

Nipissing Forest Local Citizens Committee Meeting
Location: M.N.R. Boardroom
Date: January 18, 2011

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

AGENDA

1. 5:30 P.M. Call to order.
2. Approval of the agenda.
3. Review and approval of the minutes of November 16, 2010.
4. Presentation of the 2011-12 Nipissing Forest Annual Work Schedule – Mark Lockhart (20 min)
5. Public Consultation Concerns and discussion – Guylaine Thauvette (30 min)
6. Invasive Species (follow up from last meeting) – Guylaine Thauvette (10 min)
7. EBR – Brennain Lloyd (10 min)
8. Correspondence
9. LCC Members – open discussion
10. Next meeting date: Chair Chris Mayne
11. ADJOURNMENT

1. Call to Order

Chair Lorie Reed called the meeting to order at 5:25 p.m. announcing that we would proceed with item **4** of the agenda first, as Mark Lockhart could not stay for the entire meeting tonight.

4. Presentation of the 2011-12 Nipissing Forest Annual Work Schedule – Mark Lockhart (Attachment #1 – Draft 2011-12 Annual Work Schedule)

Guylaine provided LCC with handouts of the slide presentation that Mark presented to us. The Annual Work Schedule (**AWS**) is presented to the LCC each year to let us know what forest operations will be taking place for the upcoming fiscal year (April 1, 2011 – March 31, 2012).

The AWS document presented tonight is a draft as it is currently being reviewed by MNR for final approval. Some modifications may be required to this document which will be made available for public viewing once MNR approval has been given.

The AWS describes all manner of operations that are proposed including;

- Harvesting under various prescriptions (clear cut, shelterwood, seed tree cut, selection cut, etc.) once stands have been properly evaluated and marked for harvest.
- Renewal operations (site preparation both mechanical and chemical, and planting).
- Tending through manual and chemical methods, (thinning cuts of forest stands or spraying herbicides to reduce broadleaf plant competition).
- Renewal support through cone collection for seed, arranging for planting stock from nurseries, conducting regeneration surveys to determine effectiveness of renewal prescriptions used and participating in tree improvement research projects (Gurd Twp).

- Forest protection via slash pile burning to reduce fire risk and the application of chemicals or biological controls where necessary to control insect outbreaks. (no burning occurred last year so an attempt will be made to burn slash piles in this AWS).
- Access road location proposals for all primary and secondary roads including culvert and bridge installations or removals required.
- Water crossing decommissioning where crossings (bridges and culverts) proposed for removal, must also be identified in the table "AWS - 2," (2 crossings on operational roads slated in this plan).
- Aggregate pit locations (sand and gravel) for forest operations road building and maintenance must also be identified in the AWS.

Mark described the areas where all these operations were planned to take place by operator and block numbers and he also posted maps on the walls to allow LCC members to see the locations proposed for the various operations.

Questions and Concerns;

Planting stock origin- Tracey Cain asked if any of the stock was being grown in British Columbia. Mark indicated that he believed it was all being grown by PRT nurseries in Dryden, Ontario. This could be a sustainability issue in terms of our carbon footprint (fuel used to ship our seedlings from B.C. when many nurseries exist here in N.E.Ontario). Tracey had asked for clarification of this matter last year as well and Mark stated he'd get an answer on this for the LCC.

Herbicide use reduction - Brennain Lloyd requested clarification of how much total area would be subjected to chemical application in this AWS and reminded Mark that there was an undertaking in place to significantly reduce our reliance on herbicide use in the Nipissing Forest by 2012. Mark indicated that a short term increase in the herbicide application levels were required on the management unit, due to a lack of application in the recent past- and as a result, a loss of some plantation and regenerating shelterwood areas on the forest. Approximately 4,234 ha has been planned for in this AWS. Nipissing Forest Resource Management Incorporated (**NFRMInc.**) is in the process of developing a herbicide application policy in conjunction with objective #39 in the 2009 FMP, due for 2011.

Roads and bridge removal – several LCC members requested clarification on what was deemed a public access road and how decisions were made to decommission bridges that the public were relying on for access to cottages, etc. Lorie Reed stated that this was a larger topic than we had time for at present, that it would be of interest to some absent LCC members and would be addressed at a future meeting when they could also be present. Guylaine Thauvette and Randy McLaren indicated that they would be prepared to speak to these matters at a future meeting.

Changes requested on the slides presented

Slide labeled "2010 tree planting totals" – should be changed as the slide shows the use of styroblock planting containers which are not environmentally friendly and which are not in use on the Nipissing Forest. (requested by Tracey Cain).

Slide labeled "Renewal Support-Planting Stock Production" needs to either have photos of a PRT greenhouse operation inserted or be properly labeled as Webb's Greenhouses.

(requested by Tracey Cain). (Note: this slide was also used in last year's AWS presentation and the same request for changes had been made at that time). Slide labeled "Public Inspection" (last slide) – the wording and dates require changes as highlighted in the following;

First Sentence "The public may **view** the AWS from approximately **March 15th to March 31.**"

Last Sentence "the public may **view** the AWS at the MNR office or the NFRM office Callander.

Mark Lockhart answered many questions during the presentation but he will get back to LCC with the answers to some questions for which no information was present. Mark also offered to prepare a summary of the AWS for distribution to LCC.

2. Approval of the Agenda and Introductions

The agenda was approved as distributed with no add on items requested.

Chair Lorie Reed asked all present to introduce themselves for the benefit of some of our newest members.

3. Review and approval of the minutes of November 16, 2010

Guylaine quickly reviewed our last minutes on the boardroom screen. No amendments were requested and these minutes were accepted as circulated in Draft form to the LCC on November 28, 2010. That copy of the minutes will now become your final version. Please contact Gerry if you wish to have a fresh copy of these minutes for your files.

5. Public Consultation Concerns and discussion – Guylaine Thauvette

Guylaine prefaced her presentation by reminding LCC that these discussions are confidential and are not to be shared with the public. In the case of complaints, we are not to disclose the name of a complainant or disclose information that could lead to the complainant's identity.

Guylaine sought input from LCC to suggest possible improvements to MNR's communication methods in announcing forest management activities to the public. Her request arose from an issue in the Tilden Lake area when Nipissing Forest Resource Management Inc met with the local roads board for Yellowstone Road near Tilden Lake to discuss upcoming forest harvesting operations in the area. Many present stated that they had not been made aware of logging operation proposals for the immediate area despite MNR having conducted a Forest Management Planning meeting with Tilden Lake residents several years earlier.

The process followed by MNR was as follows;

From late 2006 and throughout 2007 and 2008, MNR sent out notices on five separate occasions. They placed newspaper advertisements announcing the forest management planning process as well as did direct mail outs to contact individual landowners and others who had an interest in the area. (trappers, tourist operators, etc.). This is a costly process at \$3,000 for each set of four newspaper ads and another \$2,000 for each of the five mail outs. Approximately 700 landowners were notified by mail and 200

responses were received asking to be kept on the mailing list for more information as it became available. Some of the respondents were now apparently upset because they were not aware that logging would occur near their property, despite the communication they had received to date.

Guylaine stated that the letters sent out to people also contained copies of the newspaper ads announcing the FMP review provisions and the AWS viewing opportunities for the areas being harvested.

The complaint has resulted in MNR asking what more can be done to inform the public of forest management operations in the area. Guylaine displayed copies of the generic letter sent out to the public as well as a copy of the newspaper ads involved.

Observations and Suggestions

Describe the operations more clearly - While the generic letter states that forest management operations will be conducted in a specific area, Tracey Cain suggested that people unfamiliar with the term "forest management operations" may be unaware that the phrase includes logging. A suggestion was made to have the letter become more specific in nature by describing cutting operations clearly as logging/harvesting operations, to give readers a heads up on what is meant by forest management operations in their immediate area.

One contact approach – The LCC felt it would be beneficial to give the public one name and number to contact in both the letter and the published ads. Current ads seem to list every person and company involved in the planning process, leaving the general public unsure of whom to contact. A one window approach may be found to be more effective.

Map size is an issue – The maps in the newspaper ads do not clearly define specific operating areas, Dave Minden suggested that map size and definition could be enhanced by removing all the unnecessary contact names to the left of the published map. This could certainly be facilitated by incorporating the one window approach mentioned above.

Use of alternate media – Dave Minden also suggested that not everyone subscribes to the Nugget locally and folks who live elsewhere likely don't receive it. Several other suggestions came from the group such as exploring possibilities of advertising on Bay Today, COGECO cable network, Kijiji Flyers on internet, hard copy flyer delivery by Canada Post or to include our information with other provincial or municipal mail outs. (i.e. Flyer insertion with hydro bills or property tax assessment notices to get the message out to more individuals). It became clear that not a single system would reach everyone.

Key messaging – It was felt that key messaging that needed to get out to the public included the information that the Forest Management Plan was a negotiated document having required two years of negotiations with the various identified interest groups, to get to the final plan stage. That crown lands are licensed for harvesting with Areas of Concern identified to protect values and that licensed companies have an obligation to harvest areas according to the approved FMP to keep the forest resource sustainable.

Conclusion - Guylaine thanked the LCC for its input and will look into these suggestions to help improve communications to the public.

She concluded this segment by advising LCC that the main complainant in this issue was found to have been properly contacted and advised of the planned forest operations. Some careful discussions between Georgia Pacific (the licence holder), the MNR and the complainant involved some give and take on all sides to resolve this complaint and the harvesting operations will proceed as approved...with some slight modifications. The area will be a winter cut so tourism disruption should be minimized in the area. Guylaine provided the group with details not being recorded here, to help us safeguard confidentiality.

- 6. Invasive Species** (follow up from last meeting) – Guylaine Thauvette
Guylaine advised the LCC that she had learned that the lead agency for invasive species in the province was the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters (**O.F.A.H.**) and that a representative could possibly come to make a presentation on this topic to LCC in March if we could narrow down our area of interest. (specify the topics we'd like to see covered). Discussion seemed to indicate that our main interest lay with invasive plant species...purple loosestrife, hogweed, garlic mustard...but there is also interest in the status and spread of an insect, the emerald ash borer.

Several members still desire information on noxious weed species as well. Questions of how plants are declared noxious weeds and what that means in terms of landowner responsibility to remove, them still exists. Elwyn Behnke cited the confusion over milkweed as one example. It is apparently only declared a noxious weed in some parts of Ontario while being protected in Nipissing. Gerry VL suggested that the Ministry of Agriculture and Food might still be the lead agency for declaration of noxious weeds.

Guylaine offered to do some follow up on these topics to see what presentations might be arranged for future meetings.

- 7. Environmental Bill of Rights (EBR) postings** – Brennain Lloyd
(Handout provided)
Brennain provided members with a handout of the EBR postings of interest, posted between the period of April 30, 2010 up to December 30, 2010. Key postings include;
010-9932 – A new Guide for Crown Land Use Planning (MNR policy proposal)
011-0112 – Bird and bird habitats – Guidelines for wind power projects (MNR policy proposal)
010-9448 – Amendment proposals to declaration orders affecting forest management on Crown lands in Ontario under MOE's Environmental Assessment Act (MNR Information Notice)
011-1437 – New process for claim staking and recording under the Mining Act (MNDMF regulation proposal)
010-7614 – Modernizing the Ont. Forest Tenure and Pricing System (MNDMF Policy Decision) NOTE: See Forest Tenure and Pricing update under item 9 below.

- 8. Correspondence**
No correspondence received since the last meeting.

9. LCC Members – open discussion

Forest Tenure and Pricing – Tracey Cain stated that a Jan.13, 2011 article in the newsletter called the Working Forest, covered an announcement made by MNDMF Minister Michael Gravelle that Ontario will introduce new legislation later in 2011 that will modernize the Ontario forest tenure and pricing system. The proposed legislation will create two new bodies;

Local Forest Management Corporations (LFMCs) –government agencies that will manage Crown forests and oversee competitive sales of the timber in a given area and, Enhanced Shareholder Sustainable Forest Licences (ESSFLs)- made up of mills and harvesters who would collectively form a new company to manage Crown forests under the Sustainable Forest Licence issued to them. (See attached electronic Supplement on forest tenure revision provided by Tracey).

Boreal Forest agreement – Dave Minden advised the group that the current issue of Canadian Geographic magazine (Jan-Feb 2011) contains an interesting article outlining the agreements recently reached between governments and forestry companies to curtail harvesting operations in 29,000,000 ha of the boreal forest region. The main reason for the agreement was to protect Species at Risk, in particular, woodland caribou herds within Ontario and Quebec.

Here is the link if you wish to read it on line – just “copy” and “paste” the following URL address onto your internet address bar and the magazine article should be accessible.

<http://www.canadiangeographic.ca/magazine/jf11/default.asp>

Training and Education – Chair Lorie Reed observed that we have not been recording training and education initiatives in our minutes over the past year, as required in our Terms of Reference. He is concerned that we might be found lacking in these categories if we are subjected to an audit of our LCC program. Lorie suggests that we build a training component into each meeting agenda from now on.

DISCUSSION: It was felt that while training and education has occurred at various meetings and field trips this year, it was not felt necessary to go back and re-label these activities in our previous minutes. The minutes have been approved as presented in the past and we won't reopen them to make such amendments.

Brennain suggested that we work on developing a training plan by first identifying our training needs and then building this training into our future meeting plans by inviting the right speakers to deliver it.

10. Next meeting date: Chair Chris Mayne

Tuesday February 15, 2011 – 5:00 p.m. supper/ 5:30 p.m. meeting start - MNR boardroom.

11. ADJOURNMENT – 7:45 p.m.