

PUBLIC SUMMARY

**of the
Forest Management Certification Evaluation Report of the
Nipissing Forest under the Sustainable Forest License of**

NIPISSING FOREST RESOURCE MANAGEMENT, INC.

**Conducted under Auspices of the SCS Forest Conservation Program
and the
Forest Stewardship Council**

**CERTIFICATION REGISTRATION NUMBER
SCS-FM/COC-00055N**

**Submitted to
Peter Street, RPF
Nipissing Forest Management, Inc**

**Date of Evaluation: October, 2002
Date of Report: May, 2003
Update: October 28, 2004 (see section 4.1)**

By

**SCIENTIFIC CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS
2000 Powell St. Suite Number 1350
Emeryville, CA 94608, USA**

SCS Contact: Dave Wager

Organization of the Report

1.0	GENERAL INFORMATION	3
1.1	FSC Data Request.....	3
1.2	General Background	3
1.3	Forest Management Enterprise	4
1.3.1	Background Information.....	4
1.3.2	Management Objectives.....	5
1.3.3	Silvicultural Systems	6
1.3.4	Estimates of Maximum Sustainable Yield.....	6
1.3.5	Estimated, Current and Projected Production.....	7
1.4	Environmental and Socio-economic Context	7
1.5	Products Produced	9
1.6	Chain-of-Custody.....	10
2.0	THE CERTIFICATION ASSESSMENT PROCESS.....	11
2.1	Assessment Dates.....	11
2.2	Assessment Team.....	11
2.3	Assessment Process	12
2.4	STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION	15
2.4.1	Summary of Legal and Customary Use-rights.....	16
2.4.2	Names, Affiliations and Contact Details (If Available) of People Consulted	16
2.4.3	Endorsed FSC Contact Persons	19
2.4.4	Government Organizations Involved In Forest Management.....	19
2.4.5	Non-government Organizations Involved In Forest Management	20
2.4.6	Other Stakeholders, Including Employees And Local People.....	20
2.4.7	Summary of Stakeholder Concerns and Perspectives and Responses from the	20
2.5	Guidelines/Standards Employed.....	28
3.0	RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	30
4.0	AUDITS.....	41
5.0	PUBLIC INFORMATION ABOUT FOREST MANAGEMENT PLAN AND MONITORING.....	41

SECTION A. PUBLIC SUMMARY & BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 FSC DATA REQUEST

Name and contact information for the certified operation:

- Source name: Nipissing Forest
- Contact person: Peter Street, General Manager
- Address: P.O. Box 179, 128 Lansdowne Avenue East, Callandar, Ontario POH 1H0
- Telephone: 1-705-752-5430
- Fax: 1-705-752-5736
- E-mail, pstreet.nfrm@onlink.net
- Certified products: n/a
- Number of Acres/hectares certified: 1,147,501 hectares
- Nearest Town: North Bay, Ontario
- Biome: Temperate Mixed
- Tenure: Public (Crown) forest under provincial licence to Nipissing Forest Resource Management Inc.
- Forest Composition: Mixed conifer/hardwood
- Managed as: Natural Forest

1.2 GENERAL BACKGROUND

Scientific Certification Systems, a certification body accredited by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), was retained by Nipissing Forest Resource Management Inc. (NFRM) to conduct an FSC certification evaluation of its Sustainable Forest Licence area. Under the FSC/SCS certification system, forest management operations meeting international standards of forest stewardship can be certified as “well managed”, thereby enabling use of the FSC endorsement and logo in the marketplace.

In June 2002, an interdisciplinary team of natural resource specialists was assembled by SCS to conduct the evaluation. The team collected and analyzed written materials, completed a two-day on-site scoping evaluation, conducted interviews and completed a seven-day field audit of the subject property as part of the certification evaluation. Upon completion of the fact-finding phase of the evaluation, the team assigned performance scores to the 56 FSC Criteria and, from those scores, generated weighted average performance scores for each of the 10 FSC Principles and Criteria¹, in order to determine whether award of certification was warranted.

This report is issued in support of a recommendation to award FSC-endorsed certification to NFRM for its management of the Nipissing forest. In the event that a certificate is awarded, Scientific Certification Systems will post this public summary of the report on its web site (www.scs-certified.com).

¹ Principle 10 was not evaluated as the plantation criteria do not apply to natural forests.

1.3 FOREST MANAGEMENT ENTERPRISE

1.3.1 Background Information

The Nipissing Forest is comprised of approximately 1.1 million hectares of land managed under a Sustainable Forest Licence (SFL) by NFRM. Of the total landbase, 76% consists of public (Crown) land, 21% is private (patent) land and the remainder consists of First Nations reserves and federal lands. NFRM's forest management activities apply to the Crown portion of the Forest only. The Nipissing Forest is located near the city of North Bay, Ontario and falls within a transitional zone between what are known as the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence and Boreal forest regions of Ontario.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence forest region is a northern hardwood/coniferous forest type, commonly including such species as sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*), red maple (*Acer rubrum*), red oak (*Quercus rubra*), American beech (*Fagus grandifolia*), basswood (*Tilia americana*), white pine, (*Pinus strobus*) red pine (*Pinus resinosa*), hemlock (*Tsuga canadensis*) and mid-tolerant hardwoods such as yellow birch (*Betula alleghaniensis*), black cherry (*Prunus serotina*) and ash (*Fraxinus spp.*). The predominant species found in the Boreal forest include conifers such as black spruce (*Picea mariana*) and white spruce (*Picea glauca*), jack pine (*Pinus banksiana*), larch (*Larix laricina*), balsam fir (*Abies balsamea*) and eastern white cedar (*Thuja occidentalis*). The rest is comprised of shade-intolerant hardwoods, which include trembling aspen (*Populus tremuloides*) and white birch (*Betula papyrifera*). In the tolerant hardwood forest type, the most common harvesting and renewal methods used are the selection and shelterwood silvicultural systems. In white pine and mixed red & white pine forest types the shelterwood silvicultural system is used. Clearcutting is used on the remainder of the Forest, in the Boreal (e.g. intolerant hardwood and Boreal conifer) forest types.

Approximately 45 mills receive wood from the Nipissing Forest. However, most of these are not entirely dependent on this Forest for their wood supply. Three mills are actually located within the Forest boundaries.

Many wildlife species native to the region are found on the Nipissing Forest, including moose, black bear, pine marten, northern flying squirrel, pileated woodpecker, white-tailed deer and a variety of songbirds and raptors. Red-shouldered hawk is known to be a sensitive species: habitat planning is conducted for this and other featured species in forest management planning.

The Forest is managed by NFRM under a 'Sustainable Forest Licence' to carry out forest management and operations on the Crown land portion of the defined forest area. Company responsibilities include all aspects of forest management planning, forest operations, forest renewal activities, monitoring, reporting and self-compliance audits. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) staff conduct spot-checks of NFRM's management activities to ensure that the company is in compliance with relevant provincial legislation and the body of regulations and guidelines applying to forest management on Crown lands in Ontario.

1.3.2 Management Objectives

The objectives of NFRM are as follows:

Forest Management

- To maintain and enhance the long-term health and productivity of the Nipissing Forest while providing environmental, economic, social and cultural opportunities for the benefit of present and future generations.

Biodiversity

- NFRM acknowledges the value of genetic, species and ecosystem diversity in maintaining ecological processes and therefore implements forest management practices that sustain ecological diversity at a stand and landscape level across the Nipissing Forest.

Research and Development

- NFRM supports research and development initiatives, which advance sustainable forest management. NFRM maintains an experienced and educated forest management staff. Training and development opportunities are offered to continually improve staff skills and knowledge.

Waterways and Land Protection

- NFRM plans and conducts forest management operations in a manner that minimizes the long-term negative impacts on the forest resources. NFRM encourages all licensees to practice self-compliance with all environmental guidelines and regulations.

Wildlife Management

- NFRM will manage the forest to maintain habitat at the ecoregional level for selected potentially threatened species as well as maintain specific forest cover habitat for the full range of representative species. NFRM will actively protect fisheries habitat throughout the Nipissing Forest while co-ordinating potential habitat conflicts with other wildlife species, ideal habitat for one species may not be for another.

Historically Significant Sites

- NFRM protects known historical and cultural sites. Areas of high potential historical or cultural sites are investigated by archaeologists or historical specialists and are mitigated through project planning.

Public Participation

- NFRM encourages and provides opportunities for public comments and concerns and incorporates these in the forest management planning process. NFRM conducts its forest management planning practices in an open and transparent manner consistent with provincial policy and objectives.

Aboriginal Values

- NFRM will continue to foster relationships and partnerships with local Aboriginal communities to provide opportunities for economic growth, educational development, and forest management planning input.
- Minimize the impact of forest operations on Aboriginal communities' traditional uses of the forest.

Recreation

- NFRM recognizes and provides protection to all the provincial parks, natural heritage areas and proposed legacy sites within the forest for recreation as well as landscape diversity and ecological integrity. Other areas outside of protected areas are also managed to protect aesthetics and promote other recreational values that support activities such as

hunting, fishing, hiking, and canoeing. NFRM conducts its management planning with prescriptive standards for recreational areas of concern (AOC)

Health and Safety

- NFRM conducts its forest management activities in a responsible manner, while protecting the health and safety of employees, contractors and the public. NFRM meets all provincial and federal health and safety rules and regulations.

1.3.3 Silvicultural Systems

The Nipissing Forest is managed under both uneven-aged and even-aged management systems. Three main silvicultural systems used on the Nipissing Forest are selection, shelterwood, and clearcut systems. The intent of each selected silvicultural system is to mimic natural disturbances as historically found in the Nipissing forest

Selection cutting is used for the majority of Nipissing shade-tolerant hardwood forests. The intent of selection cut is to improve the growth rate and quality of the remaining trees, while maintaining and enhancing wildlife habitat and other natural features. The selection cuts occur on a 20- to 30-year rotation with a harvest of mature and declining (diseased or unhealthy) trees. Additionally, selection cutting allows young trees of the shade-tolerant species to become established in the mostly-shaded understory. Selection cutting emulates small gap natural disturbances (e.g., windthrow and disease), and perpetuates an *all-aged* tolerant hardwood forest.

The Shelterwood system, used with *mid-tolerant* hardwood and conifer species, involves the removal of a stand in a series of cuts, while a new stand develops in the partially shaded and protected *understory*. Shelterwood mimics major, natural disturbances such as wind, fire, and large insect outbreaks, which leave large gaps in the forest canopy where mid-tolerant species can thrive. It is used to produce an even-aged stand of trees *except for targeted wildlife trees and supercanopy trees*.

The Clearcut silvicultural system is used for stands of shade-intolerant trees. In clearcutting, most of the trees are removed in one cut. Guidelines to “naturalize” clearcuts by ensuring green trees are retained in scattered clumps or blocks are applied along with the size, shape and pattern of the cuts on the overall landscape so as to emulate the effects of natural disturbances such as fire. The cut areas may be replanted, seeded, or left to naturally regenerate with shade-intolerant species. Although the individual stands of trees are even-aged, all ages are usually represented on the landscape at any one time.

1.3.4 Estimates of Maximum Sustainable Yield

The sustainable available harvest level is 228,000 m³ of conifer/year and 342,000 m³ hardwood/year for a total of 570,000 m³/year on 11,123ha.

1.3.5 Estimated, Current and Projected Production

Since 1999, approximately 230,000m³ of conifer and 200,000 m³ of hardwoods have been harvested annually on 5,707 ha. A further review of estimated and actual production by working groups is shown in Table A.1.

Table A.1.

Species class/working groups	Projected ha harvested	Actual ha harvested
White and Red Pine	1,708	1,133
Other Conifers	3,034	1,796
Tolerant Hardwoods	4,887	1,750
Intolerant Hardwoods	1,494	1,028

1.4 ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXT

1.4.1 Environmental Context

The Nipissing Forest is a transitional area between the Boreal forest to the north and the hardwood forests and agricultural areas to the south. Wildlife habitat is diverse and rich; fisheries are a significant resource and wetlands contribute to both fish and wildlife habitat and to recreational activities such as birding, hunting and fishing.

Provincial parks and Natural Heritage Areas provide a significant contribution to the protection of other forest resources. In those parts of the forest where timber operations are permitted, the effects of timber operations on non-timber resources are mitigated through planning for 'Areas of Concern' (AOC). AOCs are applied around sensitive values, providing a zone of protection for the value through a required set of operational restrictions including timing and modifications to the actual operations within the AOC. Operational restrictions can include no harvesting within the AOC.

Three main game species are found on the Forest, including moose, white-tailed deer and black bear. In general, moose and white-tailed deer populations show a gradual increase on the unit while black bear populations appear stable.

Six old growth sites have been identified on the Nipissing Forest, ranging in size from 50 to 603 hectares. There are no operations planned in these white and red pine areas.

Patented (private) land comprises 25% of the total land area of the Nipissing Forest and is concentrated in the southern and central-western part of the area. Its contribution to the overall wood supply in the management unit is minimal. The forest in the eastern part of the management unit was cleared in the past for agricultural activities that has resulted in hundreds of hectares of idle marginal agricultural land that could make a significant contribution to the district's future wood supply, with proper management.

Eight provincial parks are within the boundaries of the Nipissing Forest. Additional sites have been proposed through a recent land use planning exercise for Ontario, and will receive interim protection until they are regulated.

1.4.2 Socio-economic Context

The province of Ontario is divided into three major administrative resource management regions. The Nipissing Forest is located at the southern end of what is referred to as the Northeast Region of Ontario. A low population density relative to the rest of southern Ontario characterizes the area; on average it is 76% forested with a density of approximately 7 persons per square kilometre within the Nipissing Forest boundaries (e.g. a permanent population of approximately 86,000 people on 11,932 square kilometres). However, the Forest is also located within a 3.5 hour driving distance of a large urban population of several million, making it a popular destination for recreational and resource-based tourism activities in addition to the established forestry and mining industries.

The major non-industrial uses that attract tourists to the areas are: camping, fishing, canoeing and big game hunting. The Nipissing Forest contains 57 Bear Management Areas, 65 trappers' cabins, 86 traplines, 318 Land Use Permits and over 100 Licenced Tourist Outfitters . In 1996-97, the Nipissing Forest had 42 baitfish licences and 24 camp operators operating in 111 harvest areas within the Nipissing Forest. The baitfish industry provides supplemental income to these people and complements the local angling industry. In 1997, the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines – Tourism Section estimated that the total annual resource-based tourism expenditures for the Nipissing area was \$10.5 million.

The wood processing facilities in the Northeast Region of Ontario vary from large, commodity-producing operations to smaller, family-owned sawmills, some of which have been in operation since the turn of the century. Major facilities include 24 sawmills, 5 pulp and paper mills, 3 oriented strandboard mills, 6 veneer/veneer panel mills and 3 composite board mills.

The forest industry, woodlands, processing and administration are significant employers in the area. People working in this industry are well paid with relatively secure employment. However, this is to some extent subject to the cyclical nature of the forest industry and most recently, the Canada/US softwood lumber dispute has had significant negative effects on the levels of softwood lumber production across Ontario and subsequent impacts on employment in the Region. Around the time of this audit, the impacts of that dispute were causing additional job losses in the forest industry in the area.

The indirect economic benefits from forestry are also important for most communities. The forest industry is a major purchaser of goods and services and often an important supporter of communities through both the local tax base and voluntary contributions. Forestry and related products and services account for a total 8.1% of employment in northern Ontario, mining and related manufacturing provides 6.6% employment, and resource-based tourism accounts for approximately 2.1%. Government as well as education and social service industries are also major employers².

² Ministry of Tourism. 1998. An Economic Profile of Resource-based Tourism in Northern Ontario.

From the estimates shown in a 1999 study in Northwestern Ontario³, it was calculated that each 1,000 m³ s of wood harvested generated 3.1 person years of employment, \$164,000 in expenditures for labour, goods and services and \$55,000 in industry contributions to government.

The Nipissing Forest also encompasses the Traditional Land Use Areas of several First Nations. Although it is difficult to ascribe a monetary value, non-timber forest products undoubtedly play a significant role in contributing to the economies and culture of local First Nations communities.

1.4.3 High Value Conservation Forest (HCVF)

As required by Principle 9 of FSC, the evaluation team emphasized the importance of maintaining selected sites as High Value Conservation Forest within the Nipissing Forest. HCVF may include unique or threatened ecological areas and/or areas of cultural significance that must be managed so as to maintain the attributes that make them of high conservation value. That is, HCVF cannot be converted to other types of forest cover lacking in the attributes that make these areas HCVF.

NFRM has completed a preliminary review of the presence of attributes of high conservation value forests on the Nipissing Forest. The assessment was conducted according to a methodology developed by Tembec Inc. and World Wildlife Fund Canada. Tembec is one of the partners in NFRM and a major SFL holder in its own right. The review and associated maps formed part of the evidence package for this audit.

The audit team considers the methodology to be comprehensive and appropriate to the Nipissing Forest.. In total, seven candidate High Conservation Values were identified as follows:

1. Loring deer yard, as critical winter habitat
2. An isolated red spruce stand
3. All significant red and white pine stands
4. All significant hemlock stands
5. All old growth stands identified in the current FMP
6. Trout Lake and Sturgeon River, as community water supplies
7. Ottawa, French, Mattawa Rivers, for their cultural/historical significance

Many potential high conservation values are already in protected areas (parks, nature reserves, enhanced management areas) adjacent to or in close proximity to the Nipissing Forest. As a result, fewer such values have been captured by the analysis than would likely have been the case otherwise. Additional potential sites may be added in the future in order to complete the province's representative protected areas network through the "Room to Grow" process, an outcome of the 1999 Ontario's Living Legacy Land Use Strategy.

1.5 PRODUCTS PRODUCED

The amount of managed Crown forest available for timber production is 559,507 hectares (1999). The abundance of species groups on the NFMU is as follows:

Table A.2.

³ W.L. Lees and Associates. 1999. The Economic Contribution of the Primary Forest Products Industry to Northwestern Ontario. The Northwest Forest Network.

Species/Species Groups	Abundance
Hard Maple	19%
Poplar	18%
White Birch	15%
White and Black Spruce	2%
White Pine	11%
Red Pine	2%
Cedar	5%
Hemlock and Spruce (other)	2%
Red Oak, Larch, and Ash	1%

Merchantable conifer species such as white pine, red pine and jack pine, and spruce are grown for quality sawlogs and plywood. Fibre from lower quality trees are sold for chip material to be used for OSB, pulp or fuelwood. Hardwoods such as poplar, maple, and white birch are also grown for sawlogs, veneer, chips, and fuelwood.

About half of the products harvested off the Nipissing Forest (by volume) are committed to the mills of Tembec, Grant, Goulard and Fryer. The largest open market mills include Domtar Inc., Columbia Forest Products, and Ben Holcum & Sons. Tembec, Grant, Goulard and Fryer are shareholders of NFRM.

1.6 CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY

SCS conducted a joint forest management and chain of custody certification evaluation of the Nipissing Forest. The chain of custody scope covers the stump to mill gate. That is, chain of custody begins with the severing of a standing tree to produce a merchantable log and ends with that log leaving the custody at the log yard gate.

During the fieldwork for the forest management evaluation, the team investigated the manner by which MNR and NFRM can maintain chain of custody over the logs that leave the forest gate to assure that only logs from the Nipissing Forest would carry the certified status were the forest management certification to be awarded. The team noted that NFRM and the shareholder are subject to the MNR bill of lading system used on all Crown lands. There are four copies of the transport tickets, noting the number of logs or weight, and where the load originated. The MNR and contractors control these. Tickets are held by the trucker and accompany the load of logs to the mill to verify load specifications, after which a copy is given to the mill and to the MNR; also the logging and trucking contractors each keep a ticket. Regardless of where the logs are transported, their origin can be traced with the ticket system. With this legally required bill of lading, the potential of contamination with uncertified logs is eliminated at least until the logs reach the log yard/sawmill. Once the logs are processed inside the sawmill complex, another chain of custody certificate is required for logs that leave the sawmill log yard gate to the processing mill or beyond. This is beyond the scope of our present certification audit.

It was concluded that chain of custody certification should be awarded to NFRM/MNR to cover logs that leave “forest gate” to “sawmill log yard gate”.

2.0 THE CERTIFICATION ASSESSMENT PROCESS

2.1 ASSESSMENT DATES

Pre-Certification Audit: June 21-22, 2002

Certification Audit: October 14-21, 2002

2.2 ASSESSMENT TEAM

SCS combined with KBM Forestry Consultants of Thunder Bay, Ontario to conduct the assessment.

Stephen Smith, Senior Forester and Team Leader, Scientific Certification Systems (California). Mr. Smith has been a professional forester for over 25 years, with extensive experience in forest management on public, private and tribal lands. Stephen has worked on certification projects in the US, Canada, Malaysia, and Indonesia and has been actively engaged in FSC-endorsed certification since its inception in the early 1990's.

Peter Higgelke, Consulting Forester, Managing Partner of KBM Forestry Consultants Inc. (Ontario). As a principal in KBM, Mr. Higgelke specializes in wood supply analysis, forest inventory, wildlife habitat supply analysis modelling, business plan preparation, timber harvesting and forest renewal prescriptions. Mr. Higgelke advises First Nations on forest management, forestry negotiations and economic development. In the past he lectured at Lakehead University on integrated forest resources management and GIS applications in forestry.

Rod Seabrook, Forest Biologist, Senior Consultant, KBM Forestry Consultants Inc. (Ontario) Rod Seabrook is a Senior Consultant with KBM Forestry Consultants Inc. Mr. Seabrook specializes in Forest management audits, Natural resource management planning and program development, and First Nation forestry. He has lead auditor experience on independent forest audits, and is a Certified Environmental Auditor. Mr. Seabrook has developed prescriptions to protect wildlife and fisheries habitat to MNR and private forestry operations. He is a member of the team evaluating Canada's Model Forest Program and has prepared forest operations prescriptions on two Sustainable Forest licenses. Mr. Seabrook has a Master of Science, Biology, Lakehead University.

Riki Burkhardt, Socio-economic Forester, KBM Forestry Consultants Inc. (Ontario). Ms Burkhardt specializes in provincial forest management policy and planning, independent forest audits, certification, Aboriginal issues in forestry, and public involvement in Crown forest management. Ms Burkhardt was involved in the review and field test of the FSC "Standards for Well Managed Forests in the Central and Southern Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Forests of Ontario" and subsequently authored the technical report "A Gap Analysis of the Requirements for FSC Certification of SFL Companies in Ontario". She is currently located in Toronto under contract as the 'Protected Areas Co-ordinator' for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence and Boreal East Regions with the Federation of Ontario Naturalists.

2.3 ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Scoping for the assessment took place through a two-day site visit to the Nipissing Forest in June of 2002. Formal initiation of the assessment process began with an initial meeting at the NFRM office to discuss the audit process, meet key staff, and begin compiling relevant information. This meeting was followed by a detailed request for information from SCS, which NFRM responded to during June of 2002. Stakeholder consultation began the same week through a meeting with the Local Citizens Committee for the Nipissing Forest.

The field portion of the evaluation took place in October of 2002 and included visitation to a variety of sites designed to represent a cross-section of stand types and treatments, focusing on treatments and activities conducted within recent years. A total of 29 stops were pre-selected to review management activities and local issues. The planned stops were:

Table A.3

Stop #	Reason for Stop
1 Obabika Lake Goulard Block #2	- Resource Stewardship Agreement area - White pine shelterwood and seed tree - Site prepare in 2001 using a skidder with rake - Tree plant in 2002 - Archaeological assessment on heritage trail
2 Murray Lake Goulard Block #9	- Concerns from local cottagers with harvest - clear-cut with standards - chemical site preparation in 2001 - planted in 2002
3 Goulard Block #10 in Janes Twp.	- Clear cut with standards - Compliance concerns with bypass, high stumps, gravel pits
4 Grant Block # 3 in Scholes Twp.	- White pine shelterwood for natural regeneration - Steep terrain - Compliance concerns with cutting unmarked trees and utilization - Archaeological assessment on heritage trail
5 & 5A Goulard Block #4 in McBeth Twp.	- Large clear cut harvested in 2002 - to the north is a pure poplar block that has been converted to red pine (5A)
6 Grant Block #13 in McWilliams Twp.	- Large clear cut being converted to red pine - spring and fall tree planting and chemical tending - heronry and moose late wintering area - basal bark treatment
6A in McWilliams Twp.	Free-to-grow white pine, jack pine and poplar

7 Grant Block # in McCallum Peninsula	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited access area controlled with removable bridge - Bump up request on 1999 Forest Management Plan - Natural regeneration
8 Grant Block #25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clear-cut in summer and winter with jack pine growing on shallow soils - Resource Stewardship Agreement area - Crown Game preserve - lateral understory moose corridors - planted - manual tending - compliance issues with water crossings - emergency culvert repairs
9 & 10 Tembec McConnell Lakes Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - McConnell Lakes Recreational Area (high public use) - Gods Lake Old Growth area - Current and past harvesting - numerous areas with white pine shelterwood and clear-cut with standards - Research Partnership experiments - stand conversion to red & white pine - ground and aerial sprays - numerous Free-to-grow areas
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - red spruce plantation - ground spray and manual tending areas
12 Grant Block 28 in Notman Twp.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - active logging in white birch and poplar stands - Archaeological assessment on heritage trail - hard maple regeneration release
13 Tembec Block # 37 in French Township	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - numerous examples of hardwood management techniques (hardwood selection, shelterwood and group selection) - stand improvement work - mechanical harvesting using feller-bunchers in hardwood
14 Block 81 Nipissing First Nation harvest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - clear cut with standards and white pine shelterwood harvesting
15 Block 103 Dokis First Nation Harvest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - bridge construction - examples of all three silvicultural systems - efforts by Tembec & NFRM to help build capacity
16 & 16B Fryer Block # 96 in Rogers Bay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - White pine prep harvest - shallow soils - tourists concerns

	- red pine clear-cut (16B on map)
17 Loring Deer Yard stand improvement work	- OLL and Forestry Futures Funding - weed and feed in the deer yard - opportunity for winter work for First Nation Contractors
18 Burnt Creek Area	- Red oak plantation - manual tending (twice)
19 Gurd Seed Orchard	- examples of Forest Research Partnership's work (MNR, Forestry Canada, Tembec, NFRM)
20	- Natural red spruce stand
21 Boulter Twp. L. Groulx Ind. Operator	- Red pine plantation commercial thinning and under-planting white pine - road maintenance issues
22 Tembec Block #126 Lauder Twp.	- Hardwood selection
23 Algonquins Block 58 in Boyd Twp.	- First Nations harvesting and mechanical site preparation by Janveaux Forest Products
24 Crookstick Lk. Area in Lauder Twp.	- White pine mechanical site preparation
25 & 25B Fryer Block #48 Papineau Twp.	- Fryer harvest - trespass from private onto Crown land - Boom Creek Old Growth (25B)
26 Tembec Block #49 in Papineau Twp.	- Compliance issues - careful logging in areas with natural red pine regeneration - white pine plant under poplar
27 Tembec Block 39 in Olrig Twp.	- Tembec selection harvest for Antoine's sugar bush operation
28 Parkman Twp.	- white pine plantations and free-to-grow areas
29 Mattawan Twp.	- harvesting/bypass of hemlock stands in an older harvest area - road maintenance issues - Mattawa deer yard

The field audit schedule including staff and stakeholders was:

Tuesday October 15th: Meetings at NFRM office in Callander, document review

Wednesday October 16th: Helicopter flight

10:00 a.m. Claude Goulard for Stop 3 in Janes Township
11:30 a.m. Wayne Dokis, Richard Restoule & Jon Cutter for stop 15 in Block 103
1:00 p.m. Rene Bourgoin for tour of active logging in Block 28
1:30 p.m. Representatives from the Research Partnership for stop 9 in the McConnell Lakes areas

Thursday October 17th: Field Tour south of Highway 17 (Mattawa to the Loring Deer Yard)

9:00 a.m. Peter Street and NFRM staff for the stop in Algonquins Block 58
3:00 p.m. John Pineau for tour of the Gurd Seed Orchard and trials

Friday October 18th: Field Tour north of Highway 17

8:00 a.m. Ron Lee and Bill Hagborg (MNR) - tour on the natural red spruce stand north of the city
8:00 a.m. Clayton Goulais & Jon Cutter - tour of Nipissing Block 81
10:00 a.m. Marc Bouthillier for tour of Tembec's Block 37 & 39
11:00 a.m. Dave Joanisse for tour of potential sugar bush operation

Saturday October 19th: Forest Management Plan Field Tour and Open House in Mattawa

Sunday October 20th: Stakeholder Interviews, Document Review, and Development of Team Conclusions

Monday October 21th: Stockholder Meeting and NFRM Exit Interview

2.4 STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

Identification of Stakeholders Influenced by the Enterprise

Pursuant to SCS protocols, consultations with key stakeholders were an integral component of the evaluation process. Consultation took place prior to, concurrent with, and following the field evaluation. There were two distinct purposes to the consultations:

- 1) To solicit input from key stakeholders as to the applicability of the SCS interim draft standard, as modified to reflect the existing draft regional guidelines developed for Ontario (Great Lakes-St. Lawrence and Boreal Standards).
- 2) To solicit input from affected parties as to the strengths and weaknesses of NFRM's management and the nature of the interaction between the company and the surrounding communities.

2.4.1 Summary of Legal and Customary Use-rights

The Nipissing Forest is administered and managed by Nipissing Forest Resource Management, Inc (NFRM) under the authority of a Sustainable Forest Licence, issued according to conditions set in the Crown Forest Sustainability Act and administered by the MNR, North Bay District Office. NFRM is owned by five shareholders, which are R. Fryer Forest Products, Ltd., Goulard Forest Products Ltd., Tembec Inc., Hec Cloutier and Sons., and Grant Forest Products Corp, all of which have overlapping licensee responsibilities on the Crown portion of the Nipissing Forest. Private land within the forest comprises 25 percent of the total land base.

Four First Nation communities are located within the Forest boundaries (Nipissing, Dokis, Mattawa-North Bay Algonquins and Antoine First Nation), which overlap with the traditional territories of these communities including the Temagami First Nation to the north. Two of the First Nations (Nipissing and Dokis) are signatories to the 1850 Robinson Huron Treaty, which guarantees the Nations “full and free privilege to hunt over the Territory now ceded by them, and to fish in the waters thereof”.

Customary public use rights on Crown lands in Ontario include largely unrestricted access for recreational activities and personal consumption, e.g. hiking, canoeing, camping, swimming, boating, snowmobiling, hunting, fishing, berry-picking, etc. The right to access Crown land for such purposes is guaranteed to residents of Ontario or through a paid permit system to visitors from outside the province.

2.4.2 Affiliations and Contact Details (If Available) of People Consulted

Prior to and during the site evaluation, a wide range of stakeholders from the region and other interested parties were consulted in regard to their relationship with NFRM, and their views on the management of the Nipissing Forest. Stakeholders were contacted with a notification mailing soliciting comment and/or phone contact. Table A.4 provides a list of the affiliations of attempted contacts and the type of contacts made. The complete list of individuals and groups contacted and consulted with is maintained in the SCS offices. Comments were received via meetings and personal interviews (“in person”), phone interviews (“phone”), and through written responses. Individuals or groups not offering feedback are labelled no response (“NR”).

Summary of Nipissing Forest Resource Management Certification Communications

Ministry of Natural Resources (North Bay District Office)

In spring 2002, Peter Street, NFRM General Manager, major overlapping licensee on the Forest), met with Dave Payne, MNR North Bay District Manager and Bill Hagborg, MNR North Bay Area Supervisor to outline NFRM’s intent of achieving FSC certification. The meeting included describing the reasons why NFRM wanted to obtain FSC certification, and providing MNR with a summary of the FSC Principles relevant to the government’s portion of the forest management program as well as a list of concerns outlining where the NFRM judged MNR may fall short in its forest management responsibilities.

At numerous Planning Team meetings over the following six months, additions to the Forest Management Plan to meet FSC certification were discussed (e.g. enhanced discussion/strategies/objectives mainly for RTE species and further work toward an Old Growth strategy).

Local Citizens Committee (LCC)

NFRM’s interest in pursuing Forest Stewardship Council certification was discussed at two LCC meetings. The discussion included reasons for certifying the Forest and additional requirements that would affect the Forest Management Plan.

Overlapping Licensees/Contractors

During NFRM’s 2002 spring compliance meetings, Peter Street made a presentation to all of the Overlapping Licensees (approximately 50 people were in attendance) explaining why NFRM wanted to certify the Nipissing Forest; i.e. and the benefits of certification. He also reviewed the FSC Principles and Criteria and expected changes to operations required to meet the FSC certification standards.

Communications with First Nations

At a spring 2002 Aboriginal Committee meeting, Peter Street discussed the NFRM’s intentions to pursue FSC certification with the First Nations in attendance (Dokis, Antoinis, North Bay-Mattawa Algonquins and Temagami). Part of the discussion included First Nations involvement in the evaluation process. Nipissing First Nation did not attend the meeting but Clayton Goulais was at the Nipissing Spring Compliance Meeting.

Around the same time, representatives of NFRM met a representative of the Union of Ontario Indians for approximately four hours to discuss FSC certification and what evidence he thought should be provided to meet his expectations for certification. According to NFRM, the main concern of Union of Ontario Indians was to improve communications and consultations with the First Nation communities; not just Chief and Council but also with elders, women and youth.

Table A.4 Summary of Evaluation Team’s Communications with Forest Managers, First Nations and Other Stakeholders

Northern Ontario Tourist Outfitters	In person
Earthroots	Phone
Wildlands League	Phone
Northwatch	NR
Federation of Ontario Naturalists	Phone
Nipissing Environmental Watch, LCC	NR
Consulting Ecologist	NR
Lakehead University/NAFA	Phone

Tembec/World Wildlife Fund Canada	In person
Tembec	In person
Tembec	In person
Tembec, Operations Supervisor	In person
Union of Ontario Indians	Phone
Makwa Community Development Corporation	In person
Makwa Economic Development Corporation	In person
Temagami First Nation	Phone
Temagami First Nation	Phone
Antoine First Nation	In person
Mattawa-North Bay Algonquins	Phone
Mattawa Trappers	Phone
Mattawa-North Bay Algonquins	NR
Nipissing First Nation	In person
Dokis First Nation	NR
Dokis First Nation	NR
Canadian Ecology Centre, Local Citizens Committee	In person
Naturalist, Local Citizens Committee	In person
LCC, Consultant for Dokis First Nation	In person
Loring Restoule Business Association	Phone
Forestry Contractor	In person
NFRM, GIS/Information Forester	In person
NFRM, General Manager	In person
Ministry of Natural Resources, Area Supervisor	In person
NFRM, Forestry Technician	In person
Ministry of Natural Resources, Area Forester	In person
Ministry of Natural Resources, Wildlife Biologist	In person
Ministry of Natural Resources, Native Liaison	In person
Ministry of Natural Resources, Area Technician	In person
Ministry of Natural Resources, Area Technician	In person
Ministry of Natural Resources, Cultural Heritage Specialist	Phone

Archaeologist, Woodland Heritage Services Ltd.	Phone
Grant Forest Products	In person
Forestry Consultant, Forestry Futures Committee	In person
Forestry Consultant, FMP Public Participation	In person
Forestry Consultant, FMP Planning	In person
Tourist Outfitter	Phone
Tourist Outfitter	Phone
Research Partnership	In person
Participant at FMP Open House	In person
Participant at FMP Open House	In person
Astorville Cross Country Ski Club	Phone
Janveaux Contractor	In person
Haliburton Forest	NR
University of Guelph	NR
Ontario Forestry Association	NR
Canadian Nature Federation	NR
Tembec	NR
Tembec	In person

2.4.3 Endorsed FSC Contact Persons

Members of the Great Lakes/Saint Lawrence and Boreal FSC Regional working groups received, via email, notification of the commencement of fieldwork and the draft versions of the evaluation criteria, requesting comment. The full list of working group members contacted is available from SCS or from FSC Canada.

2.4.4 Government Organizations Involved In Forest Management

The Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) is the provincial agency responsible for coordinating and overseeing forest management on Crown (public) lands in the province of Ontario. The MNR issues “Sustainable Forest Licences” to companies, which describe rights and responsibilities of licence holders to carry out forest management planning, harvest operations and forest renewal on Crown lands. The MNR is responsible for specific aspects of forest management, including public consultation, values mapping and database maintenance, wildlife and fisheries inventories, forest compliance inspections and reporting, and issuing fines and penalties for compliance infractions by the SFL holder and/or overlapping licencees on the Forest.

2.4.5 Non-government Organizations Involved In Forest Management

There are several non-government organizations involved or interested in forest management issues on the Nipissing Forest. The Evaluation Team made efforts to solicit and consider any concerns and comments from these groups. See Table A.4 for specific groups that were consulted and section 2.4.7 for a summary of their comments.

2.4.6 Other Stakeholders, Including Employees and Local People

As discussed elsewhere in this report, the evaluation team made contact with numerous local citizens ranging from contract loggers, local forestry consultants, company shareholders recreation associations, trappers' councils, tourist operators, cottage associations, and representatives of local business associations.

2.4.7 Summary of Stakeholder Concerns and Perspectives and Responses from the Team Where Applicable

The following table provides a summary of the major perspectives and concerns expressed by the stakeholders that were consulted during the course of this evaluation and the evaluation team's responses.

Table A.5
Environmental groups

Comment/Concern	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns with clearcut silvicultural system and level of 'residual' retention on clearcut areas Operations in 'Enhanced Management Areas', a land use designation under the provincial land use planning process (1999 Ontario Living Legacy Land Use Strategy) and how management in EMAs is being handled Assumptions used in Strategic Forest Management Modeling (SFMM) for the Nipissing Forest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation team sampled clearcut areas on Nipissing Forest with resulting Recommendation 2003.6. Team discussed SFMM modeling with GIS forester, including growth and yield inputs, use of spatial management tools, analysis of chosen management alternatives and other.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Status of representation of protected areas on Nipissing Forest under provincial protected areas gap analysis Experience with company during implementation of provincial land use strategy is that NFRM has been reasonable in negotiating new protected area boundaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representation of protected areas discussed in final presentation, with CAR 2003.6.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not very familiar with local situation, but 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See above note on clearcuts

<p>general concern with extent of application of clearcut silvicultural system e.g. is it appropriate to the forest type, does it follow provincial guidelines, etc.?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not have significant concerns with NFRM operations per se, but recommended that evaluation team contact local environmental group for more information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local ENGO was contacted, but no comments on NFRM forest practices were received.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experience with NFRM during Lands for Life planning exercise and implementation of Ontario Living Legacy Land Use Strategy has been generally positive, company is co-operative in boundary discussions and negotiations related to mapping and regulating new protected areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response required.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ENGO consultant hired by NFRM to conduct High Conservation Value Forest analysis for Nipissing evaluation. Good initiative and cooperation by company. As member of FSC Boreal Standards working group, suggested that the evaluation team make reference to the Boreal Draft Principle #3 rather than the GLSL as it was more comprehensive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments on HCVF analysis and associated condition in relevant section of evaluation report. Evaluation team considered Draft Boreal Standard indicators for Principle #3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local environmental group contacted by email & telephone, responses suggest that opportunities and timelines for involvement in the audit were unsatisfactory; a request was made for a summary of outreach efforts with respect to the evaluation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attempts to contact representative and arrange a meeting, telephone interview or alternative means of providing input were unsuccessful. Last communication via email left open the opportunity for input to the audit until such time as the report finalized and submitted.

Community Groups & Local Residents

Comment/Concern	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some concern with the understandability of technical aspects of forest management e.g. modeling information for the general public and communicating implications for forest sustainability Concerns with the credibility of the modeling exercise given the state of the Forest Resource Inventories in the province 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NFRM is using improved yield curves derived through Research Partnership that provides more accurate estimates of forest productivity and yield. NFRM also using PATCHWORKS (a newly developed spatial planning tool) on a test basis in an attempt to calibrate information derived through SFMM. In this respect, NFRM is exceeding provincial requirements as well as using conservative estimates of available growing stock in modeling.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have had good communications and cooperation with NFRM in the past. NFRM staff contributes in-kind support to forestry tours and education initiatives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ski club no longer operating, continue to receive information from NFRM. No problems in the past. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Receive planning information on a regular basis from NFRM/MNR NFRM seems co-operative with other forest users and willing to enter into discussions, though has not had extensive experience to date Some concern with an article in a local paper that described the forest industry self-compliance process, which suggested that industry was responsible for monitoring compliance in the absence of independent oversight of activities on the Nipissing and Sudbury Forests 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. None required. Explained that MNR also conducts compliance inspections; independent forest audits also verify that companies are in compliance with applicable provincial legislation. Suggested contact local MNR for more information.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trapline holder – raised concerns in spring when harvest operations started as not 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See recommendation on communications with

<p>informed by NFRM of block locations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In some cases, debris from harvest operations blocks access to trails used by trappers to access trap locations, though it is not a persistent problem • This was brought up at a trapper roundtable discussion with MNR, and may be a function of information not getting back to NFRM 	<p>identified stakeholders.</p>
---	---------------------------------

Employees and Contractors:

Comment/Concern	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good awareness of Tembec's EMS implementation, not as familiar with the FSC process and requirements • Receives regular training through programs sponsored by Tembec under the auspices of the company EMS • Has contact with NFRM staff a minimum of every two weeks on harvest operations, as well as MNR inspections monthly • Familiar with health and safety legislation and requirements, this is also a part of the training program for contractors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See recommendation 2003.1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfied with working conditions and levels of remuneration • It is a pleasure to work at NFRM, the working environment contributes to fostering employee commitment to company objectives of good forest stewardship • Forest management is a team effort 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None required.

Ministry of Natural Resources:

Comment/Concern	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had meetings with NFRM to discuss FSC process and MNR's role • NFRM presented a 'gap analysis' of roles and responsibilities for forest management and where MNR may fall short in relation to FSC principles • Some knowledge at the management level of FSC in the provincial context and MNR's corporate support of certification, but not clear how this filters down to the District level in terms of support for certification initiatives • So far, there has been no direction provided to the District in terms of their role in certification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussions with MNR field staff during evaluation indicate that understanding of FSC is minimal at the implementation level. See Recommendation 2003.1

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request for District compliance plan – not clear if District plan has been approved or not, or if available upon request as it may contain confidential information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions with NFRM suggest that company has never seen the District compliance plan, although the objective is for NFRM to ‘dovetail’ the company compliance plan with the District.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not aware of the Nipissing FSC evaluation Unclear as to the process of revising maps for high potential cultural heritage sites on the Nipissing Forest, these are sent from Thunder Bay to the District office North Bay District and NFRM have access to resources to fund First Nations capacity building when necessary on short notice Antoine First Nation has now received funding to do a Native Background Information Report, which was completed by community members Values maps are confidential, held by MNR Aboriginal Working Group meeting with less frequency recently, although it is a productive forum for discussion when meetings occur 	<p>CAR 2003.2</p>

First Nations

Comment/Concern	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Development Corporation has harvest allocation on the Nipissing Forest which is cut by a hired contractor It is felt that the quality of allocations is poor and that in some cases the treatment of Native contractors is different from the rest For example, an amendment to one of the few harvest areas allocated to the Corporation took an inordinately long time to process, and had severe effects on the viability of the operation (e.g. because it is a small allocation, there are not many alternative locations in which to conduct operations while waiting for approval to an amendment) It was felt that communications are sometimes poor, e.g. did not have direct contact with NFRM regarding the FSC evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion with NFRM/MNR regarding the amendment process did not clarify the reason for the delay, MNR and NFRM staff attribute the problem to a breakdown in communications between the three parties. Discussions with NFRM suggest that there is regular contact with all First Nations communities, (e.g. FSC was presented at

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process for Native Values Mapping does not meet the expectations of the community, the process of modeling for 'High Potential Cultural Heritage Areas' is not transparent and changes were made to maps without discussion with the community 	<p>Aboriginal Working Group meeting in Spring 2002 with First Nation representative in attendance). Faxes show evidence of communications regarding the FSC field evaluation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with MNR Native Liaison to follow up on concerns regarding values mapping as well as interview with provincial Cultural Heritage Specialist/local consulting archaeologist to obtain more information on the modeling process • CAR 2003.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First Nation has a representative on planning team, some level of dissatisfaction with the per diem compensation for participation given level of effort required for meaningful participation, felt that funding was not adequate • Land caution on Nipissing Forest was removed in 1996, therefore no present overlap with traditional lands on the Nipissing Forest • First Nation is currently negotiating a land claim, therefore focused on resolving this much broader land use issue before getting involved in detailed discussions with forest companies • The community is regularly informed of forest management activities, in part through the Aboriginal Working Group established through MNR, which meets less frequently than in the past and through the planning team representative • Because the community has not established a development corporation or business structure for their involvement in forestry, business opportunities are sometimes foregone (e.g. could have had 1.8% harvest allocation on the Nipissing Forest) • There is an ongoing effort to coordinate consultation on forest management plans because the community is involved with planning and operations on four separate management units 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed per diem compensation with NFRM General Manager and MNR Native Liaison, funding comes from MNR and is the same for all planning team participants.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In general, communications are ongoing, offers to participate in forest management activities have been made, NFRM keeps the First Nation informed when operations occur in their traditional territory 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First Nations representative on planning team for the Nipissing Forest, would like to attend more meetings but it is difficult due to other commitments • Heard about FSC initiative through planning team meetings, would like clarification regarding FSC policies on herbicide use in forestry • Assimilation of planning information has a big learning curve, difficult for new members to understand all the terms used • Is currently mainly involved in forestry contract work on the adjacent management unit, and looking for opportunities to expand to the Nipissing Forest and elsewhere • There was an opportunity to participate on a stand improvement project, but timeframe did not offer the opportunity for a timely response to the request • However, consequently received a call from NFRM forester with offer of stand improvement work in Loring deeryard • It is not a large project, but nonetheless offers the opportunity for future work on the Forest and NFRM seems amenable to this • Not very familiar with Native Values Mapping, would like to learn more about the process because these values are important to the community • Aboriginal Working Group is an excellent forum for information exchange • Heard about FSC through planning team meetings, and had questions about FSC herbicide policy • To date, is satisfied with working relationship with NFRM and MNR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explained FSC policy on chemical use. • No further response required.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community requested and received funding to prepare a Native Background Information Report, not much money but enough for community to conduct open houses and document some values although more work is required • MNR, NFRM and Tembec have been supportive of business initiatives proposed by 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See CAR 2003.2

<p>the community and have variously provided in-kind and financial support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not entirely satisfied with harvest opportunities, due to recent achievement of First Nations community status, there was not the option at the time to submit a business plan to obtain a share of harvest allocations • Present opportunities and progress toward this have been limited despite stated interest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussions indicate that NFRM is committed to providing harvest opportunities as they become available, on a preferred basis to First Nations contractors. The First Nation is currently involved in the development of a business plan (with the support of NFRM and shareholders) for an extensive maple syrup production facility, which ties up much of the community capacity in its development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community is working with local forestry consultants to implement a management plan on the reserve, with strong community support and awareness of the importance of good stewardship • NFRM also works with Native forest tech to assist in implementation of First Nations operations on the SFL • Generally satisfied with relationship with NFRM, though there is room for improvement in the quality of allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None required.

Tourist Operators

Comment/Concern	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relationship with forest managers has been very positive, NFRM is responsive to concerns • Has signed Resource Stewardship Agreement with NFRM, examples of modifications to forest operations include timing restrictions, cooperation on road closures and restricted access areas • Receive regular notice of Annual Work Schedule for forest operations • NFRM would make cull from operations available for fuelwood when possible • Feels tourist operators in general should receive more consideration given commercial interests on Forest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None required.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There have been examples of where proposed road for harvesting operations would have impacted on tourist operation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested continued contact with NFRM regarding tourism concerns and

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The harvest contractor was found to be cooperative and amenable to finding another route for taking wood out of the block • Has received a proposed RSA, which did not indicate the location of beaver ponds on maps • Is still in discussions with NFRM regarding protection (e.g. buffers) for specific tourism values, especially buffers around beaver ponds located near trails and is trying to obtain more information on appropriate prescriptions for beaver ponds • In general, experience with NFRM has been productive dialogue about concerns 	<p>potential sources of information regarding management of beaver ponds (provincial wildlife biologist)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spoke with NFRM consultant regarding approach to negotiations with tourist operators, who indicated that discussions were ongoing as part of current planning cycle.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NFRM has been proactive in negotiating RSAs with tourist operators on the Forest (one of the first companies in Ontario take action on this new provincial requirement) • As agency representing tourist operators in the province, there is some concern that operators must be informed regarding the implications of committing to an RSA • Operators should have the opportunity to see harvest allocations before signing agreements, e.g. agreements should be signed after completion of the forest management plan • However, no significant concerns or conflicts have occurred on the Nipissing Forest to date 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spoke to NFRM General Manager regarding harvest allocations maps and why these areas are not identified when negotiating RSAs • RSA process requires that agreements be signed in advance of the planning process therefore NFRM is in fact in compliance with provincial RSA requirements.

2.5 GUIDELINES/STANDARDS EMPLOYED

The Final Interim Standard that was employed by the evaluation team was developed from:

- Extensive consideration (close to complete incorporation) of the Standards for Well Managed Forests in the Central and Southern Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Forests of Ontario
- SCS Generic Interim Standards for Natural and Plantation Forest Management Certification, which are duly accredited by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC).
- Consideration of FSC Boreal Ontario Standards Consensus Draft (April, 2002) for Principle 3.

A draft version of the interim standard was made available for public comment prior to the start of the evaluation. The draft interim standard could be downloaded from the FSC Canada website or available upon request from SCS. This draft interim standard was finalized prior to the start of the field evaluation. No comments on the draft interim standard were received, with the exception of comments obtained through a discussion with a representative of the Union of Ontario Indians (UOI). These comments are summarized in Section 2.4.7, with clarification that these discussions

were not considered consultation by either the evaluation team or the UOI, but rather a necessary response to SCS' inquiries about the certification standard.

The Final Interim Standard is available upon request from the SCS offices in Emeryville, California. In addition, consistent with SCS *Forest Conservation Program* evaluation protocol, for scoring purposes the team weighted sets of evaluation criteria for each of the 9 FSC Principles. (Principle 10 is not applicable to this natural forest operation.)

2.6 SCORING PROCESS

Consistent with SCS *Forest Conservation Program* evaluation protocols, for scoring purposes the team collectively assigned weights of relative importance to the criteria within each of the nine Principles. Scores (connoting performance relative to a criterion) were assigned for each criterion at the completion of the field phase and importance-weighted means (average scores) were calculated for each Principle. Scoring takes place on a 100-point scale, using a consensus process amongst all members of the evaluation team. Scores less than 80 points denotes performance in which there is discernible non-compliance with the breadth of a criterion. Where the score assigned for a criterion scores fell below the threshold of 80, the evaluation team must specific one or more Corrective Action Requests (CARs) designed to bring the operation into conformance with the criterion. At the team's discretions, non-conformance with a criterion could result in the specification of a precondition; this response would be appropriate in the case of highly important or "pre-emptive" criteria such as those dealing with GMO use, chemical use and public summaries of management plans. If the score is assigned above the 80 threshold but the team could see opportunities for further improvement, one or more recommendations can be generated. In a limited number of instances these requests may be phrased as CARs. This occurs when overall the criterion was highly rated but there were specific instances where important improvements were required, but that these were not severe enough to move the score below 80 overall. For certification to be awarded, the importance-weighted average score for each of the 9 applicable FSC principles must be 80 points or higher. In a situation where the weighted score for one or more principle is less than 80 points, the evaluation team is obligated to specific one or more pre-conditions.

Interpretations of Preconditions, CARs and Recommendations.

Preconditions: These are corrective actions that must be resolved or closed out prior to award of the certificate. These arise when the importance-weighted average score for a Principle is less than 80 points or where there is observed non-compliance with a "pre-emptive" criterion or indicator (e.g., use of GMOs)

CARs: Corrective actions must be closed out within a specified time period of award of the certificate. Certification is contingent on the certified operations response to the CAR within the stipulated time frame.

Recommendations: These are suggestions that the audit team concludes would help the company move even further toward exemplary status. Action on the recommendations is voluntary and does not affect the maintenance of the certificate. Recommendations can be changed to CARs if gaps associated with respect to the criterion triggering the recommendation become more significant.

3.0 RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY OF NOTABLE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE FOREST MANAGEMENT ENTERPRISE RELATIVE TO THE P&C

TABLE A.6:

Principle/Subject Area	Strengths	Weaknesses	Score and CARs/Rec's
P1: FSC Commitment and Legal Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NFRM is very familiar with legal framework. • Communicates well with staff regarding legal compliance and commitment to FSC. • Maintains a strong system to assure legal compliance. • Forest manager is an active participant in the development of standards associated with provincial and regional direction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key stakeholders and forest managers have limited awareness of FSC process and implications for management. • NFRM lacks a system to track international agreements • NFRM could improve its education of public regarding trespassing issues • NFRM lacks a written statement documenting intent to comply with regional standards 	Score = 83 REC 2003.1 REC 2003.2 REC 2003.3

P2: Tenure & Use Rights & Responsibilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NFRM committed to cooperating with neighbours on boundary issues • Facilitates community access to the forest • Restricts access where values are threatened. • Provincial forest management program provides mechanisms for public input and dispute resolution • NFRM was one of the first operations to negotiate RSAs in Ontario 	No notable weaknesses	Score = 89
---	--	-----------------------	------------

P3: Indigenous Peoples' Rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The company has negotiated in good faith with local First Nations and made meaningful efforts to establish ongoing communications and sound working relationships with local First Nations • Substantive efforts have been made to assist in capacity-building and seek out business opportunities for interested communities and/or First Nation contractors • Excellent efforts and sustained commitment to including First Nations in forest management planning and operations • Many examples of mechanisms for communication, training initiatives, support for community development and capacity-building • Provisions for growth included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is insufficient documented evidence of NFRM's strategic objectives with respect to the evolving relationships with First Nations (e.g. Board-endorsed policy, written agreements/ MoUs with First Nations) • Documentation of Native Values on the Forest meets minimum standards, despite additional efforts by NFRM, remains a concern 	<p>Score = 83</p> <p>CAR 2003.1 CAR 2003.2</p>
---------------------------------------	--	---	--

P4: Community Relations & Workers' Rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NFRM efforts go beyond legislated requirements for public consultation • The company has been proactive in discussions and negotiations with communities and public to prevent disputes over conflicting forest uses • Emphasis on local hiring and support for community businesses, education groups and charitable organizations • Extensive efforts made to offer forest as a training/educational resource • Pro-active in initiating dialogue and actions to prevent grievances • Extra efforts made to involve and inform the public throughout planning and implementation (e.g. tours, posters, communications strategies) • NFRM initiates and maintains a high level of effort related to consultation with other forest users/interests 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor gaps in communications with MNR in cases where NFRM does not participate directly in discussions with specific interest groups on the Forest • No systematic approach to ensure that health & safety standards & monitoring across operations consistent • No formally designated health and safety representative as legally mandated in Ontario 	<p>Score = 85 CAR 2003.3</p>
--	---	---	----------------------------------

<p>P5: Benefits from the Forest</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that NFRM is providing in-kind support for the development of non-timber forest product businesses on the Nipissing Forest • No preset harvest levels or quotas, rather harvest levels are output of SFMM • Ongoing investments in stand improvement • Silvicultural objectives are geared toward higher value timber species and products • NFRM carefully matches species with most appropriate sites • Good support of economic diversification (e.g. Antoine maple syrup operation) • 10% contingency account in shareholder agreement • NFRM is involved in numerous additional projects that benefit both the forest and local employment using outside funding, e.g., Loring deer yard • Conservative management of renewal trust account 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistency in slash management across the unit (seen on field tour and noted in recent IFA) • Some landings thought to be excessively large • Increased use of motorized recreational vehicles has potential to lead to significant environmental impacts • Have not formalized/considered requirements for full-cost accounting 	<p>Score = 85</p> <p>REC 2003.4</p>
<p>P6: Environmental Impact</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NFRM successfully implemented a Forest Ecosystem Classification system. • Residual stand damage minimal in accordance with adopted AFA guidelines • NFRM uses herbicides judiciously and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only minimal level of pre-harvest site inspection for non-timber values when clearcutting • Current management plan does not take into account forest 	<p>Score = 83</p> <p>CAR 2003.4 CAR 2003.5 CAR 2003.7</p>

	<p>has a policy in place to reduce/phase out use on forest over time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly experienced/knowledgeable staff contributes to conservation of environmental values • Trend of increasing usage of portable bridges continues to reduce impacts to water crossings 	<p>fragmentation and connectivity effects from adjacent units</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water crossing installation quality was inconsistent across forest • Roads not being used and maintained by the forest industry are not defined •6.2j requires that roads are closed and/or access controlled unless significant economic or recreational benefits to leaving them open – current practice is inconsistent with the requirement of the standard • No road plans exist for the roads not used by the forest industry for the 5 year term of the plan • Clearcut boundaries and retention standards (as viewed during field inspections) are inconsistent with regional standards • Natural disturbance regimes directed toward larger disturbance sizes (e.g. clearcuts) which may conflict with other forest values • Species listed in Appendix XI of FSC standard are not considered in the next Forest Management Plan – • Historical abundance of white pine not established in plan • Harvesting old growth white pine 	<p>CAR 2003.8</p> <p>REC 2003.5</p> <p>REC 2003.6</p>
--	---	--	---

		<p>although representation less than 10% contrary to requirement of standard</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selected management alternative indicates decreasing trend in old growth white pine over next 100 years • Not consistently following guidelines with respect to snag retention on clearcuts • Viewed examples of erosion of material into streams (on steep roads) 	
P7: Management Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive public input throughout planning process • Well designed information systems • Provincial requirements for planning are very consistent with FSC management planning requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NFRM lacks a system to identify and monitor training/knowledge gaps to ensure the proper implementation of the management plan. 	<p>Score = 84</p> <p>REC 2003.9</p> <p>.</p>
P8: Monitoring & Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results of monitoring regularly incorporated into revision of management plans • Regulation of FIM should contribute to the systematic collection of indicator data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence reviewed (documentation, interviews and site visits) suggest that compliance performance is average • NFRM does not directly monitor changes in flora and fauna 	<p>Score = 85</p> <p>CAR 2003.6</p>

P9: Maintenance of High Conservation Value Forest	<p>NFRM completed a comprehensive and well documented preliminary analysis for HCVF</p> <p>Protection for known high conservation values on Forest appropriately prescribed and implemented</p>	<p>NFRM has not included areas adjacent parks and protected areas into HCVF</p> <p>Areas with unique plant species have not been identified and protected</p> <p>HCVF areas have not been approved through the management planning process</p>	<p>Score = 84 CAR 2003.7</p>
P10: Plantations – Not Applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • n/a

3.4 CERTIFICATION RECOMMENDATION

As determined by the full and proper execution of the SCS *Forest Conservation Program* evaluation protocols, the evaluation team recommends that the Nipissing Forest be awarded FSC certification with conditions.

3.5 JUSTIFICATION OF THE CERTIFICATION RECOMMENDATION

As detailed throughout this report, and consistent with the accredited SCS *Forest Conservation Program* evaluation protocols, certification of the Nipissing Forest is recommended in response to the principle-level scores generated from the scores assigned to each criterion, as indicated throughout the report..

Peer Reviewers

Three independent peer reviewers reviewed the draft of this evaluation report. The evaluation team carefully considered the comments provided by the peer reviewers and made changes, as deemed appropriate, in response to those comments.

3.6 PROPOSED CARS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ATTACHED TO CERTIFICATION

CAR 2003.1: Within 1 year of award of certification, NFRM, in consultation with interested First Nations, must formalize its organizational commitment to continuing and productive working relationships with local First Nations in a comprehensive First Nations policy statement.

This must include, at minimum, documentation of the following elements:

- A description of long-term strategic direction and management intent;
- The identification of specific opportunities, targets and objectives for First Nations participation in forest management and a process for monitoring achievements and progress;
- A policy for compensation for the application of traditional ecological knowledge in management planning;
- Program and procedures for improving the current understanding and documentation of Native values on the Forest;
- A description of NFRM's approach to facilitating broader community involvement and/or understanding of forest management and opportunities for participation - including an improved understanding of FSC and its implications for management; and
- Evidence of endorsement by NFRM Board of Directors and interested First Nations.

The policy statement should preferably take the form of a stand-alone document that can be used as a communication tool and distributed to interested parties upon request. It may build on and incorporate many of the elements of the forest management planning process and the existing FMP.

CAR 2003.2: Within 1 year of award of certification, NFRM, in full co-operation and consultation with interested First Nations communities, must develop and implement a program that contributes to the improved identification and documentation of Native values in areas where forest operations are scheduled to occur. The intent of such a program is: 1) to add to the existing body of knowledge with respect to Native values on the Nipissing Forest; 2) to contribute to improvements and refinements in the current modeling approach; and 3) to ensure that native values on the Forest receive appropriate protection.

Conformance with this CAR will be ascertained through SCS' review of a written briefing report of the actions taken and confirmation that the plan is being implemented.

CAR 2003.3: Within 6 months from award of certification NFRM must cause to be implemented those parts of the Occupational Health and Safety Act that pertain to the selection of at least one health and safety representative and the performance of duties of that person with respect to the Act.

CAR 2003.4 Prior to completion of the new FMP, special prescriptions and protection strategies for uncommon hardwood tree species, as listed in Appendix XI of the Standard, must be developed, documented, and implemented.

CAR 2003.5 Within one year from award of certification, NFRM must develop, implement, and document procedures that ensure that there is no net decline of current levels of 121 year and older white pine over the next 100 years. These procedures must demonstrate management objectives that will increase the presence of old growth white pine to a minimum of 10% of the white pine forest unit on the NFMU in the long term.

CAR 2003.6 Within 3 years of award of certification, NFRM must develop, assure funding for, and implement an ongoing actual forest inventory system to supplement and test accuracy of modeled growth rates and regeneration estimates. The highest priority for this inventory is in complex forest types such as the mid-tolerant hardwoods.

CAR 2003.7 Prior to completion of NFRM's 2004-2009 management plan, NFRM must expand upon the HCVF consultative process conducted to date (ensuring that representation gaps as described in the Great Lakes St. Lawrence Standards are addressed) and implement management prescriptions and monitoring techniques for continued protection of identified attributes. This HCVF policy must be integrated into the 2004-2009 management planning process.

CAR 2003.8: In the absence of the province completing its network of representative protected areas, NFRM must, within one year from award of certification, take necessary steps to engage in the candidate selection process. It is recommended that the process uses the Room to Grow report as a reference and includes: identification of candidate areas; delineation of candidate areas on maps; strategies and timelines; and, removal of the candidate protected areas from the landbase for the 2009 Plan. It is not necessary for NFRM to recalculate the AHA for the 2004 Plan, however, the 2009 Plan must be adjusted accordingly.

Recommendation 2003.1: NFRM should make concerted efforts to ensure that stakeholders and forest managers (e.g. MNR) are familiar with the Forest Stewardship Council evaluation process and implications for management.

Recommendation 2003.2: Improve public awareness of the trespass problem, educate the public, the judicial system and the local mills on the long-term ramifications of illegal logging.

Recommendation 2003.3: The MNR North Bay District staff should make a strong commitment, preferably in writing, to supporting the NFRM FSC certification.

Recommendation 2003.4: NFRM should collect and review operating procedures related to health and safety from each shareholder to develop a set of Best Practices and ensure they are applied consistently to all contractors operating on the Forest.

Recommendation 2003.5: NFRM should demonstrate that it has considered full cost accounting and is making tangible progress toward meeting an implementation goal.

Recommendation 2003.6: NFRM should consider implementing a method of preharvest site inspection, for harvest blocks planned for clearcutting that includes a focus on areas of high potential for the presence of nontimber values. The method should provide a similar level of assurance that nontimber values will be identified and protected as that provided in blocks where tree marking has taken place.

Recommendation 2003.7: NFRM should encourage MNR to work with the adjacent SFLs and private forests and initiate landscape modelling on a regional scale that would assist in better forest management

Recommendation 2003.8: The policy to phase out the use of pesticides over time needs an action plan developed to start the reduction process. By identifying and tracking types of herbicide use, NFRM can more accurately show the decline in the use of herbicides and the increase use of more friendly alternatives, such as manual tending.

Recommendation 2003.9: NFRM should develop a systemic approach to identifying and monitoring gaps in training for proper implementation and maintenance of the 2004-2009 management plan.

4.0 ANNUAL AUDITS

4.1 2004 ANNUAL AUDIT

4.1.1 Audit Dates

July 5 – 7, 2004.

4.1.2 Audit Personnel

For this annual audit, the team included Dr. Walter R. Mark and Peter Higgelke. The audit was lead by Walter Mark.

Dr. Walter R. Mark: Dr. Mark is a professor of forestry at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo and former Director of Swanton Pacific Ranch, the University's school forest. Dr. Mark's specialty is forest health. Dr. Mark is a consultant for Scientific Certification Systems and is responsible for the audit. Dr. Mark is a registered professional forester in California (RPF No. 1250) with 35 years of forestry experience in the public and higher education sectors. He is in his first year of audits with Scientific Certification Systems.

Peter Higgelke: Consulting Forester, Managing Partner of KBM Forestry Consultants Inc. (Ontario). As a principal in KBM, Mr. Higgelke specializes in forest management planning, forest inventory, wildlife habitat supply analysis modelling, business plan preparation, timber harvesting, forest audits and forest renewal prescriptions. Peter is a registered professional forester in the province of Ontario. He has advised First Nations on forest management, forestry negotiations and economic development. In the past he lectured at Lakehead University on integrated forest resources management and GIS applications in forestry. Peter was a member of the SCS team that performed the original FSC certification audit in 2002.

4.1.3 Audit Process

The SCS annual audit field evaluation commenced in the morning of July 5 and concluded in the afternoon of July 7, 2004 with the following dates and steps:

July 5 Morning—The first half-day was spent in the Callandar office of NFRM and was devoted to certification conditions and recommendations, and to management issues raised over the past year. A group interview was conducted with senior management and field staff including Peter Street, Ric Hansel, Norm Cotham, Iam Kovacs, Tom Boudreau, Frank Simard, Michel Laliberte, and Line Durette. During these discussions, the status of the conditions and recommendations were noted. This phase of the audit involved an office-based general business discussion, GIS overview of the Nipissing Forest and the operations maps for the past two years and discussion of the outstanding conditions and activities on the certified forest since the last annual audit.

At the conclusion of the office discussions, a field itinerary was developed for the afternoon, the following day and the morning of the next day. The intent was to observe a full cross section of field circumstances. The auditors were satisfied that the scheduled on-site field inspections of the forest operations were sufficient in scope and intensity as to provide an adequate factual and observational basis for auditing NFRM's activities on the Nipissing Forest with particular emphasis on sites related to CARs from the initial award of certification.

July 5 Afternoon— The field group consisted of Walter Mark, Peter Higgelke, Peter Street, Ric Hansel, and Tom Clark (a consultant to NFRM).

The field review started at the Pre-cut Hardwood processing plant that produces pallets and firewood from small diameter white birch logs with Carl Holtz, owner and operator. White birch utilization presents a problem on a number of SFLs. The Pre-cut Hardwood plant utilizes low value material and produces high value products from logs that otherwise would be processed into chips.

On the way to the next stop an area of spruce budworm damage was observed. The MNR monitors the level of the insect population and applies controls when necessary. The last control efforts were made in 1999.

The next stop was the Notman Road relocation and water crossing removal site. There were 3.5 km of road relocated to eliminate a major water crossing that had been a repeated problem in the past. The crossing was pulled and the stream and stream banks were rehabilitated through the site. Portions of the old road will be used in future harvests as truck road, so road decommissioning was not done on the entire road.

The next visit was to Block 79 to view a clearcut with retention of 25 or more stems per hectare. Retention requirements under the new NDPEG were reviewed. Animal den protective measures were taken by tree marking crews, demonstrating sensitivity to wildlife features. This unit was originally assigned to be a FN (First Nation) cut block but was declined by all FN contactors.

Next Block 29, harvested in the summer of 2003 with logs left over winter, was visited. This unit is part of the Antoine First Nations allocation and was harvested by Carl Holtz. Block 29 had an Area of Concern (AOC) for moose habitat marked in the harvest block. There was close observation of the AOC boundary in the timber operations.

July 6 All day—The field group for the day consisted of Walter Mark, Peter Higgelke, Peter Street, Ric Hansel, Iam Kovacs Tom Clark, Peter Nitsche (manager of Bancroft-Minden Forest), and Travis Hossack (manager of Mazinaw Lanark Forest), Dave Joannis (Antoine First Nation), and Rob Baker (OMNR).

The first stop of the day was at the Olrige Township harvest and research site. The group was joined here by Al Stinson of the Research Partnership of the Canadian Ecology Centre. This area was clearcut in the late 50's and early 60's and grew back to yellow birch. The latest entry was a release with crop tree marking. Funds for the release operation came from Ontario Living Legacy (OLL) and the Forest Renewal Trust Fund on a 50:50 matching basis. The release operations were done by crews under the supervision of Dave Joannis, a FN silvicultural contractor. Research is being conducted by Al Stinson on the

spacing trials for yellow birch. This project is a great example of the desire of NFRM to work with the FN contractors, to develop additional wood markets and to support research.

The next stop was the Mattawa Harvest Block in tolerant hardwoods, where a maple overstory was being converted to yellow birch. This area was marked for harvest and extensive studies on flora, fauna, soils and growth and yield were being conducted. The marking guidelines and stand objectives were discussed.

Block 91 in the Mattawa was an active red oak harvest unit. Eric Gravelle the woods operations supervisor joined us to explain the harvest operations. The harvest was done as an oak shelterwood. Experience has indicated that previous cutting has been too light to achieve desired future forest species composition. This harvest was targeting a leave tree level of 12 m³/ha with the prescription written to follow a crown spacing requirement. Goshawk nests found during the harvest block boundary layout were protected with AOC prescriptions in the nest area. Following harvest, site preparation is planned with mechanical or herbicide use to prepare sites to obtain red oak regeneration. There was a snowmobile and quad trail through the harvest area. Operations had been modified to keep some trails open for use. This provided a good example of the ground personnel recognizing special conditions and modifying practices to accommodate those conditions.

Block 112 was visited next. This block is part of the allocation of an independent operator, Blane Behnke's 1.7% allocation. Blane joined the audit group for the review and discussion of the in-progress operation. Harvest layout was performed according to direction provided by the NDPEG and included 22 ha of leave patches (5 ha of insular and 17 ha of peninsular) and the retention of at least 25 stems per ha in the harvested areas. Wood fibre from this from this harvest block was being delivered to a variety of processors to secure the best value with white birch logs going to Pre-cut and large poplar logs going for veneer. The other poplar logs had not yet been sold.

The harvest block was on a small piece of Crown land completely surrounded by private land. The application of the NDPEG in this setting caused concern for the operator about the economic impacts on harvest operation (substantially less volume per road kilometre) and whether or not the implementation of the guidelines resulted in better emulation of natural disturbances. The validity of the concern is supported by the fact that the guidelines were developed using disturbance pattern data from the boreal forest and was implemented in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence forest setting.

Next stop was the white pine competition study site at Suzy Lake. Al Stinson led the group looking at the re-establishment of white and red pine under a uniform shelterwood. This is a cooperative effort with funding from OLL, OMNR, Canadian Forest Service, TEMBEC, and the Canadian Ecology Centre. Several early and significant findings have resulted from the studies regarding spacing in

shelterwood cuts and the impact of competition on establishment and growth of white pine reproduction. For example, the studies have demonstrated that early chemical treatment for herbaceous competition reduces the need for subsequent treatments.

Block 107 was visited next. This area was marked for a first removal cut in the fall with full tree logging. The full-tree logging requires additional monitoring to assure that residual stand damage does not occur and that landing size is not excessive. Aerial herbicide application is planned for the control of heavy competition with mechanical site preparation timed to take advantage of the stress seed crop. Five goshawk nest sites were found during block layout and were protected with appropriate AOC prescriptions. The prescription was modified to leave 70% crown cover. This recognition and modification once again demonstrated the interest in protecting wildlife values in the forest.

Also visited in the same block was a first removal cut where the prescribed half crown spacing was not achieved. Re-entry is planned to improve spacing and release regeneration, and to interplant areas lacking adequate regeneration. Aerial application of herbicide is planned in the area to control vegetative competition and obtain red pine survival.

Wayne Smith, regeneration consultant joined the group to lead a tour of planting trials and silvicultural effectiveness plots. The regeneration trials looked at the impacts of 1 and 2 year-old seedlings, cold storage versus winter outdoor storage, depth of planting, mycorrhizal fungus application, and nutrient spiking with soil application of nitrogen. This work is being done to establish a system to inventory for regeneration on the Nipissing Forest. There is currently an Operational Regeneration Survey being conducted on 20-30 K ha to do an ocular survey to declare the free-to-grow status to areas to add these back into the inventory.

The next stop was the McConnell Lakes Campground managed by Andy Montreuil. This is an example of the OLL creating opportunities for First Nation management. Andy also works as a silvicultural contractor for thinning and tree planting.

July 6 Evening— The group for the evening consisted of Walter Mark, Peter Higgelke, Peter Street, Ric Hansel, and Norm Cotham.

Evening discussion was utilized to complete the review of the CAR's and Recommendations from the Certification Audit. Initial audit team reactions and recommendations were discussed.

July 7 Morning— The field group for the day consisted of Walter Mark, Peter Higgelke, Peter Street, Iam Kovacs, and Tom Boudreau.

Traveling to Block 123 the route led along Murical Road. The road right-of-way is deeded to the municipality which shares in the timber revenue based on the percentage of the cut that comes from the ROW. NFRM notifies MNR and credit for the revenue is in the invoice for payment.

Block 123 was visited as an active operation and James Ranger of Madadjiwan First Nation joined the group to participate as the timber operations boss. The present stand condition was a poplar dominated mixedwood with red and white pine. With the intent to favour a pine-dominated future forest condition, the prescription was to retain residual pine for seed and to plant. Skidding with grapple skidders was used to provide better seed bed preparation; however, skid trail density appeared to be a potential problem in some areas. Residual tree damage was observed at a higher than expected rate. This appeared to be from both the feller-buncher and skidding. We witnessed an improvement in areas of the unit that were harvested later, indicating a realization and correction of the problem. Cross drains on interior truck roads in the unit were not maintained well and some plugging appeared. The variety of products coming from the sale was good with sawlogs, pulpwood, poles, and veneer logs are designated.

The last field observations occurred on the return to Callandar with the observation of the Ottawa/Mattawa River System, which is one of the areas designated as a potential HCV. This area was proposed to the OLL Land Use Strategy to become a park/protected area and this recommendation was accepted in the 1999 review process.

July 7 Afternoon—Review with NFRM staff of audit findings with respect to its meeting the terms of the CARs and Recommendations issued as part of the initial award of certification in 2003.

The scope of the 2004 surveillance audit included: document review, field auditors spending time in the field reviewing site-specific results of planning and forestry activities, interviewing management and operations personnel and, as appropriate, interacting with outside stakeholders.

4.1.4 Status of Conditions and Recommendations

As a result of this annual audit, the team has:

- 1) closed out 5 conditions from 2003
- 2) continued 3 conditions from 2003- although the original due date for compliance with two of these conditions had expired- SCS concluded that the original one-year time frame was too short considering the complexity of the task at hand and that substantial progress has been made.
- 3) stipulated no new corrective action request (CARs)
- 4) closed out 9 Recommendation from 2003
- 5) continued no Recommendations from 2003
- 6) Issued 3 New Recommendations for 2004

Condition 2003.1:

Within 1 year of award of certification, NFRM, in consultation with interested First Nations, must formalize its organizational commitment to continuing and productive working relationships with local First Nations in a comprehensive First Nations policy statement.

This must include, at minimum, documentation of the following elements:

- A description of long-term strategic direction and management intent;
- The identification of specific opportunities, targets and objectives for First Nations participation in forest management and a process for monitoring achievements and progress;
- A policy for compensation for the application of traditional ecological knowledge in management planning;
- Program and procedures for improving the current understanding and documentation of Native values on the Forest;
- A description of NFRM's approach to facilitating broader community involvement and/or understanding of forest management and opportunities for participation - including an improved understanding of FSC and its implications for management; and
- Evidence of endorsement by NFRM Board of Directors and interested First Nations.

The policy statement should preferably take the form of a stand-alone document that can be used as a communication tool and distributed to interested parties upon request. It may build on and incorporate many of the elements of the forest management planning process and the existing FMP.

Company Action/Auditor Observation:

NFRM chose to pursue an "Agreement of Understanding" with the First Nations in an effort to formalize its commitment to working with First Nations. NFRM shareholders agreed to this strategy. This pursuit was seen by the auditors as an indication by NFRM of its intent to ensure commitment to the First Nations. Although all First Nations were approached with the agreement, only one (Antoine) signed. Negotiations with other First Nations were continuing. The determination to sign or not lies with the First Nations and not NFRM. First Nations have been invited to all the planning meetings and First Nations representatives have been present at all the planning sessions. First Nations representatives participated in the annual audit and to encourage this participation, NFRM paid their salaries for the time involved. The actual and planned allocations to the First Nations have been increased from an overall level of 7.4% to 10% in the FMP. Examples of current First Nations logging operations were visited in the audit. Additional examples of silvicultural contracts past, present and planned were discussed. The information and observations provided by the audit demonstrated a concerted and genuine effort on the part of NFRM to conform the CAR.

Status at July 07, 2004:

This condition is **closed** as a result of this annual audit.

Condition 2003.2:
<p>Within 1 year of award of certification, NFRM, in full co-operation and consultation with interested First Nations communities, must develop and implement a program that contributes to the improved identification and documentation of Native values in areas where forest operations are scheduled to occur. The intent of such a program is:</p> <p>1) to add to the existing body of knowledge with respect to Native values on the Nipissing Forest; 2) to contribute to improvements and refinements in the current modeling approach; and</p> <p>3) to ensure that native values on the Forest receive appropriate protection.</p> <p>Conformance with this CAR will be ascertained through SCS' review of a written briefing report of the actions taken and confirmation that the plan is being implemented.</p>
Company Action/Auditor Observation:
<p>NFRM has implemented an AOC prescription in the 2004-2024 FMP to address protection of native values on the Nipissing Forest. The planning process included an opportunity for all First Nations to update the native values information in the data base. A NFRM RPF visited all the First Nations to present the native values map as part of the update process. The updated information was shared with Rene Carrier, Provincial Archaeologist, OMNR, and she is working on new modelling based on this update. The NFRM manager is the Ontario Forest Industry Association (OFIA) representative on the provincial committee established to rewrite the cultural heritage guidelines related to forest management activities. Additional specific activities undertaking as part of NFRM effort are listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NFRM's "Agreement of Understanding" proposed for all First Nations within the Nipissing Forest and signed by Antoine First Nation includes measures to identify and protect Native values. • Areas identified through the High Potential Cultural Heritage modelling as high potential were investigated by an archaeologist with First Nation participation. • NFRM staff participated in Native Awareness training provided by the Union of Ontario Indians • NFRM co-hosted an Aboriginal & Cultural Heritage Values workshop in North Bay
Status at July 07, 2004:
This condition is closed as a result of this annual audit.

Condition 2003.3:
<p>Within 6 months from award of certification NFRM must cause to be implemented those parts of the Occupational Health and Safety Act that pertain to the selection of at least one health and safety representative and the performance of duties of that person with respect to the Act.</p>
Company Action/Auditor Observation:
<p>NFRM has identified Michel Laliberte as its Health & Safety representative. A letter confirming certification by Ontario Forestry Safe Workplace Association upon</p>

completion of a formal evaluation (March 2, 2004) was sent to NFRM on July 19, 2004. Evidence of an on-site inspection of an NFRM silviculture contractor according to guidelines of the Ontario Forestry Safe Workplace Association further supports SWO Certification. NFRM has developed a number of Health & Safety Policies and initiated a series of procedures related to health & safety including training and meetings with contractors. A section on safety policies, which includes a matrix of responsibilities for staff, silviculture, and contractors, has been added to all contracts. A process for recording all safety violations has been implemented. This process includes reporting to MNR if repeated safety violations occur.

Status at July 07, 2004:

This condition is **closed** as a result of this annual audit.

Condition 2003.4:

Prior to completion of the new FMP, special prescriptions and protection strategies for uncommon hardwood tree species, as listed in Appendix XI of the Standard, must be developed, documented, and implemented.

Company Action/Auditor Observation:

NFRM's response is provided in the 2004-2024 Forest Management Plan by listing species and its strategy to protect them (pages 3-15 and 3-16). The species are: "Locally rare tree species such as silver maple, white elm, black cherry ironwood and burr oak". The strategy outlines training tree markers in the identification of these species and ensuring their retention. Natural regeneration will be promoted and their presence is to be tracked spatially. There was limited opportunity to observe the implementation of this in the marking of trees.

Status at July 07, 2004:

This condition is **closed** as a result of this annual audit

Condition 2003.5:

Within one year from award of certification, NFRM must develop, implement, and document procedures that ensure that there is no net decline of current levels of 121 year and older white pine over the next 100 years. These procedures must demonstrate management objectives that will increase the presence of old growth white pine to a minimum of 10% of the white pine forest unit on the NFMU in the long term.

Company Action/Auditor Observation:

NFRM established an Old Growth Task Force with specialists and environmental group representation to address the old growth issues. These were incorporated into the 2004-2024 FMP. Goals were set for all forest components and these were incorporated into the modeling effort. The model shows that there will be greater than 12% old growth white pine in 100 years. This is up from the current level of 9%.

Status at July 07, 2004:

This condition is **closed** as a result of this annual audit.

Condition 2003.6:
Within 3 years of award of certification, NFRM must develop, assure funding for, and implement an ongoing actual forest inventory system to supplement and test accuracy of modeled growth rates and regeneration estimates. The highest priority for this inventory is in complex forest types such as the mid-tolerant hardwoods.
Company Action/Auditor Observation:
NFRM has made good progress toward meeting the overall condition. It continues to participate in a research partnership with the Canadian Ecology Centre with a focus currently on yellow birch. Growth and yield plots have been established to examine impacts of spacing and group selection. Site preparation methods are also being evaluated in these plots. Some changes in marking, especially for retention of overstory red oak and yellow birch, while removing understory, have been implemented. Wayne Smith has been retained to work on establishing a system of permanent plots and to look at silvicultural effectiveness monitoring. Temporary and permanent plots are being established to compare various silvicultural practices. Evaluations of various nursery practices and planting practices and their impact on forest renewal success is being evaluated with field trials.
Status at July 07, 2004:
This condition remains open. Good progress is being made toward meeting the condition.

Condition 2003.7:
Prior to completion of NFRM's 2004-2009 management plan, NFRM must expand upon the HCVF consultative process conducted to date (ensuring that representation gaps as described in the Great Lakes St. Lawrence Standards are addressed) and implement management prescriptions and monitoring techniques for continued protection of identified attributes. This HCVF policy must be integrated into the 2004-2009 management planning process.
Company Action/Auditor Observation:
NFRM hired Tom Clark to work on the HCV identification and management prescriptions. Funding for this was jointly from OLL and NFRM. The report has been presented to NFRM; however, the plan has not been fully implemented. Training packages for field recognition have been produced and are in use. The 2004-2024 FMP has already been implemented and the new HCV prescriptions are not fully part of the FMP. The assessment was completed prior to the adoption of the 2004-2024 FMP, and is included in the objectives and strategies section. The FMP must comply with the format standards of the OMNR and does not easily accommodate all the material specified in the CAR. There are plans to incorporate the HCV information into the website. There are AOCs mapped and prescriptions for them in place. These are all included in the HCV plans and include cultural sites, moose habitat, and rare plant species. Many areas that would have been HCV's were identified in the OLL review program in 1999. These were identified and have been protected since that process awaiting action of the OMNR. Conservation Reserves were also set up as a part of the 1999 process. The Conservation Reserves are no cut areas and are excluded from management considerations of NFRM.
Status at July 07, 2004:
This condition remains open with an extension of one year . Good progress is being made toward meeting the condition; however, not all aspects of the HCV identification,

prescription, and monitoring plan have been implemented. This needs further review in the next annual audit. Some portions of the HCV requirements were completed in time for inclusion in the 2004-2024 FMP.

Condition 2003.8:

In the absence of the province completing its network of representative protected areas, NFRM must, within one year from award of certification, take necessary steps to engage in the candidate selection process. It is recommended that the process uses the Room to Grow report as a reference and includes: identification of candidate areas; delineation of candidate areas on maps; strategies and timelines; and removal of the candidate protected areas from the landbase for the 2009 Plan. If is not necessary for NFRM to recalculate the AHA for the 2004 Plan, however, the 2009 Plan must be adjusted accordingly.

Company Action/Auditor Observation:

NFRM has made good progress toward meeting the overall condition. The FSC standard places the burden of doing this work on the SFL holder if the MNR does not complete the network of representative protected areas. NFRM participated in the OLL process in 1999 and 41,231 ha of productive forest was given protected status in that process. There are a large number of existing and proposed provincial parks and conservation reserves on the Nipissing Forest. While some of the areas are yet to be regulated, all have been withdrawn from the operable land base of the Nipissing Forest and are now afforded protection. NFRM should continue to engage the OMNR in discussions to stimulate the province to complete a peer reviewed gap analysis. The OMNR identified a Room to Grow Task Force Team in 2003, which will be leading the coordination and completion of the Room to Grow targets in the province. The HCV report was completed by the consultant, Tom Clark, in April 2004. This report identifies areas and features that are designated as HCV and others that are potential HCVs. The report identifies the characteristics of the HCV; the responsibility for monitoring and inventory; a detailed management prescription; and the current monitoring for compliance, effects, effectiveness, and status. Additional time and an extension of the CAR are appropriate to allow for implementation of the HCV Report and for the Room to Grow Task Force to make substantial progress in their efforts.

Status at July 07, 2004:

This condition remains **open with an extension of one year.**

The recommendations issued at the time of award of certification are listed below, along with the audit team's assessment of NFRM's response thereto, and the disposition of the recommendations as a result of the certificate holder's responses.

Recommendation 2003.1:

NFRM should make concerted efforts to ensure that stakeholders and forest managers (e.g. MNR) are familiar with the Forest Stewardship Council evaluation process and implications for management.

Company Action/Auditor Observation:

NFRM has worked successfully towards meeting this recommendation. Ontario has adopted a new provincial policy, which dictates that all SFL holders must be certified by an approved certification entity. FSC is one of these entities. Within the planning process, a great deal of work has been done with First Nations, including increased allocations, silvicultural contracts and inclusion in the updating of the planning data base. First Nation representation was evaluated during the audit team field review. The LCC has also been informed about the FSC process and has participated in the annual review field trip. A representative of the OMNR was included on the annual audit process as well. In addition, two other SFL managers were invited and participated in the annual audit. The FSC Certification Report was provided to the OMNR district office for distribution.

Status at July 07, 2004:

This recommendation is **closed** as a result of this annual audit.

Recommendation 2003.2:

Improve public awareness of the trespass problem, educate the public, the judicial system, and the local mills on the long-term ramifications of illegal logging.

Company Action/Auditor Observation:

NFRM has been working diligently in this area. The OMNR has implemented a press release about the trespass problem and has initiated a TV campaign to increase public awareness. Some trespass cases have been prosecuted and a local investigation is ongoing. There is currently a trespass case underway against NFRM, which was submitted by an adjacent landowner. This trespass occurred before the boundary location process was established. This process should prevent future occurrences of this type. NFRM has attempted to settle this case but it is still pending resolution. To help prevent trespass in the future, OMNR should improve the ownership layer provided to the SFL. OMNR should provide additional layers for use in preventing trespass, such as LUPs, and provide these in a timely manner.

Status at July 07, 2004:

This recommendation is **closed** as a result of this annual audit.

Recommendation 2003.3:

The MNR North Bay District staff should make a strong commitment, preferably in writing, to supporting the NFRM FSC certification.

Company Action/Auditor Observation:

An announcement was made by the Minister of Natural Resources that all SFLs in the Province must be certified by 2008. Bill Hagborg, District Manager, OMNR North District sent a letter dated July 9, 2004 strongly supporting the FSC certification by NFRM.

Status at July 07, 2004:

This recommendation is **closed** as a result of this annual audit.

Recommendation 2003.4:

NFRM should collect and review operating procedures related to health and safety from each shareholder to develop a set of Best Practices, and ensure they are applied

consistently to all contractors operating on the Forest.
Company Action/Auditor Observation:
NFRM has a new policy statement related to health and safety for all contractors. Silvicultural contractors must adhere to these policies due to their contractual relationship with NFRM. Overlapping licensees are offered training and provided with the new policy documents; however, they are responsible for their own health and safety procedures and NFRM has no authority over them.
Status at July 07, 2004:
This recommendation is closed as a result of this annual audit.

Recommendation 2003.5:
NFRM should demonstrate that it has considered full cost accounting and is making tangible progress towards meeting an implementation goal.
Company Action/Auditor Observation:
NFRM has made significant progress towards full cost accounting and is continuing to move towards the use of this method. The 2004-2024 FMP considers several alternatives while determining which will be the selected management alternative. Renewal rate calculations are done related to the selected alternative.
Status at July 07, 2004:
This recommendation is closed as a result of this annual audit.

Recommendation 2003.6:
NFRM should consider implementing a method of preharvest site inspection, for harvest blocks planned for clearcutting that includes a focus on areas of high potential for the presence of non timber values. The method should provide a similar level of assurance that non timber values will be identified and protected as that provided in blocks where tree marking has taken place.
Company Action/Auditor Observation:
The <i>Forest Management Guide for Natural Disturbance Pattern Emulation</i> , implemented in 2003, covers this recommendation. Several examples of the recognition and protection of non-timber values during sale preparation and logging were observed throughout the field review. These included nesting sites, moose habitat, AOD boundaries, and wildlife den sites.
Status at July 07, 2004:
This recommendation is closed as a result of this annual audit.

Recommendation 2003.7:
NFRM should encourage OMNR to work with the adjacent SFLs and private forests and initiate landscape modelling on a regional scale that would assist in better forest management.
Company Action/Auditor Observation:
The OMNR is in the process of developing a Landscape Level Guide. NFRM participates

on a committee that provides input to the forest industry representatives on the writing team. There has been a meeting between the SFLs and OMNR to discuss this. These actions meet the intent of the recommendation.

Status at July 07, 2004:

This recommendation is **closed** as a result of this annual audit.

Recommendation 2003.8:

The policy to phase out the use of pesticides over time needs an action plan developed to start the reduction process. By identifying and tracking types of herbicide use, NFRM can more accurately show the decline in the use of herbicides and the increased use of more friendly alternatives, such as manual tending.

Company Action/Auditor Observation:

NFRM has engaged in extensive research with the research partnership in order to determine the appropriateness of herbicide use. Considerable analysis of the results, including the publication of those results, has substantiated the efficacy of the herbicide use program, particularly in red and white pine restoration efforts. One study showed that through the application of herbicide early and at appropriate times, the total number of applications can be reduced. This research finding should lead to a reduction in the amount and frequency of herbicide use in restoration activities. The requirement to increase the area of red and white pine in the Nipissing Forest will involve further restoration activities. These restoration activities depend upon herbicide to successfully establish red and white pine. Therefore as long as the SFL is charged with restoring the former acreage of red and white pine, there will be a dependency on herbicide use. The NFRM has summarized all the use of herbicide from 1999 through 2004 and the amount used for restoration was identified.

Status at July 07, 2004:

This recommendation is **closed** as a result of this annual audit.

Recommendation 2003.9:

NFRM should develop a systemic approach to identifying and monitoring gaps in training for proper implementation and maintenance of the 2004-2009 management plan.

Company Action/Auditor Observation:

A new 2004-2009 Compliance Strategy and Plan for the Nipissing Forest has been adopted. This document details a systematic approach to training and implementation for the five year period. Annual reports provide the necessary monitoring to assure compliance with the plan.

Status at July 07, 2004:

This recommendation is **closed** as a result of this annual audit.

4.1.5 Additional Conditions, Recommendations, and Observations

Additional CARS

Based upon this audit, the SCS team concludes that the issuance of no new Corrective Action Requests (CARs) is warranted.

Additional Recommendations

Based upon this audit and the closing of some of the CARS, the SCS team concludes that the issuance of 4 new recommendations is warranted:

Background/Justification: The SCS Team noted that the efforts made to develop continuing and productive working relationship agreements with the First Nations have been progressing well. One agreement had been signed prior to the audit and another following the audit. The 2003.1 CAR has been met; however, continued efforts to obtain additional agreements is the subject of the new recommendation. NFRM has demonstrated compliance with FSC Criterion 3.4 by their efforts, including the payment of the salary of the First Nations' representative on the audit field evaluation. Since completion of agreements with First Nations requires the interest and approval by the First Nations, NFRM must continue the effort to obtain productive working relationship agreements with all appropriate First Nations.	
Recommendation 2004.1	NFRM should demonstrate continued efforts to reaching agreements or other arrangements with all First Nations on the Nipissing Forest.
Reference	FSC Criterion 3.4

Background/Justification: The SCS Team observed severe residual stand damage, problems on cross drainage structures on tertiary roads, skid trail location and coverage problems, and poor application of the tree marking guidelines in Block 123.	
Recommendation 2004.2	Improved oversight by NFRM should be implemented on forest operations, operations layout, and implementation to reduce residual stand damage, improve installation, care and maintenance of cross drainage structures during operations, improve skid trail layout, and assure that the tree marking guidelines are correctly applied prior to harvest. A training program for tree markers should be implemented and monitoring of their mark in sale preparation should be done. This will be demonstrated by field review of logging operations.
Reference	FSC Criterion 5.3

Background/Justification: The SCS Team observed a trespass issue by NFRM onto adjacent land owner's property during the audit. There is a pending lawsuit and countersuit to settle the trespass. The trespass occurred due to an inaccurate boundary location on the ground. The ownership layer provided to the SFL by the OMNR is often inaccurate. OMNR must work to improve the accuracy of this information. Another potential trespass issue may arise if new LUPs are established and the SFL is not notified by OMNR and provided with timely and accurate data showing the location. A new boundary location approach has been implemented by NFRM in an attempt to prevent further trespasses until accurate data is acquired. As well, NFRM	
Recommendation	NFRM should work more closely with the OMNR to obtain

2004.3	accurate data related to land ownership and the establishment of LUPs. NFRM should also continue to use the new boundary location methodology to prevent future trespass conflicts.
Reference	FSC Criterion 1.5

4.1.6 General Conclusion of the Annual Audit

Based upon information gathered through site visits, interviews, and document reviews, the SCS audit team concludes that NFRM’s management of its concession on the Nipissing Forest continues to be in overall compliance with the FSC Principles and Criteria. Although aspects of NFRM’s management program remain deficient relative to the standard of certification, the SCS audit team has concluded from this annual audit that NFRM’s management is in general compliance with FSC Principles 1 through 9.

As such, continuation of the forest management certificate is warranted, subject to ongoing progress in closing out the conditions and CARs, and subject to subsequent annual audits.

5.0 PUBLIC INFORMATION ABOUT FOREST MANAGEMENT PLAN MONITORING

Public information concerning the management of the Nipissing Forest is available on the Nipissing website and by request at the local MNR District office. The full text and supplementary documentation for all provincial management plans can be found at the MNR information centre at Queen’s Park in Toronto

Appendix 1

Conversion English Units to Metric Units

Length Conversion Factors

To convert from	to	multiply by
mile (US Statute)	kilometer (km)	1.609347
inch (in)	millimeter (mm)	25.4 *
inch (in)	centimeter (cm)	2.54 *
inch (in)	meter (m)	0.0254 *
foot (ft)	meter (m)	0.3048 *
yard (yd)	meter (m)	0.9144 *

Area Conversion Factors

To convert from	to	multiply by
square foot (sq ft)	square meter (sq m)	0.09290304 E
square inch (sq in)	square meter (sq m)	0.00064516 E
square yard (sq yd)	square meter (sq m)	0.83612736 E
acre (ac)	hectare (ha)	0.4047

Volume Conversion Factors

Volume

To convert from	to	multiply by
cubic inch (cu in)	cubic meter (cu m)	0.00001639
cubic foot (cu ft)	cubic meter (cu m)	0.02831685
cubic yard (cu yd)	cubic meter (cu m)	0.7645549
gallon (gal)	liter	4.546
Canada liquid gallon (gal)	cubic meter (cu m)	0.004546
Canada liquid gallon (gal)	liter	3.7854118
U.S. liquid** gallon (gal)	cubic meter (cu m)	0.00378541
U.S. liquid fluid ounce (fl oz)	milliliters (ml)	29.57353
fluid ounce (fl oz)	cubic meter (cu m)	0.00002957

Mass Conversion Factors

pound (lb)	kilogram (kg)	0.4535924
avoirdupois		
ton, 2000 lb	kilogram (kg)	907.1848
grain	kilogram (kg)	0.0000648

Temperature Conversion Factors

degree Fahrenheit (F)	degree Celsius (C)	$t_c = (t_F - 32) / 1.8$
degree Fahrenheit (F)	kelvin (K)	$t_k = (t_F + 459.7) / 1.8$
kelvin (K)	degree Celsius (C)	$t_c = t_k - 273.15$

Velocity

mile per hour (mph)	kilometer per hour(km/hr)	1.60934
mile per hour (mph)	meter per second (m/s)	0.44704

1 acre	= 0.404686 hectares
1,000 acres	= 404.686 hectares
1 board foot	= 0.00348 cubic meters
1,000 board feet	= 3.48 cubic meters
1 cubic foot	= 0.028317cubic meters
1,000 cubic feet	= 28.317 cubic meters

Breast height = 1.4 meters, or 4 1/2 feet, above ground level

Although 1,000 board feet is theoretically equivalent to 2.36 cubic meters, this is true only when a board foot is actually a piece of wood with a volume 1/12 of cubic foot. The conversion given here, 3.48 cubic meters, is based on the cubic volume of a log 16 feet long and 15 inches in diameter inside bark at the small end.