of the criteria and indicators are related to land management issues and policy. People are also worried about cumulative effects because it can influence policy. Maybe not policy with a capitol “P” but with regard to procedures and things on the ground.

- It has not been policy per se, but the Model Forest has looked at the decision making processes and has targeted these processes. It has led to integration and connectivity between agencies to push any policies on to the broader landscape.

- It is an area that I have not been paying much attention to. Through things like Special Places 2000 and the Forest Conservation Strategy industry will influence forest management. How the Model Forest will relate to those I don’t know.

- There has been discussion of ecosystem based management and landscape based management change over in the Province. Research is advancing the policy and helping people interpret how policy could be applied at a landscape level. Through the criteria and indicators work land managers are discussing how to work together on the landbase. This is seen as a key issue by the Province. The Province hasn’t figured out how the process is to function yet. The Resource Managers Forum is seen as a forum to help with certain things. The Forum consists of senior resource managers from various land management agencies. The Province sees this as a template for forest land management in Alberta. Management planning is being looked at because in the past management plans were developed without looking at other jurisdictions. The IRM in Alberta is in state of flux right now, for example. The IRM in the past has been quite faulty, but the Province has found a good template to help fix it. Also, the thinking of the Model Forest is reflected in the Forest Conservation Strategy for Alberta. They are looking at our Model Forest to
help craft the strategy.

- There have been four areas that I can think of that will impact regional strategies and policies that will impact government. From the ground rules perspective of industry, for example, they have designed bridges now instead of culverts. Policies and guidelines of cut-block design and layout on natural disturbance regimes have also changed. The cumulative effects has potential for regional impacts in the Model Forest area for how we do business over space and time. The results may impact provincial policy from a government perspective. It may also influence industry and the environmental impacts of large projects.

- We have not evolved to a point of writing policy, but, for example, Weldwood has policies vetted through the public that they should do certain things (e.g., block size). I feel more confident and so do they with what they are doing now with certain things because of research results of the Model Forest.

- Within the company they have taken habitat considerations into their forest management plan. They have also taken visual attributes of the landscape into consideration. Their procedures have been responsive to Model Forest findings. The provincial government has not been as enthusiastic, however.

25c. If No. Will there be discussions of specific forest management policies as part of the Phase II activities - explain?
26a. What is your understanding of the types of policy problems in regards to forest management in your area/region/province?

- A lack of integration of all policies on the landbase, for example, tourism, recreation, mining, forestry and protected areas. All policies should be where one plus one plus one plus one equal four, but they don't always add up correctly all the time. That is why cumulative effects is so important, because it will give you a quantifiable tool to quantify all of the impacts of policy together.

- An understanding of what is happening has changed. More is happening with local communities now. The policy process is still a frustration but an increase in awareness is what has changed. An understanding of what is going on in socio-economic research has helped this.

- I don't know how to answer that. As a forester and teacher I have different perspective. From a generic point of view, however, I can say the Province has a conifer bias for cutting (have tended not to look at aspen forest for cutting). Reforestation policy is also a problem as it is a requirement for the whole province, but does not take into consideration the differences in forest stands, sites, etc. It tends to ignore other values that we may want to manage in the forest as well. It has to be regenerated in a generic way. The Province is realizing the importance of this though. Through sound science other values can be incorporated. It use to be that one recipe would fit for all, but it doesn't work.

- Moving from sustained yield to sustainable forest management. In this move there have been no guidelines, it has been a wide open playing field and there are huge issues to deal with when moving from one to the other.

- Natural resources and the concept of SFM is bigger than trees. Policy regulation for forests can come from five different departments (e.g. Department of Environmental Protection, Energy, Trade and Tourism, etc.). One department can initiate a project or policy without looking at the ramifications on other departments and they all charge down separate tracks and don't look at how their policies affect others. We have to work together to look at the bigger picture.

- Our policy with respect to caribou and caribou habitat and how forest management impacts it positively or negatively influences the guidelines we come up with. What we come up with has a direct bearing on those guidelines or policies. We try to work with stakeholders and advisory committees to work with industry instead of coming up with hard and fast rules of heavy legislation. It may have serious policy implications but it will definitely have serious implications on practices.
• Special Places 2000 and The Forest Conservation Strategy are challenges the Model Forest has to deal with.

• The legislation we are dealing with is archaic and it largely focuses on a sustained yield basis and as fiber as the principle commodity. It has not progressed to include different facets of resource management (e.g., flora and fauna). Conflicting land uses have been presented by environmental advisory groups who are dissatisfied with local land uses of the company.

• The Protected Areas Strategy since it has been a problem for Weldwood. Problems also arise with groups when we try to develop ways to conduct our forestry business in relation with other values (e.g., recreation, wildlife, watershed, aesthetics, etc.). There are more people in the area and as forestry operations move closer to town they bump up with competing interests.

• There are two or three major ones. First, I'm not sure the people or politicians of Alberta or Canada really know what they want. We can't have pristine forests and access to fiber, which supports the largest industry in Canada, in the same forests. The policy issue is that politicians and the government do not understand the forests or the forestry industry. Second, is the trade off of values. How do you manage a petroleum network, coal mining system and forestry industry on the same hectare of forest land. The Provincial and Federal Governments have not dealt well with this. Third, is the relationship between federal and provincial responsibilities. For example, in building a bridge approval is needed from both governments. We had to get federal approval from the coast guard in Vancouver and fisheries approval in Winnipeg. We needed some other approval from the Province. One would give approval for before March 15 and one would give approval for after March 15. As a country we are not managing resource issues very well where provincial and federal jurisdictions cross. It's a hell of a mess. There are a whole litany of policy issues. In the Model Forest area the public thinks that everything that happens in that area is the Model Forest's responsibility, but most of the land is subject to the management by those vested with the responsibility or authority. It is a real tragedy of the commons because public land is managed by the Provinces who do not have a long-term view of resource management.

• We don’t set provincial policy. Therefore, it is difficult to extrapolate what we do in the Model Forest. Many companies are threatened by what is happening with the Model Forest because it may change what they have to do. Foothills Model Forest does not dictate policy though. Jasper is a near myopic symbol of preservation/conservation and how they are trying to do things impacts and dictates that on our land base.
26b. Has your understanding of the policy problems changed as a result of participating in the Model Forest? (Y/N)

- We see it [MF] as positive and able to contribute to provincial policy problems. If things are adopted by the province then we have succeeded.
- I am involved in so many issue drivers it is difficult to suggest what the Model Forest has changed.
- It has not changed it, but it has helped to substantiate concerns I have had. I can see the detriment of decisions being made in isolation.
- Mine, no.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.

26c. If yes, how?

- As stated in 26b.
- I am more informed at the landscape level and more aware of the importance of scale.
- I have a better understanding of the problems.
- I have become more knowledgeable.
- I'm aware of a tremendous strength and opportunity of the Model Forest Board. If we operate together we could have a significant influence with research with regard to policy. There is a significant role of the Model Forest within the Province.
- In two ways I understand better the seriousness and intensity of the issue of integration, and I understand better the impact of policy with other land users (e.g., Weldwood) It has been an education.
- Through natural disturbance regime work.
27a. Do you feel that your MF is in a position to offer advice to the stakeholders most involved in influencing and setting forest policy? (Y/N)

- I hope we would shy away from that. They are in a position to based on what they know, but some of us (myself, Weldwood) would say that is not the position of the Model Forest to do that.
- Yes, absolutely.
- Yes, I suppose so.
- Yes, I think they are.
- Yes, you bet.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- You have to be careful in how you inform or give advice. The Model Forest can influence by stakeholder presence at the table and can continue to debate with members at the table. With that you go through osmosis and an evolutionary process. It would be dangerous for researchers to stand up and preach. Therefore, you have to have an open Board with no hidden agendas and at the end of the day you have to integrate decisions amongst agencies.

27b. If yes, how?

- Because we have some senior people involved in the program who are people who have connections with policy makers.
- Forest policy is mostly set by the Province with some set by the Federal Government through such things as international trade, etc.
- I think they have acquired some excellent in-depth information in areas that are useful for knowledge based decisions in policy. The information is available. Yes, they can offer advice to policy makers if it is in those areas that relate to policy. To the public they can only offer it as knowledge
- Same as stated in 26c.
- Through involvement and by going back to organizations and decision makers.
- Through research results.
- Through the senior representative(s) who hopefully take advice. The lack of attendance is a slight problem, however.
- We are all well positioned to do that and we are doing that. For example, Rick is involved in the Forest Conservation Strategy. Our approach to cooperative management planning is being examined by the Province, as well, as a template to do that in other areas of the Province. Our work here is an opinion leader.
28a. Who would you identify as being part of the forest management policy community in your region (i.e. those groups, or individuals, that set forest management policy, or have a direct influence on those setting forest management policy)?

- The Department of Environmental Protection, Weldwood, and Jasper National Park. Those are the only three vested land management authorities that can influence decision making and policy.

- Federal Government, Provincial Government, the local government (a little bit), and industry, which sometimes gets to the table and sometimes doesn't.

- Regional and provincial level government officials. The Federal Government (i.e., Jasper National Park - at regional level for local park autonomy), and the Company (autonomous within the FMA area - have seen a lot of progress because they capitalized early on).

- The Department of Environmental Protection, Jasper National Park, and importantly in the Alberta climate are regional stakeholders, which would primarily include industrial stakeholders (e.g., oil & gas, seismic industry, forestry, etc.).

- The Department of Environmental Protection. That is where everything is set. I take home messages about what is to be written into policy.

- The forest management holders within the region (FMA holders), NRS as resource managers, the oil and gas industry, and the mining industry.

- The Forest Resource Advisory Group of Weldwood. The Board of Directors of the working groups of the Model Forest can also have an influence of policy, both government and industry policy. They could have an influence on environmental policy. For example, the Three Toed Salamanders were thought to be considered endangered but through research they were found not to be. The Model Forest research brought this out.

- The Land and Forest Service, the Natural Resources Service and Jasper National Park. One group that is not involved in the Model Forest is the energy sector. Their absence as a partner in the Model Forest is a void. If you look at the management of the landscape, however, they are a key player and the policy making in relation to the energy sector influences the landscape.

- The Province, the Alberta Forest Service, and those individuals with recreation, tourism, and watershed values and concerns.
• The Provincial Government (e.g., regional director, regional managers of NRS). Industry (e.g., Bob was involved with a panel that gave advice to the Minister), the Alberta Forest Products Association which is a common voice for industry in the Province. If a policy is being proposed it will be brought to AFPA and be discussed there. The Forestry Mayors Caucus will also have an increasing influence in Alberta. They look at themselves not as a regional stakeholder but as a stakeholder with a stronger voice. Environmental groups as well have an influence on policy development in Alberta. For example, in the Forest Conservation Strategy and the Protected Areas Strategy they put forward their agendas.

• The public, who expresses its views to their MLA’s. Everybody (i.e., local government units, senior government agencies, local public sector, NGO’s and forest companies).
28b. How has your MF attempted to link and work with these organizations?

- All of them, except the energy sector, since they are direct partners of the Model Forest. The reason the Model Forests were established in the first place were to look at fiber management on the landscape, not to look at the broad impacts on the landscape or the cumulative effects. However, these are important issues now and the energy sector should be considered in this regard.

- By having people sit on the Board. We have to have senior people there. The Model Forest could not fetter any agencies.

- One way has been through the Yellowhead Regional Planning Committee. It has had major input. It includes communities and mayors. It brings people together to make joint decisions and policies.

- Principally happened by involvement of professional personnel at the subcommittee levels. In Phase II I hope to see an emphasis on knowledge to see achievements go on beyond local stakeholders.

- Through demonstration. The Provincial and National Ministers have gone on tours and are shown how the landbase of the Model Forest is being managed. Also employees and partners in the Model Forest sit on other committees. Most people, however, are not interested in the broad sense of policy, they are only interested in the specifics (e.g., grizzly bear management, or if they can see a clearcut from their front door).

- Through direct involvement at all levels.

- Through direct representation and through involvement with these organizations.

- Through incorporation on the Board and dialogue with working groups.

- Through linkages with Board members and also through project activity teams in which we try to get a broader involvement into those projects. On an ad hoc basis we try to get information from key people (e.g., input into the Phase II proposal).

- Through research. We have to look at what we do. We have to look at science and how we involve them in forest management. We have to test research and apply it and provide recommendations to provincial officers to develop policy and guidelines.
• We have given presentations to other organizations. Also through personal influence. For example, most of the Board members of the Model Forest sit on other boards (e.g., FRAG).

28c. Which of these organizations has your MF liaised with most closely and why?

• All the aforementioned partners because they are principally the largest funding agents except for Weldwood. The Model Forest also impacts the land management of those areas.

• All three of them.

• In general the forest industry. We have done poorly with the oil & gas industry, NGO’s and Aboriginal groups.

• Industry and government.

• Senior decision makers of those organizations that are on the Board of the Model Forest. Things are discussed formally and informally when we meet.

• The Company because of their ability to respond to procedural changes in short order. Their area of responsibility is in the Model Forest area and not beyond.

• The Department of Environmental Protection and Jasper National Park. Jasper is in a similar position as we are and have probably arrived at similar policy conclusions as we have. They have been very enthusiastic.

• The Yellowhead Planning Group, the public advisory body of Weldwood, and a group of mayors independent of the Yellowhead Planning Group.

• We have had some influence provincially, but not so federally. Certain issues are politically charged and come out of Ottawa. We work with closely with the mayors in northern Alberta.

• We have liaised with university people, other Model Forests with regard to research projects, and both the provincial and federal governments.

• Weldwood, Jasper, the Provincial Government, communities, environmental groups, FRAG, mines (for example, they have been partners in studies), other industries, and other indirect stakeholders as well.
29a. In question 12 you identified particularly significant projects or programs that your MF had undertaken. Do the recommendations, or activities, of any of these projects/programs have implications for forest management policy? (Y/N)

- No. Only peripherally, because policy is set provincially for the most part. In the strictest sense it is the Province, because they have a standing committee on resources and if any true policy was to be created it would have to be vetted in that community, which includes 7-8 ministers.
- We're spending time on policy, but not in the Model Forest. They tend to be problems of a more immediate nature. We work in a policy framework. We have identified different issues (e.g., habitat, wildlife, etc.) and those are in a presently constituted framework of forest management, which includes timber and other values. We have not deliberately looked at broad policy changes in Foothills. We have looked at operational procedures.
- Yes, but I can't be specific in answering that.
- Yes, certainly.
- Yes, from a policy and guidelines perspective. For example, the caribou, grizzly bear, disturbance regimes and cumulative effects work will have implications.
- Yes, very much.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
29c. If Yes. Why do you think these projects were successful in influencing changes in policies and/or operating procedures?

If No. Why do you think they were unsuccessful?

- Any research you have (e.g., applied research) then there is an onus on people to use this stuff. For example, I use the socio-economic information.

- Because it has created some changes and more will come. We now have sound science of other values. There has been a value of learning that dead trees and “crummy” trees soon to be dead will have a value later on [i.e., will provide habitat for wildlife later on].

- Because of the concept of timeliness and relevance to land managers. The work identifies the real land management issues.

- Because they have broad support from stakeholder groups, they are scientific in nature and they are applied on the landscape. It is adaptive management and we tie our stuff to national issues. We are on the leading edge and we have to adapt our research. Other organizations can also take it further and apply it in an adaptive way (e.g., oil and gas industry, and province can apply it).

- For example with the Aquatic Habitat project the Forest Company ordered more stringent regulations for water body crossings (e.g., construction and engineering of roads). They have taken remedial action with hung culverts because before they [culverts] restricted action of fish. The Company has also made changes with respect to block layout for habitat requirements for birds, and have monitored habitat requirements for woodland caribou. The Company responded with forest harvest experiments and habitat retention operations.

- For example, with the natural disturbance work I don’t know if it has influenced policy. I’m inclined to say, no. I don’t know for sure. The notion of natural disturbance is bigger than the Model Forest and I don’t know if it has influenced policy or why it would be successful in changing policy.

- There has been a paradigm shift. We have been given a better glimpse of stepping away from sustained yield to sustainable forest management by the work of the Model Forest.

- They have been successful in influencing changes because these projects were initiated at our request. We saw a need to change or improve our practices. We selfishly set out to influence projects and took the results and applied them.
30a. Does your MF routinely require project “contractors” to identify the policy implications of the research that they carry out? (Y/N)

• I don’t know.
• I don’t know.
• I don’t know. I don’t think our preference is to ask that. For example, in an ecological study we just for ecological research.
• I don’t think I can answer that. It is a good question though. We do talk about policy and policy implications at the Board level.
• I hope so. They can identify and suggest, but they may not say yes or no.
• No, it doesn’t require or solicit it. Part of the problem in the area has come from graduate students who have taken license with findings without adequate peer review of their work or of consideration of the implications of their work in the large arena of land and resource policy. It is not encouraged and when it has happened it has been detrimental to the process.
• No, it is done in house, in workplans it relates to our proposal document. For example, it talks about “improvement to forest resources” in the documentation.
• No, not as a matter of course. It’s in our minds though.
• No.
• No.
30b. If Yes. Are these implications discussed among Board members and specific action items identified?

If No. Does the Board identify and discuss the policy implications of the findings of projects undertaken?

- Yes, the implications of a project are considered before a project is done. For example, it would trigger an EA. The Board looks at those types of things.
- No, I don’t think so. It is done through the other two bodies (e.g., Yellowhead Ecosystem Working Group and Land Managers Forum) and that is where policy would be brought up for presentation and development.
- Not routinely, but we do embark on some of those discussions, particularly if they are controversial.
- The Board members receive documents and look at them. We will also have staff involved on some of the projects, therefore, it comes from many directions.
- We discuss policy with stakeholders and more with working groups. As a Board we determine if we should carry on with a certain direction of research or if we should change it. Yes, there is discussion at the Board level and about impacts on our policy.
What impact has the MF had on the policies and programs of your organization, in particular? (Why successful or unsuccessful? What plans are being made to change this situation?)

- It has had influence on policy documents. For example, the Forest Conservation Strategy and the Timber Harvest Ground Rules document. It has influenced implementation and planning.

- It has just had an impact through awareness and better understanding of how natural disturbance might be integrated into policy and operational decision making.

- It hasn’t had any influence on our actual “policy book.” It has had an impact on what we do, like our actions. The intention is to bring the information from the Model Forest and incorporate what we can into the Park’s management plan process. In that way the Model Forest will influence policy/mandate of Jasper.

- It impacts on economic development. Research based in the community provides different people with information. It can enhance things. It would help though if research was more visible. For example, the fisheries research should be shown to people and should be more educational. There should be a demonstration project done on it.

- Ours have been more operation and guidelines. I’m not aware of policy change. There has been added value to guidelines and it has kept practices current. It has given us broader knowledge of practices and people on the landscape.

- The group I represent is Nova and the association that we are a part of is the Commercial Energy Pipelines Association. I can’t think of a direct influence, but indirectly what we discuss at the Model Forest does involve what we will discuss at the pipeline board. For example, things like risk decisions of forest vegetation. So I would have to say, indirectly, yes, but directly, no. At the Model Forest we are not here to directly look at these things (i.e., energy issues).

- The Partnership Group does not have a clue what’s going on. For the University of Alberta, money talks. If people at the university realize there is funding for research projects then they will get involved. People at the university have done projects because funding was available.
There has been a significant opportunity for applied research of socio-economics and carbon budget modeling that may not have come about without the Model Forest Program. Ecological processes and classification, perhaps, may have been done without the Model Forest.

There has been an indirect impact. Given the comfort of sustained yield, it is research [through the Model Forest] that will guide us through to moving to SFM.

We [Model Forest] have had a major impact. We [MF] have had big projects in Weldwood and have contributed a lot of money. Under the CSA (Can. Standards Assoc.) in SFM, for example, they [projects] are managed on our landbase in Hinton and in other areas they have had an impact.

We are modifying our harvesting practices for habitat of wildlife. We have done a river valley inventory and modified silvicultural practices. We have also looked at the impacts of reforestation on the genetic variability of lodgepole pine and have found there is no difference between the original standing trees and the reforested ones. We have done a carbon budget study and it appears that a managed forest stores proportionately more carbon than a natural forest. This could have big implications for the oil and gas industry. We could get carbon offsets by reforesting pipeline areas to offset non-renewable resource use. This could have big policy implications for Alberta. We are striving to incorporate many other values into our management plan. The work of the Model Forest will contribute to that. We are trying to develop a planning model for the landbase which will incorporate impacts on wildlife, aesthetics, etc. The work of the Model Forest has enabled us to gather more information and values than we were traditionally able to do. We now conduct inventories on trees, wildlife, values, etc. We have addressed national shortfalls that were criticized by the Blue Ribbon Panel with regard to the National Forest Strategy.
33a. The national evaluation of the MF program concluded that "MFs have not had a major impact on provincial forest policy". Do you feel that the conclusion of the national evaluation team is fair in respect to the impact of your MF on provincial policy? (Y/N)

- At the time that statement /evaluation was made, I would say, yes. The whole Model Forest Program and public concern about SFM are going to make major changes in forest management in the province. Those changes are underway right now. Five years ago I would have said no.

- Generally I would agree [yes]. However, you need more context to substantiate yes or no. We need more time to substantiate our research. It has only been a few years since we have collected the research and have been able to apply it on the landscape.

- In a national sense, yes. In a Alberta sense, indirectly it has had some benefit because senior members of the Province sit on the Board.

- In general, yes, it is accurate.

- No, not in our case because as we went through the Conservation Strategy document we were ahead of the wave. Policy change takes time as well. You have to demonstrate there is a need to change.

- No.

- No.

- Yes, but I would have to qualify that because these policies are changing every day by other changes in provincial policy. The Model Forest won’t change a significant policy directly, but the Model Forest will change how “policy # 18” looks, for example. The Model Forest may be shifting the language in policy or may shift it to being bolder, but the policy may have come from somewhere else (e.g., NAFTA).

- Yes, I think it is a fair statement considering the time frame for acquiring knowledge and the process for implementing plans.

- Yes, it was fair at the time. You will see impacts in the next five years. The first five years were information gathering.

- Yes.
33b. If Yes. How might the MF impact policy in the next five years?

If No. Why not? How do you expect to have an impact?

- As responsible managers if it was positive research we would do it. There is potential in the next few years to apply what we have been doing.

- By taking the research findings and applying them to the Model Forest landbase. Only through application can you see the trade-offs that will happen on the landbase. Phase II will contribute more than Phase I, which was a research phase.

- Provincial policy is founded on more than the area and the people represented by the Model Forest. After five years of Model Forest activities directed at research and development, it is premature to assume they will have an effect on policy. At the end of the second phase, perhaps there should be a more significant shift at the Model Forest level. Most shifts now are corporate procedural shifts.

- Stated in 33a.

- The Forest Conservation Strategy document is going to the stakeholder communities and if it is endorsed it will give a rubber stamp to the Model Forest and how it does business.

- There is sort of an understanding. It won't be through recommendations because we'll get into conflicts. It is an understanding of natural regimes. That is the beauty of the Model Forest because of the application of applied science and education.

33c. Do you believe MF findings will some day have an influence on forest management policy and procedures? (Y/N)

- I would like to think so, but I'm not going to hold my breath.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes. We are having an impact now.
33d. If Yes. How might this occur?

- If not through broad policy than in local policy. It will affect how things are done in the Model Forest (i.e., on the landbase).

- As responsible managers if it was positive research we would do it. There is potential in the next few years to apply what we have been doing.

- The Forest Conservation Strategy document is going to the stakeholder communities and if it is endorsed it will give a rubber stamp to the Model Forest and how it does business.

- The Model Forest is additive. There are a number of incremental influences and the Model Forest is one of these. It is a marriage of different types of actors to change policy and the Model Forest has to integrate with the other actors to change policy.

- Through applied science and education.

- Through modifications of policies and procedures for more flexibility to allow more groups to implicate forest management.

- Through more knowledge, utility, tech. transfer, and more credibility we'll see a bigger shift to Model Forest findings - see a shift in integrated resource management.

- Through research, knowledge, and the diversity of partners at the Board and project steering committees. Also through the commitment to implementing the work and knowledge. It takes time though to implement the work and effect policy.

- Through research.
34a. **Who within the provincial government has your MF worked most closely with?**

- Department of Environmental Protection (Land and Forest Service and the Natural Resource Service) and Jasper National Park as well.
- The Alberta Forest Service and the Alberta Department of Environmental Protection (both the Land and Forest Service and the Natural Resources Service branches).
- The Department of Environmental Protection (the field biologists in Edson).
- The Department of Environmental Protection (the Land and Forest Service).
- The Land and Forest Service and the Natural Resources Service.
- The Lands and Forest Service and the Natural Resource Service of the Department of Environmental Protection.
- The Ministry of Environmental Protection.
- The Natural Resource Service and the Land and Forest Service.
- The regional director of the North Eastern Slopes, and the director of the Forest Management Decision.
- The regional directors of the Land and Forest Service, the Natural Resources Service, and Dennis.
- The regional level of administration and management; but this has not excluded national or provincial land managers.
35a. Is your MF working cooperatively with the provincial government to develop specific aspects of their forest management policy (e.g. Foothills and Alberta Forest Conservation Strategy)? (Y/N)

- I guess we do that through the regional director of the Land and Forest Service. They do that as the land manager of the area. NRS works closely with them as an integrated service in that respect.
- Indirectly, probably. Directly, we don't work with the government to develop policy. We work indirectly with the Provincial Government on a few things. Directly, it has not been addressed.
- No, not formally. The closest we get is having Evelyn W [provincial person] working on the Criteria and Indicators Working Group.
- To my knowledge I don’t think so. [no].
- With regard to policy, no. With regard to plans, yes.
- Yes, I would think so because the Provincial Government and the regional director are on the Board.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.

35b. If Yes. Please identify when the activity began and describe the MF’s role in these projects.

- As stated previously, and by assisting in the development of enhanced forest management in the Province. There are three task forces involved in this. They are Forest Growth and Yield, Landscape Management and Forest Policy and Tenure. The Chair of the working group is Rick and he is there because of his understanding of the landscape management issues.
- By applying the Model Forest findings and thinking into parts of the provincial landbase.
- It formally started in 1993 with the formal draft going to the Minister in 1997. It is going to the stakeholder communities in 1998 and if it is ratified it will be a template for the future.
- The Province has seen fit resource management planning on areas where it has not been done before (buffer strip between Weldwood’s FMA and Jasper - areas E4, E9, etc.)
- They are working on the Alberta Forest Conservation Strategy. Rick has been involved all along because of his expertise.
38a. Have the projects undertaken in your MF affected local forest management practices in any of the following ways? (Y/N)

i) On woodlots

Not applicable.

ii) Federal lands

- I can’t answer that because I haven’t seen any evidence yet.
- I don’t know, I’ll leave Jasper to answer that.
- I’m sure it has, but how we differentiate between what was done before and is done now is hard to say.
- No.
- Yes, because they have understood that the fire program, and insects and disease have impact on the larger landscape. They are monitoring more now.
- Yes, Jasper National Park.
- Yes, with the natural disturbance work we have staff involved closely. Parts of the project come into the Park in on the ground surveys.
- Yes.
- Yes, in Jasper.
- Yes, but I don’t know specifics.

iii) First Nation lands

- I can’t answer that.
- Minimal if any.
- N/A now because they are newly established in the area. It may affect it in the future.
- No, because it is only formative and the land claim only came into existence last year.
- No, not on the land that has been established as the new reserve area.
- No, there is not much around.
- No.
- No.
- No.
- No, because there has been no involvement to this point.
- No.
iv) **Use of available wood supplies**

- In a fashion, yes, but not directly. I would have to say, no.
- I can’t answer that.
- I don’t know.
- I would hazard to say yes, but I do.
- I’m not sure.
- No, not at this point.
- No, the Annual Allowable Cut has not been effected.
- Probably no.
- Yes.
- Yes, through the chipper project. At the time we didn’t know if we could open certain areas but now we feel comfortable doing that with this project.

v) **Environmentally friendly logging**

- Generally, yes, they have and they will be.
- I don’t know, there may have been some work done.
- It has had some affect on riparian areas. How much of it has been the Model Forest and how much of it has been Weldwood is unknown. I’d like to think it is both.
- Yes, there has been some outstanding work done on riparian areas and caribou habitat.
- Yes, through the Shelthwood wood project and the Disposal of Chipper Residue project. The Chipper Residue was successful because Weldwood has re-evaluated and have found a new way to dispose of chipper wood on their land.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes. There has been research on riparian areas and on carbon budgets.
- Yes, through experimenting with shelter wood and understory protection treatments.
- Yes, through the mixed wood trial and ecological classification work.
39a. What sorts of policy changes do you feel will be required on the part of government, industry, NGO's, individuals, to “accelerate the implementation of sustainable development in the practice of forestry”?

- A lot of policy change and mechanisms are in place, it is just a matter of planning processes to formally use the information.

- A willingness to hear and debate the views of all parties, because in this era of devolution of responsibilities of the provincial governments to industrial organizations there will be problems unencumbered in the outcome of this if some aspects are devolved to industry and others stay with the Crown. And if the Crown doesn’t manage an area the same as industry would then problems may arise. For example, there is no responsibility to manage fish. It is not the resource management responsibility for the FMA owner, though the Company is paying heed to it. It is also not the responsibility of the province. Therefore, no one has control over their actions. It is up to the government to devolve a greater range of resource management responsibilities with commensurate reward. For example, if populations increase because of habitat management who will reap the rewards. The government who legislated the action, or the industry who did it. The next debate will also be between the non-consumptive users and the land managers. Again, who will reap the rewards from habitat management and subsequent population increases.

- From an industry perspective there needs to be more confidence in the security of the landbase and tenure. We are asked to invest a lot of time, money and resources into SFM. You don’t want to spend a lot of time investing in trees and mortar.

- I don’t know.

- Implementation and tools that let you quantify policies. If you have all these policies, but don’t know what they are doing then they aren’t effective.

- Policies that should be changed should be taken on by those in the communities. For example, NGO’s should understand natural disturbance regimes and their effects. Governments should recognize resource based communities and see what is going on. General views should not be imposed on communities, rather they should be taken in context of the community and the issues in the area.

- Provincial policy makers and the Model Forest are heading in the same direction with criteria and indicators and sustainability. Understanding criteria and indicators and what the thresholds are is key. Have to understand how much
development is enough.

- That is presuming we don’t already have some sustainable development. What we are articulating here is the concept of sustainability. If we look at what the public wants with regard to fiber we are probably there, but how do we put it all together (i.e., mines, forestry, gas, etc.) to make it sustainable?

- The work we will do with criteria and indicators. CCFM has said a lot of work has to be done in changing and redefining our objectives so we can sustain or enhance sustainable development on the landscape. We tended to have worked on measuring individual things on the landscape but we have to look at that from a broad and cumulative effects landscape basis. We have to look collectively at things and perhaps we need new policy or guidelines to achieve (SFM) things collectively. It is not just local people who have an impact on the local landscape but it is all people nationally. The Model Forest will help us achieve sustainable development over space and time.

- We already have sustainable development in Foothills Model Forest.

- We have to move to a broader landscape level and consider values other than fiber.

39b. **Do you feel that MF should be advocating directly (e.g. letter writing by Board), and through their research, for the sorts of policy change you identify? (Y/N)**

- I'm not sure we have identified any.
- No, during Phase I. In the second phase very judiciously. We have to be careful. [yes?]
- No.
- No.
- No.
- No.
- The Model Forest should focus on directing policy in its area/organization. I don’t know for something like that. How far can you go with a policy? There is a culture of policy. There is written policy and a type of understanding of what you can do with it. It is changing that attitude to policy that we can assist in. I suppose we could do that but I don’t want to give a definitive answer to that.
- We already do. If we see a problem we ask Udell to write a letter.
- Yes, but they are not all applicable. They should take a look at the research and how it fits in. The Board should pass a motion to write letters, etc. for policy change.
- Yes, I think the Model Forest can.
• Yes, they could be, but I’m not saying they should be.

39c. If Yes. What are the most effective mechanisms (e.g. direct lobbying) the MF might use for advocating policy change identified through their activities? (Probe whether any of those identified have been tried by the MF)

If No. Why not?

• As responsible members we should feed the information back internally. The Model Forest has a role to play in supporting what we do, but it should not take the lead. They [Model Forest] should help us do this but individuals should do it through their sectors and mandates. We should be the driving force and adapt our management and work with it.

• Because the Model Forest is not responsible for managing the land and the Model Forest does not have a stake in the outcome. The responsibilities and decision making have to remain with the agencies.

• It is not the Model Forest’s role, that is why land managers are there. They need to take what is known and implement if in their areas.

• The Model Forest can undertake that by making recommendations; that is the role of the Model Forest. They have no role to manipulate the landbase and they can’t do it on their own, but through recommendations they could. You’ll find recommendations can cause things to pop. It can happen pretty fast.

• To be considered non-partisan our research has to speak for itself. It is not for us to be an advocate of that research because it is in the public domain and they can use it to advocate their views.
41a. Policy modification is but one way for MF to effect change aimed at achieving sustainable forest management. What other techniques (e.g. direct action - planting trees) has/might your MF utilize?

- By showing decision makers and policy makers the things that are happening on the ground and the good will that is going on. There are people with progressive thinking and ideas.

- Education and tech. transfer have been very credible in the communities and they have been very effective already.

- Foothills is making presentations to the chamber of resources (body of resource and development managers). There are other ways rather than letter writing. There are “show and tell” presentations to senior officials, for example, that are more effective.

- Good quality research with practical applications is key. If you have that then the policy changes will flow from that. That has to be the basis.

- I see direct action as an example of policy change.

- If we can come up with something that will be useful with regard to SFM for land holders and their goals then they will adopt it. For example, logging blocks in certain areas.

- Outside of policy the biggest thing is to just change operation procedures based on good information. B.C. has changed based on its Forest Practices Codes. Having actual practitioners involved is better because when they find out about the information they can make more operational changes and practice changes that are better.

- As responsible members we should feed the information back internally. The Model Forest has a role to play in supporting what we do, but it should not take the lead. They [Model Forest] should help us do this but individuals should do it through their sectors and mandates. We should be the driving force and adapt our management and work with it.

- We have been successful in technical workshops and findings. The communications plan for the next five years is focused on delivering information we learned in Phase I and getting it out to a wider audience.
• We need a broader base process for involvement into the decision making, consensus and research which could really build on the recommendations for policy.
• We're getting hung up on policy in these questions, that's not the job of the Model Forest.

41b. Have any of these been tried thus far (if so explain)?
• If it has it would be reflected through the partners advisory committee.
• Yes, presentations to chamber of resources.
• Yes, we have had students involved in projects and have developed brochures. We have worked with the Environmental Training Centre to work with students through projects.
• Yes.
SOCIAL VALUES

43a. Has your MF formally attempted to identify the forest values of Board members/participating partners? (Y/N)

- No, not officially. They have come out in strategic planning initiatives. Organizations’ views have been expressed.
- No. The values are implicit in the organization’s representation. We haven’t formally stood up and shared values, but they are implicit and understood.
- Yes, absolutely. One of our cornerstones is looking at the socio-economic aspects of forest land management.
- Yes, I think so.
- Yes, in our strategic planning [of the Board] we listed our values.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.

43b. If Yes. Briefly explain attempts (get copy of any project).

- By talking about it and revisiting it in the process of developing the Phase II proposal.
- One of our socio-economic activities is a baseline survey of values. It is a summary of values and a ranking of public views. There were a number of communities and working groups involved. Hinton was one community. Rick was involved with one of the working groups.
- There has been a high level of influence and we understand the trade-offs in a less subjective manner.
- Through a criteria and indicators workshop when we were setting goals. The values are reflected in the strategic direction the Model Forest is taking in this area.
- Through our strategic planning exercises. We have looked at the major partners, where they are coming from and their concerns. We are also looking at the socio-economic impacts on the partners.
- Through some projects. The socio-economic programs are more in tune with public values than the Board is.
- We are going through an exercise tied to criteria and indicators where each of us brings our objectives to the table. We bring our objectives to the table collectively and tie the criteria and indicators to those objectives.
- We have surveyed multiple times about what was important to us. That’s how the group was formed.
43c. If No. Does your MF plan to carry out such research in the future? (Y/N)

- Yes, certainly on the socio-economic side of things, but not on values directly.
- Yes.

43d. If Yes. How do you think this information should be collected?

- Through the support and continuance of socio-economic research.

44a. Can you identify any of the forest values held by Board members or participating partners in your MF? (Y/N)

- I think the demonstration of values is reflected in the Phase II document. We facilitated a workshop process and through what was important to the individual organizations. There is a subset of values embodied in the Board.
- Yes, we have a clear understanding of values, but it could be better. There is a huge value that deals with education.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
44b. If Yes. Please identify.

- All Board members share the desire to sustain wildlife species that we have on the landbase and that we are working with. We also do not want to inflict any environmental damage on the landscape. We are doing cooperative work and share in these goals. We also want to maintain the flow of fiber to the plant in Hinton and continue to provide benefits to the community and the government. We all value Jasper and what it represents to Alberta and Canada.

- Collectively we share similar resource management objectives. For example, with the biodiversity strategy, the oil and gas industry, NRS and other groups, we all recognize we can have grizzly bears on the landscape as an indicator of ecosystem health. We have all signed on, that collectively we all agree that we should aspire to the criteria and indicators through our research, targeting to work to the goals and objectives set by the CCFM. This will impact our goals and objectives. I assume we will adapt to that and it may have implications for policy.

- Industrial partners are profit motivated and value economics and employment. Jasper National Park is preservation minded and natural disturbance is the chosen way of bringing change on the landscape. The Province has certain policies and authorities that are in place and are recognized. They [policies] will remain in place until higher authorities denounce them. The Mayor of Hinton reflects the views of the local people who expect they should have a say in how the forest is managed and the activities that affect their lives. The only thing is that urban views are not necessarily reflected in this as their views are a long way away from the forest area.

- Jasper National Park - conservation ethic, ecological integrity (mandate is to preserve the ecological integrity of the Park). This Board swings more toward community development and the economic side of things (lifestyles, communities).

- Jasper values non-resource extraction management. Weldwood types are resource extraction oriented. The government has an holistic approach to resource extraction and communities. The University has an academic point of view. They have a different value system.

- Most of us are pretty traditional, most of us are foresters or biologists. We are missing Aboriginal values (e.g., TEK and a cultural perspective).
• There are an amazing variety of values. One member is concerned about cumulative effects (e.g., have to look at all groups involved in an area - Weldwood, Oil & Gas, etc. - and what the effects of all these activities are having on communities). Others values wildlife (e.g., ungulates, birds, fish, etc.). Others value jobs at the mill.

• There is a clear understanding of economic values with timber and the utilization of fiber. There are also mineral resources, coal and petroleum. There is a strong understanding of a lot of values in wildlife, recreation, hunting, fishing and guiding. There is a lot of value in birds. There is also a value of respect for biodiversity in the area. Clearly there is an understanding of the inter-relationships between these values and the fact that you end up with highly managed areas (e.g., coal). You also have broad values with access and reforestation. The public values the use of the forest for many things defined and undefined.

• Value of fiber. Value of a mix of age stands across the landscape (e.g., mature to over mature stands). Values of individual species of wildlife. Natural disturbance models. There are any number of held values out there.

• Weldwood values job creation and the economic contribution of the forestry industry. The mayor values community values, a stable community, and a good quality of life in the community. The Province manages the land and is responsible for all people’s values.

• Weldwood would like to stay in business and be a profitable company.
45a. What does your stakeholder organization value about the forest?

- As stated in 44b.

- Environmental stewardship.

- How developers look at things once the trees are out of the way. We want to start enhancing and building processes to do things jointly. We want to partner relationships to look at issues timely and with knowledge of the broader landscape level. The magnitude of finding the answers is out of reach of any one partner. We have to look at the landscape level and look at the frameworks of what communities, government and industry expect. We have to dovetail what everyone expects.

- It encompasses every wishy washy value you can think of. It includes people, prosperity and preservation. There is a value around representing unique sites, and there is also a value around economics and ecological prosperity. There is both yin and yang through all the staff.

- Nothing earth shattering. It [MF] is a great place to take research to an applied level with support of partners and it [research] stands a far better chance of being taken up at the other end of it’s life.

- That we have a legacy for parks for our children and our grandchildren. We all have our motherhood goals and we should all be measured by them by the end of the day. Our mission is; “As proud stewards of Alberta’s renewable natural resources, we will protect, enhance and ensure the wise use of our environment. We are a dedicated and committed team, responsible for managing these resources with Albertans. We are guided by a share commitment to the environment and are accountable to our partners, the people of Alberta.”

- The entire partnership group in the Model Forest provides a for a wide range of opportunities and values. It summarizes the three circles of sustainable development. It recognizes the economic, social, and environmental values in the area. People hold those values close because they make a living in this area and recreate in this area.

- The Partnership Group - nothing.

- The research that is going on. For example, the work on criteria and indicators and the socio-economic side of sustainability. Those things are going to drive our
ability to determine our future. Right now it is outside forces and organizations that drive our future.

- The values Jasper provides. Jasper has ecological, spirituality, escape, recreation and leisure values. It has a value for experiencing and learning about the Park. Our values are reflected in the National Parks Act.

- We do have a mission statement, but I can’t remember it.

45b. **Is your stakeholder organization currently making any attempts to translate these values into action? (Y/N)**

If Yes. Explain how.

- Yes, absolutely. I am organizing resource based communities across Canada.
- Yes, big time. We are putting a lot of research into our forest management plan and that is where actions will arise from.
- Yes, everyday through staff work.
- Yes, the research projects of the Model Forest focus at looking at one of those three spheres of sustainable development.
- Yes, through jobs, by doing our work.
- Yes, through research.
- Yes, very much so through our jobs. We have consistently had good representation at the Board, and so has Weldwood and Jasper National Park. We have had good continuity and consistent representation.
- Yes. The Partnership Group is only by participation of special interest groups. The U of A is looking at non-timber values (e.g., what the mill is not doing).
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
45c. Do you see the MF as a viable vehicle to assist you in doing this?

- Yes, but only through arms length.
- Yes, I do. The Model Forest is an honest broker and a neutral stakeholder. By virtue of consensus decision making and achievements it should be an ideal means to do so.
- Yes, it is critical.
- Yes, it is very viable. It is very leading edge. It allows us to do research we otherwise wouldn’t have done. It allows us to do collaborative research to justify and change policy guidelines.
- Yes, the Model Forest is one vehicle. There are others though. There is the Forest Conservation Strategy, the Special Places 2000 Plan and the Centres of Excellence. We are involved in a number of issues. For example, with caribou management there are common issues on the landscape and there are a number of vehicles to look at that have participatory action.
- Yes, through workshops and symposiums.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes. We could improve on this by better representing our values at the Board and by having better two way communication between the Board and those people that hold certain values.
- Yes.

46a. Do you think your MF has served as a good means for bringing people together, that hold diverse forest values? (Y/N)

- Yes, absolutely.
- Yes, absolutely.
- Yes, absolutely. That is the strength of the Model Forest. But having said that those diverse interests are not so diverse anymore.
- Yes, I really do. It has been a win for the Model Forest, especially for Jasper and Weldwood.
- Yes, I think so.
- Yes, I think so. It hasn’t always been the best experience but it has been good.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
46ba. If Yes. What processes are in place/or should be in place, for stakeholders/partners to gain a better understanding of each other’s values? If No. Why not?

- It happens through the Board, Executive Committee, Steering Committee, information sharing and social extravaganzas (e.g., Christmas party).

- It is a matter of keeping lines of communication open for the continuity of what’s going on. For example, with the Partnership Advisory Committee, which has been periodically successful. It is a matter of getting the most out of effective communication.

- People are involved on activity teams and put their value stamp on projects. We also went to our partners to get their views for the Phase II proposal.

- Socially we get together. We talk freely at Board meetings. I can tell there is good camaraderie, openness and trust. People aren’t afraid to put their position on the table.

- That is one of our challenges. I partly answered that earlier when I was talking about working with stakeholder groups, but we are then challenged with communications though.

- There are no processes in place. Rather we are listening to each other and are discussing issues at the table. It is very positive. There is not always agreement but that is positive too.

- Through the partnership association and the partnership advisory committee. The communications project will hopefully fill any voids and bring people up to speed on why we do what we do. Hopefully this will this will create an appreciation of other people’s values.

- To get time for people to do what they should do as part of the Model Forest.

- We have had on ground tours with Ministers, and the Model Forest has hosted a great number of international visitors that have provided many different perspectives (e.g., Japanese, German, Scandinavian).

- We have workshops.
47a. Can you identify any changes in the decision making process of the MF organization, or partners, that have occurred due to the consideration of stakeholder values? (Y/N)

- I think there are lots but I can’t think of any specifics. If they are raised they are taken into consideration.
- No, not off hand. I’m too removed from the landscape to know.
- No, not specifically.
- Not so much in the decision making process but in the types of things we look at, yes.
- We are always aware of each other’s values. The context of values always comes out at the table and we have to be aware of those values.
- Yes, the process has changed.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.

47b. If Yes. Please describe and probe as to how these changes occurred.

- I think one of them is that most of the stakeholders are going through a growing process in a general sense. Clearly the relationship that many stakeholders have developed with Jasper has been good. Their relationship before was next to nil. That has grown.
- The decision making context, hearing and listening, has changed. It changed when Jasper and Willmore Wilderness Park came on because they have a different approach and perspective of things. The coordination is much better now. I give credit to the Model Forest Program for bringing groups together. For example, Weldwood and Jasper never talked before.
- Through changes in the block size issue and through the best practices thinking, which have been influenced by what has come out of the Model Forest.
- Through the two partners of the Advisory Committee whose views are generally respected and heard by the Board.
- We have changed from being bottom up to being top down. We are going to focus on fewer areas and ensure that they are adequately resourced.
- Weldwood themselves have increased their sensitivity about their operations with researchers on the land base and with studies that affect their day to day operations. It has probably caused them to be very conscientious of their operations.
48a. Are the values of any stakeholder/partner given more consideration than another for inclusion in the decision making processes of the MF? (Y/N)

- No. Priorities are with spending money, but they are not predetermined.
- Yes, certainly, for those of the principle sponsor partners.
- Yes, probably.
- Yes, probably.
- Yes, to be honest Weldwood has.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
48b. If Yes. How so?

- Because the accountability of what we do lies with land managers rested with the appropriate authority. For example, with watershed and trout management certain points were made and brought back to the Board to make changes. To make change on the ground lies with those three main groups (Jasper, Province, and Weldwood) and it is the only place for us to do it. The accountability lies with them.

- Broad ecological values aren’t given as much weight as resources are.

- I suppose the squeaky wheel gets the grease.

- I would suggest the industry is given more consideration. There is more of a perception that they are given more consideration. They do more “destructive” activities so if we can mitigate this through research that may be good.

- It is based on the “golden rule” [he has the gold rules]. It is the name of the game. The squeaky wheel gets the grease. For example, if Weldwood puts in a million dollars for funding they’ll get more achievements and say, There is a dwindling authority of CFS guiding the agency. With money/funding comes influence and the opportunity to more effectively influence the agenda.

- It is by a commitment to doing a project or program and through the leadership of financing something like that.

- One can see that the Board is dominated by resource management agencies that set the direction and how money will be spent. It has gone from bottom up to top down. We have gone from who could speak the loudest to those who have to manage the land range because they have to do the work. In that respect we have become less democratic than we were.

- There is a perception by external people that Weldwood gets more consideration. My staff believe that. I have not see that and would not stand for that at the Board. I dispel that belief with my staff. I have not seen it and would not allow it to perpetuate.

- Weldwood carried the weight of direction for Phase I, but it will be more evenly distributed in Phase II.

- Weldwood has because of their land base ownership and where they are going. It hasn’t been negative though.
49a. Has your MF discussed how the values held by Board members/partners might apply in forest management decision making outside of the MF? (Y/N)

- I can't think of any specific examples.
- I would have to say, yes, because we keep talking about sustainability in the broadest sense. Everything we do we need a tech. transfer component to apply outside of the Model Forest.
- No, not that I know of.
- No, the Board has not. Yes, the Land Managers Forum has. Similar attitudes of expression and interest will carry through to that body.
- There is every intent to reach out to outside stakeholders and organizations outside of the Model Forest. We see the value of their interests and the value of our research. Yes, there is a common understanding of values.
- Yes, I suppose so, indirectly.
- Yes, indirectly, slowly and discreetly. The Model Forest cannot step out and tell the government what to do.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.

49b. If Yes. What approaches have been proposed? If No. How do you think it might apply?

- Finding common ground.
- Just the incorporation of the concept of bringing stakeholder groups together to discuss and understand things. We have to get the discussion out to other groups to encourage sustainability.
- Similar attitudes of expression and interest will carry through to that body.
- There is every intent to reach out to outside stakeholders and organizations outside of the Model Forest.
- The approach is hands off. We supply the science and let individuals deliver it through their agencies.
- We have had discussions between Board members and have had workshops. For example, the concept of landscape management and the Land Managers Forum might be used as a template for forest management in the Province.
50a. Has your MF engaged in stakeholder values research amongst the broader community not directly involved in the MF organization (e.g. aboriginal groups, active users, passive users, non-local users) (Y/N)?

- I don’t know.
- No, I don’t think so. We have had a few open houses but we have no gone out to the public to solicit views.
- No, not that I’m aware of.
- Yes, I think it has tried, but some of those groups haven’t stayed (e.g., the Alberta Wilderness Association).
- Yes, it has been done through the socio-economic program at the very least.
- Yes, through the socio-economic program we are looking at public values and ways of getting feedback on public values.
- Yes, we did values research on a cross section of the entire community and we also went to Edmonton.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.

50b. If Yes. How did the results of this work modify your understanding of other group’s values? If No. Do you think values research should be done?

- As a Model Forest group they were surprised how uninformed, in general, people were about the Model Forest in general.
- I haven’t seen the results yet.
- It has not been very satisfactory.
- It is being done by the socio-economic research group.
- It is still in progress there is no direction yet.
- It shaped our priorities. It gets to the issue of environmental values, but we’re still trying to act on that. For example, we see mining as an impact to the landscape and we are trying to figure out how to attract them. We recognize gaps and are trying to see how to we can get other groups and their values involved.
- No, because when the Model Forest was starting all the individuals had a chance to participate. Unless research would be utilized I would say no.
- The results are not in yet.
- The results aren’t in, but we understand the magnitude of the economic component. It will be very visible when the results come in.
- They have been taken into consideration.
51a. Has the Board discussed ways of incorporating the lessons learned from this work in order to influence forest management decision making? (Y/N)

- I don’t know I’m not on the forest management decision making side of things.
- I don’t know.
- No, it is still in progress.
- No, not to date. The results are preliminary. It is to be discussed pending research.
- No, not yet the work is not finished.
- Yes.
- Yes.

51b. If Yes. What approaches have been discussed?

If No. What approaches do you think should be discussed?

- No approaches to be discussed.
- Same as stated in. For example, we see mining as an impact to the landscape and we are trying to figure out how to attract them. We recognize gaps and are trying to see how to we can get other groups and their values involved.
- They were swayed to put more money into public relations and communications.

52a. Do you think your MF has increased stakeholders’/partners’ appreciation of the ways in which other people value the forest? (Y/N)

- I don’t know, you would have to ask other people.
- No, there has been very little because of a lack of communication.
- Yes, absolutely. We have a fairly diverse group.
- Yes, certainly.
- Yes, I think it certainly has.
- Yes, I think so.
- Yes, I think so.
- Yes, we have attempted to do that.
- Yes, within the Board, but with the partners I don’t know. I don’t think so.
- Yes, within the narrow range of stakeholders that are involved, but for those are not involved, no.
- Yes.
52b. If Yes. Could you please explain how? If No. Why not?

- Because of a lack of communication.
- If they can reconcile all those beliefs and values it will be something else. They have recorded them, and they have been considered and heard.
- Just by discussion around the table. When you put a position on the table you have to discuss the background and position behind it. It gives a wider scope and complexity to decisions we follow. It gives a wider perspective of players, issues and values on the landscape. In the end when we apply that our research gives benefit to all stakeholders, and not just to people in the local area.
- The newspaper article on the community was very helpful.
- The preliminary feedback we have gotten from Beckley has raised our awareness and at the Board level it gives us insight into how other managers have managed their land.
- There are a lot of comments from people, primarily from people on tours of the Model Forest. They have jaded views when they arrive but when they leave, they leave feeling more comfortable once they see what has been going on in the Model Forest area.
- There is a recognition that Weldwood, Willmore, and Jasper can do and needs to do what they have to do. There is respect and appreciation for each other’s position. For example, Jasper’s preservation of Grizzly Bear habitat and how it impacts areas outside of the Park.

53. Has your MF assessed how different stakeholders/partners perceive the legitimacy of other stakeholders and their forest values? (Y/N)

- Get that information from Beckley.
- I don’t believe it has been done. I don’t know for sure, it may be part of the socio-economics research that is going on.
- I don’t know if we have.
- I don’t know it may be in some studies.
- I don’t know. No, I don’t think so.
- I think it has increased that.
- I would like to say, yes, but the jury would have to be out on that one. The big issue dealing with that are the hearings of the Cheviot mine. It drove some stakes between stakeholders. We had a discussion on how we could be involved in that outcome. I think we have had a positive outcome/influence on some things though.
- I’m not sure, you’d have to ask the researchers.
- No, not a formal assessment. It is more of an intuitive thing. We have a better appreciation of each other’s values.
54a. Are the findings of all social values research discussed with stakeholder/partner groups? (Y/N)

- No, not any more than any other findings are.
- They will be.
- Yes.

54b. If Yes. When and how? If No. Are there plans for this type of sharing?

- I don’t know. I think the communications group would be doing that.

55a. Do you think that stakeholder values research, and the incorporation of such values can accelerate the implementation of sustainable forest management practices? (Y/N)

- I’m not sure we’re going as hard as we can and I don’t think we’re going to go any harder. [no?].
- I’m not sure.
- Maybe.
- No, not necessarily.
- Probably.
- Yes, absolutely.
- Yes, for sure.
- Yes, I believe so.
- Yes, without a doubt.
- Yes.
- Yes.
55b. Explain Why or Why not?

- Because the decision making emphasis, at the landscape level, has to consider all levels, so we have to step up timber values, but we do have good linkages with other values and it is understanding and developing good linkages to those values.

- If we had money for research it may help bring us closer together, but the values of environmental activists of outside groups oppose cutting vehemently. It may give us an understanding of how to talk with them. They are a minority. For example, they had very little impact with the Cheviot Mine issue. I wish they would come in so we could get an understanding of them.

- It would in the short run enhance the understanding of the host of other values associated with resources. It would make other fiber users more aware of both commercial and non-commercial uses. It would not shift policy. It would be confusing and would “turn over the apple cart.” It would change the procedure of how you give due consideration to values and views.

- That is what sustainability is based on, integrating all those different values.

- The more people know about the whole picture the more likely they are to look at a whole picture solution.

- The more people you have championing a new cause or direction the more you will have a greater impact locally, nationally and internationally. Our research will have more impact.

- The only way we will be able to look at sustainability on the landscape is by looking at different values and incorporating that knowledge.

- The Province is moving ahead on that regardless of what the Model Forest is doing.

- Through mutual understanding and appreciation. It is difficult to change forest management practices and policy if you only work from your point of view. The Phase II proposal in itself is a living document. But things are like a moving goal post and you have to stay on top so your value set has to be current. You can’t have knee jerk reactions. It could throw
things off. You should use a crystal ball for looking at lasting values and then tinker around the edges for values that are not as long lasting.

- You would hope if you involve those people in the process they would understand a little more of it and be able to establish trade-offs in the process of it.

56. Please feel free to offer any other comments about the model forest program and or this survey (may want to prompt specifically about the red/green flag business).

Model Forest Program:

- I must reinforce that the Model Forest is not a decision making body and everyone on the Board has come to that conclusion. CFS drives that to us time after time, but it is to the detriment of the Board. They want to see policy change but it's not that easy. For example, I have a plan that took 12 years to do, but to change that because of Model Forest findings is not that easy. We have had failings with our communications. We need to emphasize the message and get it out there.
  For me it would be valuable to go to Fundy because I think they are a leader in the program. I think you'll be impressed with McGregor. It will be interesting to see the findings. Foothills will pay for a presentation of the results of the findings.

- It is a tremendous first move with groups who previously didn't work together. Anytime you can do that it is a major achievement. However, here there isn't the same degree of conflict as in other Model Forests. I appreciate you asking the social part and I would like to see that strengthened elsewhere. Our question to the Feds. Should be to see how they are using the Model Forests to inform their policies and regulations. Why are they not using the Model Forests? They are a very legitimate group. Why are they not using the Model Forest? It may be too late though.
One thing I really like about the Model Forest is its approaches to developing SFM at a local level. A lot of projects in Canada are very top down and by and large include academics, etc. and are mainly in urban areas where they attempt to provide solutions and opportunities. The Model Forest enables local people to define the approaches within the area and context of the area. It enables us to bring in who we want (e.g., researchers). The issues across Canada are so different so it is interesting to see different approaches. It shows there is no one template to follow and people should be sensitive to that. The Model Forest is groundbreaking in that sense.

Our program is true to the intent of the program. We have tried to look at the big picture. We are trying to fix our communications. We are also trying to encompass as broad a range of values as we can. In Phase I we tried to be all things to all people but it was difficult with the limited funding we had. In our evaluation it was stated that the Board should consider other involvement from outside groups. In defense of our Board of not adding any seats it is because their vision is “it it’s not broken, don’t fix it,” but they have left the door open to other stakeholders. If you want to affect change it has to be at the level we are working with. In Phase II we tried to look at the real issues and look at fewer projects and to do a good job on those projects. At the network level we should be encouraged to make time to work together. We should demonstrate and try to practice SFM and this can be done through the network.

The Model Forest Program might be a model of models to come. For example, a model for community forestry. Some people or groups might turn to the Model Forest as an honest broker to heal wounds from impacts of resource use. The Model Forest will continue to serve as an honest broker and be a neutral subject of sustainable forest management. Hopefully it will be used to take in negative feedback for adaptive management. It is politically neutral enough to withstand the heat of adaptive management. It is a new step. The Model Forest can and should continue to hold its head high and continue to take steps in new directions.

The more you get other stakeholders around the table the more you get understanding. You get more networking. You get to know what drives stakeholders (e.g., Jasper, coal mine, etc.) and the public. Clearly there has been a lot of research done on a whole lot of issues on how to manage better. You asked a lot of questions on policy and I think we have lousy policy in this country. We don't look at broad issues and we deal with the
symptoms and not the problems. I hope the Model Forest will bring us closer to dealing with these policy issues.

- There is one thought that I have always had. Of all the Model Forests across Canada with their unique land bases, I would rate this one at the top because it includes the Rockies, the Willmore Wilderness area and Jasper National Park. All the attempts to sustain all the values for future generations is very good here. It shows how unique Canada is and the implications we should consider when managing the land base.

- We are dancing right now. It is early in the game and things are going good, but we have big issues to tackle and that is when the Model Forest will be tested, when we have really gotten involved in these issues.

- Alberta operates differently. Alberta sets the objectives and it is up to industry to carry it out. The Model Forest has not turned it around but it has influenced things.

- From my experience we have a very committed Board of directors and strong science in our project teams. We are very strategic. We try to attack big issues. We try to be aware of what other Model Forests are doing, and what leading edge research efforts are being done (e.g., at universities) so we don’t reinvent the wheel and can concentrate on our research efforts. We have a strong team concept. Consensus decision making works well. We make a strong emphasis to apply research to every day adaptive management processes. We are critical of ourselves and critical of shortfalls (e.g., communication failure both internally and externally). We have a strong commitment to put that [communications] back on track. The Model Forest has strong linkages with other organizations to ensure we are supportive of each other and so we can get added value. We try to take a holistic view of landscape management. We are aware of the strategic direction from the CCFM and that is our vision. We don’t look at easy things, but rather major issues. We try to tackle them and challenge ourselves. They are topical things we look at. It gives us good research results so we can better integrate our resource landscape so we can have sustainable development within our sustainable development concepts.

- Our frustration is trying to communicate to the public ways SFM can be done so effective changes in policy can be done. In our Model Forest we don’t see this as necessarily a community forestry advisory body to do these things. We should also be talking to majority owners in Edmonton and Calgary.
Survey:

- The survey is good. It is great that it is being done. I support this type of project. It makes you think. For example, in the social values section I first said no to some questions and then I thought about it again.

- The survey, I don’t know, it seems fairly complete.

- The survey was good. The questions went to the heart of the matter.

- I’m not sure the survey is getting at the effectiveness of the Foothills Model Forest. It may not be getting a good picture of our Model Forest. It may be good for Manitoba, Prince Albert, and Long Beach, but we are not doing these things exactly.

- The questionnaire is comprehensive. Hopefully themes will be able to contribute to the subtleties of the network. It seems to be based on subjective expression and then annotated. How will you undertake the analysis?

- The survey has touched on the leadership side of things, on values (held values) and decision making processes. It has been quite thorough.

- The survey had good fundamental questions. Some questions had tricky language, but most were in plain language. The survey was well thought out.

- The questions are good. The emphasis to how it relates to policy is strong. The things done in the Model Forest shows we should do things with policy which challenges us to adapt. We ensure that. The questions were heavily weighted on policy which does not consider the impacts the Model Forest may have on guidelines. I hope you judge how the Model Forest has impacted on the landscape. I hope you are aware that we are astute enough to be aware of changes. For example, with guidelines and what we do with certain practices. They show that the proof is in the pudding.

- It would be interesting to do this [survey] again in five years. I’m curious to see what the others have said in the interview.