

Forest Certification Advisory Group
Z809-08 Meeting #3
Algonquins of Ontario Office, Pembroke
April 3/4, 2012

Tuesday April 3

4:00 pm - 5:00 pm

Pole Plant Tour – Herb Shaw and Sons - Pembroke



A.



B.



C.



D.



E.

A) Dana Shaw (second from left) presenting poles manufactured from red pine trees managed in Algonquin Park to Advisory Group. B) Kevin Sarazin (right) peeling a red pine pole as he describes how the pole peeler operates to Tom and Lacey. C) Larry Rose (operating chainsaw) and Gary Sarazin (holding tape measure) demonstrate to the Group how a peeled pole is trimmed to final product specification. D) Dana (front-left) explains how he completes his final assessment of the peeled pole before Darrell Leach (Cary-Lift Operator) places on rack to be air-dried in the yard (E).

Meeting – Algonquins of Ontario Office Wednesday April 4, 2012

Present: Deb Cumming, Barry Bridgeford, Anne Mundy, Emmett Godin, Danny Janke, Terry Mullin, Joe Yaraskavitch, Irvin Yateman, Lacey Rose, Shaun Dombroskie, Tom Clark (Tom), Richard Zohr, Randy Malcolm, John Doering, Tom Ballantine (Tom B), Bob Craftchick, Doreen Davis, Dan Kohoko (Algonquins of Pikwakanagan), Jerry LaValley (Algonquins of Pikwakanagan), Jeff Leavey (Observer), Dana Shaw, Shari Sokay, Steve D'eon, Gord Cumming.

Regrets: Nathan Mieske, Dave Commanda, Don Spring, Clifford Bastein

Richard- provided an introduction to the Algonquins of Ontario facility, began by sharing with the Advisory Group that every meeting begins with an opening prayer and closes with a closing prayer. The mural on the wall is a collection of advice from Elders to keep ourselves grounded through discussions at meetings. The centre piece is a collection of medicines from nature to help heal.

Bob- feels that the Algonquins have been dictated to in other forums, felt that it is important now to take time to invite this Advisory Group to Algonquin culture, and stated that our prayer is part of Algonquin culture.

Doreen -led the opening prayer.

1. Approval of March Minutes

Everyone provided a short introduction and background for the new members.

Tom- emphasised to the Group that we have a heavy agenda. Main focus today is working through Criterion 1 and 2 of the VOIT matrix. Went over the handouts provided and advised the group to insert pages into the binder under the Meeting 3 tab.

Omissions:

Joe – minor typos observed, pg. 5 missing a comma. Gord – comma addition has been corrected with the latest copy.

Tom – new members can use past meeting minutes to follow along and catch up, emphasised that this Group is really building upon work from previous Advisory Group efforts putting together last SFM Plan. Wording in new Standard speaks to incorporating mandatory indicators and these new indicators will need input from members on how best to measure them. Mandatory discussion topics are also a requirement of the new standard.

Meeting 2 Minutes were accepted by Advisory Group.

2. VOITs - Criterion 1 and 2

Tom –the plan is to dive right into the VOIT matrix. If any new members have questions please ask.

Gord – Last meeting we covered the applicable background material prepared during the development of the Forest Management Plan (FMP). Parallels between the FMP and the SFM planning process were re-emphasised. The Algonquins around the table are familiar with the FMP process through their experience on the planning team.

We need to circle back on a couple of indicators under Element 1.1 & 1.4. Group was advised not to worry about the numbering of Indicators in the VOIT Matrix at this stage – the numbering will be finalized at the end of the process. The challenge is to look carefully at the VOIT wording and ensure they fit in under the appropriate Element.

The Group was advised that the mandatory indicators have been highlighted in yellow and in most cases fit well under the old objectives.

Element 1.1 Ecosystem Diversity: Maintaining Non-forest Ecosystems

Gord - suggested that for this indicator an area target be set at >57,575 ha for non-productive ground, over time (level derived from the 2000 FMP). The amount of non-productive ground is not heavily influenced by forest management activities. This clause in the Standard is mainly intended for intensively managed areas to grow trees by perhaps draining wetlands - not applicable to Algonquin Park. A table was presented to the Group that showed the level of non-productive forest over time in the Park's natural and management zone.

Barry – which period in time would be more accurate? Do you think a recent period of time be more applicable? Gord – explained the change in area is mainly a result of a digital park boundary change forwarded by Land Surveyors office. Joe- cautioned the Group of the new forthcoming inventory update will likely change levels again (e.g. past photo Interpreter may have called it treed muskeg and new Interpreter may call it a spruce stand based on better quality imagery). Best to select an amount based on historical information that could be maintained over time and to be prepared for this anticipated change when new inventory is adopted.

Deb – AFA has no control over amount? Gord – no, consistent with defined forest area approach. Joe- point here is that we have it in our forest and we maintain levels over time.

Dan Kohoko – what are the implications of failing an Indicator? Gord – we are audited once a year, having either a Registration or Surveillance Audit. AFA's achievements are measured and we as managers must submit commentary on failures to rationalize sustainability. Auditor ultimately decides whether or not forest sustainability has been compromised. Tom – auditors would be forgiving in a case where the area of non-productive ground dropped below a set level due to changes made to an updated inventory.

Bob- where is the balance when area is lost from changes made as a result of “Lighten the Footprint”? Gord – a final decision on “Lighten the Footprint” direction has not been made by MNR. Other than “allocation deferrals” that have been made in the 2010 FMP, we will be addressing this here.

Lacy – need to allow a higher % variance, to allow for increased beaver activity flooding low-lying productive forests? Joe- suggested a variance of +/- 20%

Jerry – how did we lose 17 ha of rock? Gord – change in the location of the digital Park boundary before development of the last FMP.

Group suggested a variance of +/- 5% to allow for anticipated changes due to new inventory.

Forest Area by Seral Stage

Gord – proposed that using all of the landscape classes from the FMP (as discussed at the last meeting) is too much for this process. At the last meeting we discussed the lack of pre-sapling forest issue and were undecided on this VOIT. Over the last month Gord spoke to Steve, Lacey and Joe about our options here and have decided to propose two indicators for seral stages – young and old forest. No need for indicators for immature/mature forest which contains most of area and will continue as a result of the type of management we do. Young forest – go with the “pre-sapling/sapling/T-stage” forest group target – able to meet the $\geq 75\%$ NB level. Old forest – go with $\geq 75\%$ NB of old growth level for each even-aged forest unit. See description in VOIT Matrix.

Steve – explain “T” stage? Gord – stands for “two-story condition” – young forest developing under the shelterwood harvest system, has 2 stories – understory and overstory. There are wildlife habitat benefits to both of these conditions which are recognized in the SFMM habitat matrix. The group reviewed the pre-sapling/sapling/T-stage graph that was produced from the forest management planning process. Graph had a timeline of 160 years, this period used to forecast the forest condition and blue line is the natural benchmark trend.

Steve – sounds like a good solution. Gord - Showed Site Region 5E map having Seral stages for the region (provincial picture). Levels are consistent with what we have in Algonquin Park (area by seral stage present for Algonquin Park).

Gord – that wraps up the first Element of 1.1.

Element 1.2 Species Diversity

Gord – Showed a Course Filter /Fine Filter diagram. Illustration shows conceptual approach to managing the forest at large and small scales. The idea here is if we maintain landscape conditions, we maintain ecosystem diversity. The visual is a good introduction to next part of VOIT Matrix and into fine filter type indicators in the Standard. Fine Filter or forest management at small scales are site specific and are mainly dealt with through Areas of Concern (AOC) prescriptions – table FMP-14 in the FMP.

Degree of Suitable Habitat in the Long-term for Selected Focal Species

Gord – this course filter long-term indicator is a similar approach to indicators worked through Element 1.1 - same natural benchmark trend emulation approach. Showed graphs for selected wildlife species modelled during production of FMP. The variety of species uses a variety of habitat types. Additions to the list were suggested by Eco-Watch and subsequently added. As a result, the list is a bit skewed to species that prefer an old growth condition. A few anomalies need to be discussed:

Black Bear Summer Habitat: Black Bear summer habitat is best created through large disturbances such as wildfire or clearcuts. Neither event is common on the Algonquin landscape. The declining trend is

directly linked to the projected declines in the presapling forest condition (preferred black bear summer habitat). The modelling of the MWUS and SFUS forest units as uniform shelterwood limits the ability of the model to create this habitat condition. These forest units do contain preferred BLBE habitat, however this is not being created in the model because following the final removal cut, a sapling condition is created. The group shelterwood approach for intolerant tree species within these forest units will increase the presapling habitat on the forest, benefiting black bear foraging and result in movement towards the desirable levels of this pre-sapling habitat condition. For these reasons the BLBE target was set at the highest level possible that can be sustained by the proposed management strategy which balances social, environmental and economic objectives.

Recent research suggests that black bear densities in Algonquin Park range from 20 to 50 bears per 100km², well within the averages for Ontario. This means Algonquin Park probably has a population of over 2,500 resident Black Bears.

Moose Foraging Habitat: Forest management undoubtedly creates forage and browse for Moose. This is reflected both in the SFMM modelling for moose foraging areas as well as on the ground. Moose surveys in recently harvested areas of Algonquin often yield high numbers of moose. The SFMM modelling for moose forage indicates substantially higher levels of forage with forest management when compared to the natural benchmark run.

For moose foraging desirable levels have met for all terms. The natural benchmark run is projected to drop dramatically over the first three terms, primarily due to the succession of preferred T and U stage moose foraging habitat in the SFMM model. The model is also unable to simulate disturbances or future U-stage in selection forest units. This underestimates the amount of moose browse that would be available on the landscape in the natural benchmark scenario making it a weak indicator. As a result a straight line desirable level and target of 97,000 ha has been set which is within 80% of the current level over time. This level represents the highest level possible that can be sustained by the proposed management strategy which balances social, environmental and economic objectives.

The 2012 Moose Aerial Inventory Report was reviewed in which the Algonquins participated in the data collection. Interesting note: population projections in the FMP are very similar to actual moose density numbers collected in the survey.

Bob –as part of the Moose Inventory Report, there is a Hair Loss Survey. Asked if people are passing through the Park to report moose with no hair or showing hair loss.

Gord – except for the two species mentioned, every other species preferred habitat modelled falls in-line above target level. Deb – seems skewed too much to promoting old growth condition? Pre-sapling condition helps meet diversity and seems to me that there needs to be a drive to encourage and give more attention to address short-fall? The level of pre-sapling condition would increase if small clearcuts were created? Joe – model is a model and FMP Background Package explains the limitations of the model. Refinements in the model are being considered by MNR to address this modelling issue. Opportunities on the ground to create the pre-sapling condition are being implemented where possible.

Joe – model does not create more old growth just because we are modeling more old growth wildlife species. These species share a similar preferred habitat which is provided if we have 1 or 5 of these species. Shelterwood cutting is creating some pre-sapling forest but model is not showing it. Model is not perfect, but we do recognize there is a shortage. University of Pennsylvania is having a Webex

session to bring awareness to a north eastern US shortage of pre-sapling condition. Suggested to reflect a -25% variance and drop the (+/-) in VOIT Matrix to communicate that it's okay to go over but not under the 75% natural benchmark level and explanation can be given in the SFM plan text.

Barry – does the Biologist verify the occurrence of these modelled species in the field? Gord – to a certain extent yes – moose and bear studies for example. Not so much with other species. Steve – Canadian Wildlife Service provides large scale tracking, not at local scale and the Breeding Bird Atlas is another source.

Joe – refinements are being made to the model for the next plan. Gord – there is a commitment in the Stand & Site Guide to complete more effectiveness monitoring to help make population linkages to forest conditions.

Habitat Protection for Selected Species at Risk (SAR)

Gord – 100% target set in the past with no variance, have missed the target in past. Gord showed trend included from SFM annual report. Explained the rigours involved with conducting forest management in this area. It is also a dynamic AOC, as soon as there is new sighting, boundaries are changed.

Dana – there should be an allowable variance. Lacy – suggested that administration errors that end up being a non-compliance and are not considered to impact species should not be included in the summary. Gord – would likely need some kind of confirmation process with a biologist. Joe – agree that there should be a variance, compliance discussion would acknowledge non-compliance but considered a non-issue.

Dana – turtle restrictions currently in place have a dramatic impact on forest activities.

Tom – what is the proposal, fixed number of non-compliances? Presented as a ratio? Gord – it is important how we set this target up, it does trickle down through all the compliance-based VOITs. Tom – seems to be agreement to continue with a % based calculation, and allow 5% variance for non-compliance.

Habitat Protection for Selected Other Focal Species (Not SAR)

Gord – current target 95% or better, 5% variance to conform to AOC prescriptions.

Barry – who determines the number of inspections? Joe /Gord – explained in brief the compliance planning and the role of compliance inspectors, reporting deliverables and timelines associated with reporting. Gord – showing how the stats are prepared by Shaun at annual report time, for each compliance-based indicator measured through inspections.

Joe – suggested lumping the two indicators together and not separating them i.e. “Degree of habitat protection for selected focal species, including species at risk”. Tom – this could cut down the paperwork and it will have no material effect. Gord – agree.

An explanation of Brook Trout (BT) AOC prescription was provided to give the Group a sense of the restrictions that are in place.

Video – The Natural Brook Trout Lakes of Algonquin Park

Riparian Buffers

Tom – riparian buffers are important because of the transition between water and land.

Joe – suggest including a variance as well? Gord – it is the BT AOC area that we are assessing – not riparian buffers - we need to find the right wording. A map was shown of the Park and the cumulative impact of AOC restrictions. The SFM annual report for this indicator was reviewed to show past conformance. Keeping a zero variance has affected our performance.

Bob – are these all proven BT lakes? Galipos Lake has not had a speckled trout living in it? Joe- Brad reviewed and verified the list of lakes. Bob – lakes need to be looked at on individual basis.

Barry – is the 500m boundary arbitrarily set without ground truthing? Yes – it is a standard 500m setback (modified zone). The geological survey information could help determine the real location of the boundary. Joe – a hydro-geological model has been run but results need to be ground truthed.

Richard – do activities include skidding or cabling in AOC? Gord - no

Tom – any objectives to a 5% variance? Steve – no, it is consistent with the others.

Tree Species Diversity

Red Spruce: Gord – suggested we keep in the matrix, confident that the new FRI work will capture some of these species. An updated map of red spruce verified locations was shown. Algonquin Park is at the extreme western range for red spruce. Red spruce tree occurrences are reported and this map is updated. A red spruce natural zone also exists. Training is completed with tree markers to help them distinguish from white spruce.

Bob – elaborate more on the protection of red spruce. Is this species of spruce protected from harvest (i.e. no cut)? Gord – no, instances of red spruce are managed as encountered and red spruce regeneration is released if required, managing species to promote future growth and establishment.

Tom – indicator here is keeping the status of the species updated on a map. Gord – we are also doing some red spruce planting and re-establishing in suitable sites. Barry – is this species an alternative to planting undesirable species? Gord – no, planting them on good potential red spruce sites; it is a shade tolerant species.

Hemlock Regeneration and Recruitment Status

Gord – previous committee looked into the degree of browsing on hemlock regen to see effect on recruitment. Brian Harbord, a student at Lakehead University is re-measuring old hemlock seedling plots. Pictures of Brian conducting field work were shown – hemlock regeneration and recruitment appears to be abundant. Suggesting this indicator that focuses on hemlock regen recruitment be kept, pending the outcome of Brian's thesis.

Jerry – is ground hemlock included? Gord – no it is a different species and not included.

Terry – if there is a problem, what can be done? Gord – depends on the problem - could site prepare for more hemlock regeneration but don't think there is an issue here. We are currently not harvesting much hemlock due to market conditions. It's hard to do silviculture work when you are not harvesting the species. Hemlock now managed under group selection silviculture system which allows us to take advantage of creating openings that allow more sunlight to reach the forest floor to provide more ideal growing conditions.

Old 1.1.1.1.3 Hemlock Presence VOIT – Propose to Remove from Element 1.1

Gord – this VOIT was proposed by Eco-watch in last plan, suggesting to remove it from this plan.

Provincial and local summaries both indicate hemlock levels are not declining. Gord reviewed hemlock levels in Algonquin Park - the 7th largest forest unit in Algonquin Park - representing 6.2% of the available production forest. Levels have also increased when compared to historical levels - The Ontario Crown Land Survey (1858-1893) composition of hemlock was recorded at 3.3% as opposed to 4.3% in the 2005 forest resource inventory for Algonquin Park.

Also reviewed Rob Pineo e-mail from 2007 (Development Team member for the provincial landscape guide in 2007, and FCAG member) - We have 17% more mature + old area than LG projected median amount of hemlock in Algonquin Park – not an issue.

Joe – have it covered already in Element 1.1 with all the other indicators – no need to separate it out.

A map of Algonquin Park was shown of the locations of pure stands of hemlock.

Tom – okay, no objections to removing it? Advisory Group – No.

Proportion of Regeneration Comprised of Native Species (back to Species Diversity section)

Gord - not an issue in Algonquin Park forest. We rely heavily on natural regeneration, which limits opportunities for non-native regeneration. The Native Trees in Algonquin Park book was shown to identify native tree species. Most significant non-native population is the Scots pine in the development zone along Hwy 60 planted by MNR. One Scots Pine was identified by Area Forester in RU Zone and plans are under way to cut it down.

Joe – in future could have a non-native southern species growing as a result of climate changes. Suggested 1% variance agreed.

Genetic Diversity

Gord – certain aspects of Tree Marking form used to measure the natural regeneration component of this VOIT...specifically, Species Priority criteria.

Local Seed Collected

Gord – explained the Provincial Seed Zone protocol and referenced a map to show the Advisory Group that Algonquin Park is situated in Seed Zone 29. Steve – is the red spruce seed local? Gord – yes, obtained cones from a squirrel cache.

Tom – is Genetically Modified (GMO) tree seed being used in Region? Steve – GMO seed is not proven and attempts to produce modified trees were not successful and scientists continue to experiment.

Identification and Protection of Zone Boundaries and Culturally Important Sites

Tom B. -there is potential for improvement with the cultural heritage database. Gord – map locations are verified by boots on the ground and changes are made to map location during reconnaissance at tree marking and pre-operation planning.

Tom B. - designation of site is made with Ministry of Culture. Joe – do not have a lot of input on what sites get these “borden numbers”. Tom B. – Ministry of Culture is very protective and these can be misleading designations.

Tom B. - Algonquins can highlight historical sites to help improve database. This is done during native values mapping during FMP development.

Dan Kohoko - do the woodworkers know that they are working near a CHS? Gord – they know that they are working along a red line and only the Contractor Supervisor knows the distinction of red lines. Joe – woodworkers and tree markers are trained and encouraged to report if they happen to find old camps, historic features.

Zone Boundaries

Joe – need to include all zones. Anne – don’t specify number, just keep generic...“zones”. Post meeting note – identified only those zones related to “Sites of Special Biological and Cultural Significance”.

Gord – showed graphs , tables and the breakdown of management zones. Only 55% is actually available for forest management - after AOC reserves are deducted (source: LTF Joint Board Report, Sept 2009). Agreement that “0” variance for the indicator is suitable.

Video: Protected Areas - Yolanda Wiersma

Proportion of identified sites with implemented management strategies

Gord – showed Appendix 1 of FMP: strategies for forest management for each of the zones in Algonquin Park and the strategies are covered off with this page of the Park Management Plan. Showed the AOC prescription that contains management strategies for each value and this Indicator points to having a strategy in place.

Protection of identified sacred and culturally important sites

Gord – potential archaeological locations (APAs) are determined by a model and are mapped and included with this VOIT. A 5% variance agreed.

Tom – what is the difference between CHS2 and CHS3? Joe – varies by importance of site. Tom B. has taken initiative to categorize the Algonquin Park cultural heritage database during FMP development.

Gord – occasionally we have also hired Tom B. to verify potentially important locations prior to operations that involve ground disturbance.

Doreen – working on collecting a Sacred Locations Map, and interested in open communications. Shared a personal example that occurred in Lanark Mazinaw, where a list kept by the community containing 177 known sites was shared in court to stop the development of a mine.

Tom B – protocol is that archeologist must consult with local citizens, including the aboriginal community.

Bob – there is never the resources available now to do the needed work to identify/locate all of the known sacred values/ sites.

Outstanding Discussion Items for Criteria 1

Invasive Species

Tom – began to ask group what invasive species they are aware of. Gord – touched upon the fish species which are invasive to lakes containing native species and the ‘no live bait’ policy in Algonquin Park. Scots pine was already discussed. Erosion & sediment controls – use of native seed only for this.

Barry – is equipment cleaned prior to moving (i.e. prevent spread of purple loosestrife)? Danny – most local contractors work in Algonquin Park on regular basis not moving to and from infected areas. Joe – written in contract for work along Hwy 60 the contractor must wash equipment.

Steve – is there any restriction on bringing in firewood into Park? Joe – rules are set by province and are applicable.

Gord – Beech bark disease training session held and Area Forester attended to learn to identify and mitigate spread.

Lacey – garlic mustard is being spread by hikers.. so clean your shoes!

Steve – mountain pine beetle is a risk to pine, the Prairies are a big barrier, but there is a risk of it being transported through other modes of transportation.

Criterion 2. Ecosystem Condition and Productivity

Reforestation Success

Gord – some of the core Indicators spoke to in Element 1.1 are also relevant to Element 2.1, a mandatory Indicator.

In the previous VOIT matrix provided to the group we had 100% regeneration with no variance. Change was made to this previous version. Propose to have a target that recognizes both regeneration and silviculture success. So new revision proposed will have both regeneration and silviculture success with a variance.

Gord discussed the complexities of silviculture effectiveness monitoring (SEM), and setting associated targets. The Silvicultural Ground Rules (SGRs) were shown that are included in the FMP and followed during the implementation of the plan. The differences between intensive and extensive SGRs were explained. Challenge for the Foresters is ensuring the correct Forest Operations Prescription (FOP) label is on the stand, and up to date prior to measuring against regeneration standard. A lot of work is being done to ensure successful implementation of the SEM program. The variables that influence stocking levels prior to final removal were explained. Measurements are now taken to a “drop dead date” after final removal in shelterwood managed areas. All of these changes make it difficult to look to historical numbers to draw meaningful conclusions. Past results for SFM Annual Report were shared with the group. Need to have internal discussion with AFA foresters prior to next meeting.

Danny – a lot of timing restrictions and access strategies create a lot of challenges to regenerating these stands, and can affect silvicultural success.

Steve – Poplar working groups are easy to regenerate, red pine is hard to regenerate. Challenging working groups influence success, may not be wise to lump all in one measure? On the other hand – could be very complicated setting individual working group/forest unit targets.

Danny – requirement as part of Algonquin Park Forestry Agreement to keep \$1.5 million to regenerate any liabilities, we are protected from budget cuts.

Dana – turtle restrictions are having a large impact on regenerating pine forest. Gord – dealing with these constraints by using more expensive techniques - hand scalping in restricted habitats, we are finding alternatives. This is resulting in fewer opportunities for natural regeneration and more artificial regeneration required.

Tom – suggested to group to hold off until next meeting to allow Gord to discuss with Steve (Area Forester) to hear his concern on target and variance suggestions.

Additions and Deletions to the Forest Area

Gord – explained the only loss to productive forest is due to roads, landings and pits. During strategic planning a 2% is consistent with the SFMM model. Actual recent historic numbers = 1.6% area in roads /landings/pits.

Barry – suggested changing wording to “no more than” 2%. Gord – agree.

Tom – will the research conducted by FP Innovations on roads have an effect? Danny – the study will attempt to define ‘what is a road’? This needs to be answered for road density calculations.

Gord – showed the calculation to determine the amount of road. Also showed FAM zone map.

Steve – suggested measuring this Indicator over a 5 year time frame? Joe – as forest areas move around there will be no big change yearly, it is not that dynamic. Gord – agree reporting this on this Indicator every 5 years.

Proportion of the Calculated Long-term Sustainable Harvest Level that is Actually Harvested

Gord- proposing a big variance, concern of failing this target if we don't accommodate economic /market fluctuations.

Danny – not just markets, it is constraints on operations, weather, constraints caused by SAR habitat. We need all area allocated in order to be flexible and keep people employed. This year we are trying new methods to stimulate harvesting in underutilized areas in order to meet our mandate to maintain or increase employment.

Gord – Historic Planned vs. Actual Harvest table was reviewed with the Group. May be better to go with a rolling average?

Steve – are you allowed to go over annually? Joe – yes. Gord – as long as you don't exceed the 5 year AHA level.

Deb – set the target to meet demand and if demand is not there than it will show that you made it available. Joe – thinking along the same lines, that you set target to ensuring 100% is available for harvest.

Danny – not sure how you would word that? Lacey – word the target to say that it not greater than 100%. Deb – demand each year would set the bottom target boundary. Advisory Group – agree.

Dana – the % we are cutting right now is what it is. It is not bad to leave trees growing on the stump, in order to provide a cushion to allow for things like natural disasters. We need all of the available harvest area - not "protecting" it from ever harvesting it if it's not used - it is protected when it is growing bigger on the stump. Contractors have millions of dollars tied up in equipment and they need to work, and need many options over the course of the cutting season to be able to keep working.

Barry – can you carry-over uncut area to next plan? Danny – yes but can never exceed the calculated available harvest area in the FMP.

Outstanding Discussion Items for Criteria 2 *Climate Change*

At a management unit level, sustainable forest management that maintains or increases forest carbon stocks and produces an annual sustained yield of timber, fibre, or energy from the forest, provides the largest sustained mitigation of climate change, while also providing many social and environmental benefits. Following landscape direction to manage a forest's age and tree species composition within a range of natural variation will maintain the above ground forest's carbon balance within an expected range of natural variation. This is consistent with the approach we are using in this SFM Plan.

Joe – couple of things in MNR Practitioners Guide helps provide framework for planning teams that have an outline to incorporate climate change in thinking. Lacey – read through the whole document and it never really helped provide operational direction.

Barry – what changes will influence forest growth? Joe – not too sure at this point, new modules are being prepared to help planning teams during FMP preparation; likely more insects, disease, wind

events.... Managing a diverse healthy forest is a good start to protect against impact. There will likely be a slow shift in management approach but no big immediate need for reaction (e.g. planting walnut today for tomorrow's climate).

Gord – reviewed the Landscape Guide excerpt on climate change and direction provided in guide to help forest managers. Climate change impacts on growth and yield, natural disturbance events (blowdown, insects and disease) will be revised in future models, as science progresses and new direction is provided – adaptive management.

Barry- maybe there will be more pressure to use wood to dampen effect instead of relying on the use of alternative products with high fossil fuel emissions? Dana – with the adoption of a new bylaw in Toronto wood can be used in the construction of six storey buildings. Tom – yes the impact of using steel, concrete is having a negative effect on climate change and incorporating wood in building construction is a sustainable, green alternative.

Video: Natural Disturbances - Bill Thornton & Rod DeBoice

Gord – there was one image of blowdown in the video - that is the more common natural disturbance event in Algonquin Park. A historic map was shown, showing the location of recent blowdown events in Algonquin Park, and of those areas that were salvaged: 64% of the 1999/2006 blowdown area was salvaged and the remaining area was left to naturally recover.

Irvin – was this salvaged blowdown area planted? Gord – yes, much of the area was planted and tended using funding from the provincial Forestry Futures Trust Fund. Historic graphs of natural disturbances were shown that shows how fire is no longer a big disturbance agent as it was in the past. Yearly Disturbance Maps from 2008–2011 were shown: most fires were started by recreational users and were very small in size. Insect and disease maps were also shown: budworm map shows successive years of feeding that has caused some tree mortality on the west side of the park.

Barry – appears that spruce budworm has run its course? Steve – yes, for now.

Biomass Utilization

Gord – explained that it is not really relevant to us in the Park, shared FMP text on topic: In Algonquin Park it is anticipated that the use of unmerchantable volume will consist primarily of utilization of tree length to smaller top diameters and utilization of previously unmerchantable landing material. Increased utilization of tops and limbs that are normally left at the stump during tree length logging is not anticipated.

Danny – explained that utilizing bio-fibre is not really a feasible option at this point - logistics and economics are not there. New bio-economy industries that produce green power from woody biomass would be a welcome addition to help alleviate current market issues, however, current feed-in tariff pricing for green power in Ontario seems to be inhibiting the development of this sector.

Bob – one restriction that is holding up the expansion of this market is that there is no capacity in the power lines to move power created from Bio-energy plants.

Dana – there is currently only one plant in Cornwall and one in Ingleside for pellets that are being produced for markets in Europe? The Ontario government has not offered a viable solution to address this issue.

Summary of Broad Public Consultation Received

Gord – we are not getting a whole lot of certification website “hits”: 33 in total so far. Link will be distributed to Advisory Group members to try to share to more individuals.

Gord – discussed recent correspondence with Algonquin Eco-watch.

Next Meeting:

May 2nd – same time and location.

Following meeting will be on June 11th in Huntsville.

Adjourn



Picture taken of Forest Certification Advisory Group shown at Meeting 3 in the Algonquins of Ontario office.