

Nipissing Forest Local Citizens Committee Meeting
Location: M.N.R Boardroom
Date: November 16, 2010

INTEREST	Primary Member	P/A	Alternate Member	P/A	Others Present
Access groups, Anglers/Hunters	Lloyd Anderson	P	Peter Foy	A	MNR Staff: Guylaine Thauvette Randy McLaren Robin Hill SFL: Support Resources Mark Lockhart – support resources NFRM Guests: Observer: Recorder: Gerry Van Leeuwen c.c. Peter Street, NFRM Inc. Dave Payne, MNR
Cottagers	Dave Minden	P	Derek Stewart	P	
District Aboriginal Working Group	Dave Joannis	A	Clayton Dokis	A	
Education	Jan Vandermeer	A	VACANT	N/A	
Environmental Groups	Jan Vandermeer	A	Brennain Lloyd	A	
Independent Loggers	Elwyn Behnke	P	Blayne Behnke	A	
Local Cultural Heritage Groups	Roy Summers	P	J. Fred McNutt	P	
Municipalities, Chmbrs of Comm, Econ. Development	Chris Mayne	P	Sarah Campbell	A	
Naturalists	Lorie Reed	P	Roy Summers	P	
Prospectors, Mining/Aggregates	Frank Tagliamonte	P	Mike Roxborough	A	
Public at Large	Tracey Cain	P	Tim Toepfner	A	
Silvicultural Contractors	Andy Straughan	P	VACANT	N/A	
Sustainable Forest Licensee – Nipissing Forest R. Mgmt. Inc.	John McNutt	P	Peter Street	A	
Tourist Industry	Johnny Matthews	P	VACANT	N/A	
Trails	Jennifer McCourt	P	Tracey Cain	P	
Trappers & Baitfish	Heinz Erb	A	VACANT	N/A	
Wood Workers/Trade Unions	VACANT	N/A	VACANT	N/A	

AGENDA

1. 5:30 P.M. Call to order.
2. Approval of the agenda.
3. Review and approval of the minutes of September 21, 2010.
4. 2010 Local Citizens Committee Provincial Report – Guylaine Thauvette (10 min)
5. Filling LCC Vacancies – Guylaine Thauvette (15 min)
6. Update on FMP Amendments and AWS revisions –Guylaine Thauvette (15 min)
7. Forest Compliance Presentation – Robin Hill (30 min)
8. EBR –Brennain Lloyd (10 min)
9. Correspondence
10. LCC Members – open discussion
11. Next meeting date: Chair Lorie Reed
12. ADJOURNMENT

1. Call to Order

Co-chair Chris Mayne called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m.

2. Approval of the agenda

The agenda was approved as posted although we're not sure if Brennain will be present this evening to present Environmental Bill of Rights postings.

3. Review and approval of the minutes of September 21, 2010

Guylaine quickly ran through a copy of the last minutes on the projection screen. No amendments were requested and these Minutes were accepted as circulated to the membership in draft version on September 30, 2010. That copy will now become your final version. Please contact Gerry if you require a fresh copy.

4. 2010 Local Citizens Committee Provincial Report – Guylaine Thauvette

Guylaine presented an excerpt from the last State of the Forest Report (a very large document) which dealt with the province-wide survey of LCC members this past spring. Answers from individual members were solicited and compiled into regional and provincial summaries. Our individual responses were not compiled for a district summary as we did not collate the data locally for that purpose this year. The report compared responses from similar surveys conducted in 2001, 2004 and 2010 in an attempt to see if LCC's felt that their input was worthwhile and being listened to. Other questions dealt with determining the actual make up of LCC membership dealing with such things as the average age and the average years of experience of LCC members. Guylaine demonstrated how one could interpret the graphs of the province-wide responses and offered to supply

copies of this part of the report to any LCC member who might be interested in reviewing it. Please contact Guylaine directly if copies are desired.

Chris Mayne asked if any part of the report reflected on whether or not MNR was pleased with the role the LCCs were performing.

Guylaine responded that while MNR staff are asked to suggest changes to the role of LCCs from time to time, MNR is not asked how effective they feel LCCs are.

5. Filling LCC Vacancies – Guylaine Thauvette

Guylaine reviewed the current chart of LCC membership, showing the positions occupied by representatives and their alternates. She has been actively involved in recruiting new members in most categories that currently show vacancies.

Two new members joined our ranks tonight and we were pleased to welcome J. Fred McNutt as the new alternate representative for local cultural heritage groups and Derek Stewart as our alternate to represent cottagers.

We will have to let Sarah Campbell leave her alternate position in representing municipalities, chambers of commerce and economic development due to her recent loss in the local municipal election. Guylaine will notify Sarah of this.

Guylaine also solicited input to help update the information of current members and she will revise the chart accordingly.

A question was raised from the floor on what standard of participation was required in order for a member to be retained on the LCC. It was believed that the Terms of Reference indicated that missing three LCC meetings per year would initiate a review of that member's interest and future participation.

Guylaine and co-chairs Chris Mayne and Lorie Reed may need to review our attendance records at some time in the near future to determine if some membership changes may be needed.

6. Update on FMP Amendments and AWS revisions –Guylaine Thauvette

Guylaine placed an electronic chart up on the screen to show the LCC what Forest Management Plan (**FMP**) Amendments had been processed and what Annual Work Schedule (**AWS**) Revisions had been processed to the current Nipissing FMP. She conducted a quick review of the overall process and how it is intended to work.

Our current Forest Management Plan runs for ten years from 2009 until 2019. That plan was subjected to widespread public review prior to its approval in its present state. Nipissing Forest Resource Management Inc. prepares the Annual Work Schedules (AWS) for each operating year in the FMP to select forest management operations that will occur in that year. No plan is ever static and the FMP will from time to time need to be changed to reflect new forest composition information, market demands or respond to natural forest losses

caused by forest fires, insects, disease, etc. When such changes called AMENDMENTS are proposed to the ten year FMP they are first classified into one of three categories. **1) Administrative Amendments** are generally those that deal with wording changes in the FMP document itself or changes that are not likely to be of concern to the public. (Administrative amendments therefore do not need to be subjected to public review). **2) Minor Amendments** are those that will change some part of the "on the ground" forest operations previously approved in the FMP and that are likely of interest to the public. For instance, a company may request that stands already approved for cutting in three years time in the FMP be substituted for forest stands scheduled for harvest this year in the FMP due to some justifiable need. These Minor amendments are advertised in local media to give the public an opportunity to become aware of them and to provide input into the proposal within two weeks of advertising them. **3) Major amendments** are those that are of such a nature that their impact was not the subject of public review during the creation of the FMP. An example of this may be the proposal to build a new main haul road through an area not previously approved for this in the current FMP. A major amendment requires advertising of the proposal, holding public information centres where public comment on the proposed change is received by MNR, and then sending the proposal revised with public input back out for final public review and comment. The decision to approve such an amendment rests with the MNR's Regional Director. LCCs have an important role to play in many FMP Amendments as they review the particular proposal and recommend to the MNR District Manager the category that they feel the proposed amendment should fall in to.

Administrative FMP amendments are not usually discussed at LCC and the annual review that Guylaine is conducting with us today is designed to let LCC know of the Administrative amendments that have been proposed and/or been approved to date.

Currently we have a number of FMP Amendments in process. Amendment 2009-09 is classified as a minor amendment but is quite complex and will take some time to be approved.

Revisions to the Annual Work Schedule documents (AWS) which run from April 1 until March 31 in the following year do not require public review as the overall operations have already been approved within the FMP. AWS Revisions therefore merely are needed to fine tune already approved operations on the ground. These are also contained in the chart Guylaine presented to us today. *Numbering system* - FMP amendments are sequentially numbered according to the first year of the ten year plan, hence 2009-01, 2009-02 etc. Over the ten year life of the FMP we may see some 30 or 40 proposed amendments to it.

AWS revisions always appear with the AWS operating year associated with it, so revisions to the AWS running from April 1, 2010 until March 31, 2011 (the operating year) will always be numbered 2010-01 or 2010-02 and will often appear under the FMP Amendment number that has necessitated them. (This is easier to understand when you have the chart in front of you).

7. Forest Compliance Presentation – Robin Hill

(Attachment #1 – Forest Operations Compliance Program)

Robin presented a slide show on the way in which forest operations compliance is conducted in the field by Nipissing Forest Resources Management Inc. and the MNR. The Forest Compliance handbook was updated in April 2010 and a new version of **FOIP** (Forest Operations Information Program) was implemented at that time. Under the new manual, issues of non-compliance with the FMP (Forest Management Plan) or the AWS (Annual Work Schedule) are now termed "**operational issues.**" Certified inspectors from both organizations review "on the ground" forest operations occasionally and if an operational issue is discovered, a FOIP report is completed and entered into the provincial FOIP data base which tracks the nature of each issue and how each is addressed.

The compliance process is a fairly complex system of checks and balances including a verification process that MNR uses to confirm or reject a reported operational issue.

If an operational issue is confirmed by MNR, it must determine if the issue is correctable or if mitigation is possible. If correctable the MNR and the licence holder will consult and determine what corrective measures must be taken. It is up to the licence holder to determine how correction will be accomplished. When an issue is deemed non-correctable, or if mitigation is required OR when the licensee refuses to do the work required in a correctable operational issue, the licensee will be subject to one of five administrative penalty remedies available or will be taken to court for the offence. (Please review the attachment).

8. EBR –Brennain Lloyd

No updates available, Brennain was unable to attend.

9. Correspondence

No correspondence received since our last meeting.

10. LCC Members – Open Discussion

October Field Trip report – Dave Minden and Lorie Reed reported on what was felt to have been a very interesting field trip to the Sand Dam Road area north of the city. We first viewed a rehabilitated water crossing where Tembec had

removed a bridge and trenched the bridge road approaches at an angle, to help divert rain water run off into straw bails placed in the trenches to filter water before it entered the bush or the brook trout stream being protected. Large logs placed across the roadbed, parallel to the stream, also anchored sheets of filter cloth to further protect the creek from erosion run off.

Unfortunately, it appeared that ATV enthusiasts, likely hunters, sawed through the logs, removed the filter cloth and ran their ATVs through the creek despite company efforts to protect it.

Our second stop was to view an experiment involving whole tree removal in a hardwood stand. It was observed that the process was still falling short in meeting the 80% stocking standard required to be deemed a success. The tree tops and limbs from this operation were either being chipped or put through a grinder. The chips (used as wood pulp) and ground wood (used as hog fuel) at the mills. Piles of both materials were viewed on site.

We then viewed a public fuel wood area designed to allow members of the public to cut their own firewood in stands felt unsuitable for use by the companies. Such sites are laid out close to road ways and require members of the public to purchase a personal use fuel wood permit before gaining access to and cutting at such sites. The boundaries of the fuel wood area are clearly marked to contain the cutting within the delineated boundaries.

Our last stop involved viewing and AOC (Area of Concern) area laid out to protect a possible canoe route corridor along the Little Jocko River. The prescription was for a 30 metre no cut reserve along both sides of the river, followed by 30 metre wide strip cuts alternating with 30 metre "leave strips" (buffers) in the zone found 30 -60 metres from the creek edge, with clear cutting allowed beyond the 60 metre zone. The prescription was felt to be a good one for this site but might not have done the job had the backshore been steeper according to Dave.

SUGGESTION: Chris Mayne asked if we could consider reviewing AOC prescriptions at a future meeting. Guylaine agreed that this could be arranged.

Noxious weeds and Invasive Species - Elwyn Behnke voiced concern that there was a fair bit of confusion surrounding noxious plants. He stated that milkweed was considered an undesirable weed in some areas while being protected in others. He also wondered why no agency seemed to be controlling weeds such as purple loosestrife, long considered to be an invasive exotic species that should be controlled. Shouldn't LCC be concerned about the spread of such plants? (Giant hogweed also mentioned).

Guylaine explained that while noxious weeds and invasive species were being discovered, control was generally the responsibility of the affected land owner.

Various government agencies produce publications on how to control many such plants.

SUGGESTION: Guylaine suggested that we might like to bring in a speaker on invasive species in future.

Carbon Tax Credit - Frank Tagliamonte read a letter from a colleague who objects to the implementation of carbon tax credits saying that volcanoes have put more carbon into the atmosphere over recent years than all the activities of man since his creation. The letter was presented to show that there is still an opposing view point to the theory of climate change being a human caused event and the author accused governments of fear mongering to justify the implementation of carbon tax credits and offsets which could affect all industrialized nations.

Forest Stewardship Certification Audits – Roy Summers reported on his tour of various forestry operations sites visited during the audit process of Nipissing Forest Resources Management Inc. His presentation unfortunately would not run on the computer in our board room so he advised us that he would post it on his webpage. The crew inspected 2 bridges on the Klocks Road system, viewed a site where Nipissing First Nation is planning to construct a wood fuel pellet manufacturing facility and visited pine stand operations off the Orlig Road system where GPS units were being used by operators to locate skid trails. They also viewed the Sinton Creek area where a new branch road had been approved/constructed because a proposed water crossing was found to need a larger bridge than first expected. (cost prohibitive crossing). At a white pine shelter wood cut site in Chudley they discussed the problem of herbaceous competition and the presence of white pine blister rust. Good operations were observed near Warren and overall, it was felt that the tour went well and that no major issues are expected for the certification process.

11. Next meeting date: Chair Lorie Reed

Tuesday, January 18, 2010 – 5:00 p.m. supper/ 5:30 p.m. meeting start.
MNR Boardroom

12. ADJOURNMENT – 7:46 p.m.