

**Forest Certification Advisory Group
Z809-08 Meeting #4
Algonquins of Ontario Office, Pembroke
May 2, 2012**

Present: Nathan Mieske, Barry Bridgeford, Shaun Dombroskie (minute taker), Lacey Rose, Richard Zohr, Shari Sokay, Bob Craftchick, Randy Malcolm, Emmett Godin, Bob McRae, Tom Ballantine, Deb Cumming, John Doering, Joe Yaraskavitch, Tom Clark, Gord Cumming, Ethan Huner, Danny Janke, Dana Shaw.

Regrets: Dave Commanda, Clifford Bastein, Anne Mundy, Terry Mullin, Irvin Yateman, Doreen Davis, Steve D'eon.

Ethan – led the opening prayer.

A brief introduction was provided for the new members - Ethan Huner and Bob McRae. Ethan is a standing “alternate” for the Algonquins and Bob has replaced Don Spring of the Friends of Algonquin Park.

1. Approval of April Minutes

Tom C. – went over handout package and advised group to include in binder under Meeting 3 tab. Gord - we have started posting the meeting minutes on our CSA Certification website. Suggestion was made to clarify Shaun as the minute taker. Tom B. – need to distinguish which Tom in the minutes. Bob C. – comfortable to post on website after minutes are approved by group. Not hearing any further discussion, the minutes were approved.

2. Outstanding Criterion 1 and 2 VOITs

2.1 Re-forestation

Tom C. – circled back on the regeneration/ success indicator. Drew attention to Target column and explained that silviculture success is based on the silvicultural ground rules in the FMP. Discussed differences between silviculture success and regeneration success. Gord – spoke to Steve, our east side Area Forester, who has more challenges to ensuring silviculture success remains high. Looked at historic numbers and set the Target and Variance for this indicator. New target captures both silviculture success and regeneration success. The Target is set to achieve 100% regeneration success and 80% silviculture success (both with a 10% variance).

The old target for this VOIT was noted in a past audit report that it required attention by AFA. The 2009-10 annual report stated that 88% area assessed during the 2005-10 term was a regeneration success and 81% was a silvicultural success.

Gord - In shelterwood forest units the final call is now made after the final removal cut. Assessing at this time should further improve success numbers. Preliminary assessments (stocking) are being made in the interim to intervene and help at achieving final success.

Tom C. – the 88% reported does not mean AFA walked away from the other 12%? Gord – no, the areas that are not FTG are either retreated or just need more time to get there.

Tom C. – who sets the rule? Gord – the Province sets the standard. There may be some local variation on the standard. The regional MNR Silviculture Specialist completes a final review leading up to approval of the FMP.

Joe – Target can be misleading, species proportions fluctuate overtime, and as a Planning Team we monitor FU proportions and the level of shifting that occurs over time, the balance needs to be maintained. Gord – having the correct forest prescription label on the stand is critical to assigning success and can be quite challenging as management progresses.

Deb – are stands written off? Gord – no, stands are scheduled for re-treatment if necessary and the assessment process starts over after retreatment date.

Gord – showed 2009-10 annual report summary of the last 5 years. Numbers are further complicated by including area depleted by harvest and by natural depletion (e.g. blowdown). These results were used to help set this target.

Deb – seems excessive to summarize yearly, should be a 5 year rolling average? Gord – agreed with suggestion to report on target every 5 years.

Joe – we could also set up target to be 100% silviculture success also, but with a 30% variance?
Gord – looked at this and had the discussion, but prefer to state it the other way even though the outcome is the same. It's really just optics but the 80% target is more realistic.

Danny – spoke to people over the years that have been in the Park a long time. Silviculture success will come, however, many factors influence success, i.e. maybe not a good seed crop, heavy moose browse on hardwood, time of year it was logged,.. The trees will grow, it just takes time. Gord – we try to meet time frames set in the FMP so the modeling is realistic.

Lacey – the terminology is hard for the layman to understand, may be misinterpreted by general public. There is no situation in Park where we would not be reforesting, other than some roads, landings and pits. Gord – agree clarification will need to be made in text.

Gord – shared the video on natural regeneration with the Group. Natural regeneration is relied upon as much as possible in the Park.

VIDEO - Natural Regeneration Following Disturbance

Gord – It is becoming more challenging to manage stands for successful natural regeneration in Algonquin Park. Logging/timing restrictions often prevent areas from being cut at the right time for natural regeneration to be successful. For example, winter-logged stands often do not have enough ground disturbance for natural regeneration to establish and site preparation cannot be completed before seed fall. As a result, we are relying more heavily on artificial regeneration, which is a higher cost alternative. This is one of the reasons why renewal stumpage rates have been recently raised.

3. VOITs - Criterion 3 and 4

Tom C. – Referred to Standard in binder, and reviewed content applicable to Element 3.1.

Gord – in many cases the new mandatory indicators fit well under existing objectives, but in some cases they don't. As we work through the remaining Elements, we need to ensure the indicators are still a good fit under the old objectives, or create new objectives.

Tom C.– Reviewed the objectives in Element 3. Gord – two new mandatory indicators under this element: level of downed woody debris (DWD) and level of soil disturbance.

Element 3.1 Soil Quality and Quantity

Level of Soil Disturbance

Gord - Level of soil disturbance is similar to the site impact guidelines indicator included in the old VOIT Matrix. The FMP includes an appendix that speaks to site impact guidelines and defines a rut. The tolerance is different than what we had previously as we included new provincial direction in the FMP. Actual methodology in Stand and Site Guide provides detail on how to measure.

Richard – when ruts occur are they rehabilitated? Gord – yes, we have a Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) that provides direction and detail to rehabilitate ruts where they occur. Bob C.– I like to see rutting in lower sites, to regenerate yellow birch. This creates microsites needed to get this mid-tolerant species to establish. Gord – mineral soil exposure and rutting are different things. Do not need ruts to establish yellow birch, just mineral soil exposure.

Danny – provided some background on operating during wet seasons. Sandy sites are not a problem. We have to carefully watch when we work on clay/loamy sites in the fall and when it rains or we get early snow. Last year a logging contractor was shut-down for weeks due to wet weather. We need the flexibility in the allocation to work around this.

Gord – there are also woodland pools that are sensitive sites that need to be carefully worked around. Table 14 - Conditions on Regular Operations in the FMP provides more operational direction for working near values such as woodland pools and intermittent creeks.

Richard – the indicator included by Eco-Watch to do research on pits/water table has been removed? Gord –yes, the establishment of monitoring wells has been completed. One needs to be licenced to measure water in wells and interpret results which is beyond our scope. There has been extensive discussion and dialogue over the last 5 years. David Webster, the MNR Regional Hydrogeologist provided his professional opinion on the type of pits developed in the Park and does not see issues.

Bob C. – Are wells being installed in existing pits? Danny – yes, but only on a small number of critical pits (a culvert pipe is installed vertically in the ground when a new pit is being developed, used to gauge where the water table is). The pit on the east side of the Park that was selected to carry out research is now in species at risk habitat and cannot be further developed.

Bob C. – when designing an experiment, controls need to be in place. It's hard to use the same area as a control when pit is already developed; putting in wells is a waste of money. At best you would need to collect data well in advance of pit development.

Richard – has a study been done elsewhere? Gord – not aware of study on pits of our scale. Most research is for larger pits where results are not applicable. Joe – David Webster would concur that pits of less than 1 hectare active area have far less impact. Precautions are taken during approval process:

site plan maps are reviewed to ensure location is 120m away from water and 500m away from brook trout (BT) lakes. Ground water moves very slowly – 6 months to move 100 metres – so it would cool before it would recharge back into a water body. We are looking for a new location to carry out another small study. Gord – the Algonquin FMP direction for aggregate pits is above the Provincial standard.

Deb – I hear the need to carry out costly planning and analysis before work is carried out in wood turtle (WT) habitat and I hear Dana showing frustration. I understand that the wood turtle is a species at risk, however, it seems to be negatively impacting almost every aspect of sustainable forest management? Is one species of turtle more important than another in the ecological chain? Is someone on top of this and trying to address all these issues?

Danny – we have been told that MNR is moving away from a species level approach to more of an ecosystem based approach. This may help change the situation. AFA sees some positive movement to slowly help alleviate this situation locally. I think people at all levels recognize the impact.

Dana – decisions are based on political science not on real science. With the introduction of LTF and then the wood turtle AOCs, the wood is more expensive. Contactors can't work in the summer and have to work in winter (shorter season), but still have to make payments on equipment year round. It's a scheduling nightmare for roads, until after October 15 timing restriction is off. After wood turtle timing restriction is off then we are into in-stream water crossing construction restrictions until spring. How can you operate like this?

Emmett – why are roads on the East side of the Park such good wood turtle habitat? Joe – habitat encompasses area 6 km up and downstream from where a wood turtle sighting has occurred, up to a 12 sq. km area restriction per turtle. This mapping includes roads that are within this area. This mapped habitat must be protected. Also there are restrictions on building roads through habitat to get to area beyond the habitat, so the affected area can be larger than the mapped habitat. Concerns have been raised to senior managers at the MNR.

Deb – it is very hard to listen to the discussion related to the environment in which you work in. Danny – currently have a large area of WT habitat. AFA contributed funds to turtle research - putting GPS antennas on blanding's turtles to track movement. Gord – Park Biologist found through this research that the provincial direction was not adequate and a more stringent local restriction was necessary for the research area. We ended up with 2 prescriptions, one for the local research area and one for the rest of the park that followed provincial direction.

Lacey – there is no science proving that logging has an impact. Deb – the wood turtle is coming up in discussion at every single meeting? Tom C. – the passing of Section 18 of Bill 55 2012 (An Act to implement Budget measures) may help to address SAR in FMPs and not in separate provincial direction. The problem with the SAR Act is with the way it was implemented.

Level of downed woody debris (DWD)

VIDEO - Forest Based Bioenergy

Gord – this is new mandatory indicator, more applicable to clearcut silviculture in the boreal forest and not really an issue in Algonquin Park. We are not full tree harvesting and we are topping and limbing at the stump – lots of DWD. A lot of research has been completed in the GLSL by MNR and AFA is

partnering in another study this summer. There is some discussion in the FMP also to address biomass harvesting and strategies for utilization in poor markets (results in more DWD). In clearcut situation there are controls to retain wildlife trees which eventually become DWD.

Tom C. – need to word target to be clearer to include requirements in tree marking prescription of wildlife, mast trees “if available”.

Compliance with FMP Operational Standards for Aggregate Pits

Gord – Added this objective and target to element 3.1 to address effective and efficient use of aggregate resources. It is more appropriate here under “soil quantity” than where it was before under “water quality and quantity” (see monitoring wells discussion above on page 3). There is an active compliance monitoring program and lots of direction in FMP on this. Suggest set target at 100% with a 5% variance. The Provincial Parks and Conservation Reserves Act requires a demonstrated need for aggregate. This is addressed in the FMP through the preparation of a site plan, a review by Ontario Parks and implementation of standard operating conditions.

PowerPoint Slideshow – silvicultural systems and roads

Renewal Slides: Danny – currently approximately 500, 000 trees are being planted in the Park this year. Trees are ordered 2 or 3 years in advance. Planted areas are checked out through SEM. Gord – planting mainly occurs on higher competitive sites or where natural regeneration is not feasible.

Harvest Slides: Feller bunchers are commonly used and do a good job. Roads are narrow. Barry – where there are shallow soils does that change how you proceed with harvest? Gord – yes, shallow soils classed as site class 4 have limited tree growth potential and are labeled as protection forest stands in the forest inventory. There is 7400 ha or about 1.4% of the Park in this category.

Access Slides: Gord – culvert installations are carefully completed. A greater use of portable bridges has turned out to be a good environmental practice.

Element 3.2 Water Quality and Quantity

Proportion of water crossing installed

Gord – same VOIT as before. The group reviewed the latest Annual Report and past success to achieving this target. A lot of installations and removals that occur throughout the season. Tom C. – what was the cause of some of the past issues? Joe – perched culverts, erosion and sedimentation control not properly installed.

Compliance with Prescriptions Developed for Protection of Water Quality and Fish Habitat

Gord – same VOIT as before. The group reviewed the latest Annual Report and past success to achieving this target. The issue last year was as a result of having no approval before the activity.

Number of Spills that Enter in Water Bodies

Gord – Reviewed the AFA Emergency Response Plan with the Group. Tom C. – how common is a spill in water way? Gord – not common, only one incident on record in 2003 - the emergency response plan was activated and the spill was successfully contained and cleaned up. Explained the tracking system AFA uses to measure spill occurrences by size and location. Deb – Is there some link to size of spill? Is the +1 variance included for this indicator related to small spills also?

Gord – this VOIT applies only to spills affecting water quality. Barry – suggest that a big spill is significant and having one spill may be too many? Suggest removing the +1 variance. Danny – have procedures and mechanisms in place to deal with clean up. Barry – do you have clean-up teams? Gord – yes everyone is trained and can clean up a spill. Tom C – Group comfortable with Barry’s suggestion?

Gord – we could accept a zero variance here. Group agreed.

Use of Salted Sand for Winter Maintenance

Gord – explained that indicator was requested by Algonquin Eco-watch during the FMP process. Salted sand is used in road maintenance to prevent road sand from freezing to allow for application to ensure road safety. Eco-watch raised concern about potential environmental impact. AFA agreed at the time to phase out use of salt in sand and a commitment was made in the FMP.

Dana – need to be more flexible here, is there really a need to eliminate all use?

Danny – salted sand mainly used on Lake Travers road. Pits are loamy and salt is blended in to prevent piles from freezing. Gord – I think Hwy 60 winter salt application has far more impact. Joe – we have asked FP Innovations to look into this during road review and Dana has good point. The content of salt is less than 1% when mixed with sand. July 2012 we anticipate having an answer on impact of using salted sand. Dana- salt is expensive. Contactors only use what they need to. Randy – should we be wording the indicator text differently? Text can be interpreted as though AFA is pouring salt on the road.

Danny – past suggestion has been made to pave the Lake Travers road, but this may cause the need for more salt to be used. Dana - there are reasonable instances where salt is needed, should be flexible here.

Tom C. – when can this FMP direction be re-visited? Danny – poor pits need more salt blended into the mix. We have limited options to develop good pits along Lk. Travers Road. There is a past instance where we bought sand with salt for an application, to ensure road safety. Deb – suggest we drop the “100% by 2020”. Bob C. – will this lead to an FMP amendment? Include a variance to help achieve target?

Dana – text needs to be edited to state “salted sand” not salt. Joe- agree, we need to change wording.

Emmett – when was the decision to eliminate the use of salt made? Gord – 2009 during FMP development. Emmett - has there been a reduction since 2009? Danny – yes, purchase invoices for salt are less. Deb – consider still honouring the 50% by 2015 but drop the 100% by 2020. Gord – suggest we wait and see the FP draft report and decide on wording in September? Joe- agree with Deb, we can base decision on final report because will be in a partial FMP re-write in 2015 - can keep the 50% by 2015.

Action: Advisory Group to decide on final wording after review of FP Innovation Draft Report.

Proportion of Watershed or Water Management Areas with Recent Stand-Replacing Disturbance

Gord – this is a new mandatory indicator. Large forest disturbances can impact water quality. Showed a map to the group of watersheds in Algonquin Park where recent stand replacing disturbances occurred

(i.e. blow down, wind events, clearcuts). Minimal in scale – only 1.5% of total forested area affected. Tom B. – where have the biggest disturbances occurred – can see on map. Spatially located following NW-SE pattern running along Cedar Lake through Lake Travers and heading down towards Petawawa. Gord – reviewed a summary table of area depleted by watershed. There was 4000 ha of naturally depleted area and 5000 ha of harvested area in the last 10 years (stand replacing depletions).

Barry – is <20% a high allowance? Gord – should be set on research and we don't have it.

Barry – why not 10%? Gord/ Joe – were thinking to increase to 50%, but no science to direct us, so used a pre-cautionary level of <20%. Need to consult with an expert to help set this target.

Action: Joe to ask David Webster about the size of forest disturbances that can impact water quantity and quality in a watershed.

Tom C.– reflected on the mandatory discussion items and appears that we have covered them off fairly well.

Element 4.1 Carbon Uptake and Storage

Net Carbon Uptake

Tom C – read over content in indicator. Gord – shared videos to help explain carbon storage.

VIDEO- Climate Change and Adaptive Capacity

Gord – videos provide a good global perspective on the importance of sustainable forest management and climate change. Young forest is a better carbon sink than old forest. Tom C. – similar to VOIT we had before. Ontario has decided not to include this as a provincial FMP requirement. CSA standard has carbon storage included - no other Certification Standard has it specifically required.

Gord - the SFMM model output was sent to Ontario Forest Research Institute (OFRI) to run through the FORCARB model to get the results for the Algonquin Park forest. Storage is directly affected by many factors including the age of forest, successional/disturbance patterns and growth and yield projections. Carbon levels decline till 2040 then storage increases over time. Two runs presented based on projected and actual harvest levels. The run based on actual harvest levels shows greater carbon stocks stored (less removal).

Tom C. – reviewed the wording in Indicator with the Group. Gord –harvested wood products help store carbon for the long term. When you factor in harvested wood products you see a steady increase of carbon storage. Barry – do you think the government will make changes in building codes to include more wood in construction? Yes, Building Code changes are being made to include wood in up to six storey construction.

Lacey – young forests store carbon, we know inventory reflects an old forest, FMP projections show movement to old forest, confused with the storage projection, should be moving down not up?

Post meeting note – Gord reviewed average forest age in SFMM over next 100 years and it declines as a result of natural succession, natural disturbance and harvesting.

Joe – target text needs to be worded to maintain or increase carbon stock and make link to graph produced by OFRI.

Reforestation Success

Gord – this mandatory indicator is the same as indicator in above Element 2.1. Tom C – no need to have further discussion.

Lunch – catered by Golden Lake

Tom C. – provided another brief talk about Carbon. Gord – explained that there is a mandatory discussion item on carbon emissions from fossil fuels used in forest operations. Looked at detail from Ontario's Forests and Forestry in a Changing Climate MNR, 2008. Emissions from transporting wood to mills and burning fossil fuels during manufacturing were estimated to be roughly 9% of the amount of carbon stored in wood products from Ontario (Colombo et al. 2007a).

Copies of this report are available - please see Gord for more information. Shared quotes from a report. Conclusions and adaptation techniques were highlighted, including the need for more all weather roads with projected shorter and warmer winters. Some adaptation techniques are difficult to implement when you rely so heavily on natural regeneration.

Additions and Deletions to the Forest Area

Tom C. - began reviewing content in Standard. Gord – same as earlier indicator and no new change on this one.

Element 5 Economic and Social Benefits

5.1 Timber and Non-Timber Benefits

Quality and Quantity of Timber Benefits, Products and Services Produced in DFA: Long-term Projected Available Harvest Volume by Product

VIDEO - Wood Products – Everywhere for Everyone

Tom C. – led group through content in indicator. Gord – the past indicator is now connected to this new mandatory indicator. Volumes are consistent with Table FMP-13 targets. Not all products included in VOIT Matrix: only poles, Pr/Pw sawlogs, hardwood sawlogs and total pulp and total sawlogs and better. In some cases projected volumes have gone up due to increased yield curve projections. Other products have gone down because of increased ecological constraints like old growth (e.g. Pr poles). This is all linked to the long-term wood supply model (SFMM). For example, red pine is projected to decline bottoming out in 2040 - this low point was used to set target at > greater than this point. Target is based on what FMP can produce. Question to Group is: do we set Target low and meet it, or set high and not meet it?

Richard - Is target sufficient to support local industry need? Gord – no, demands are greater than Target for some products e.g. poles. Danny – current demand is approximately 17,000 tonnes of poles per year, market dictates. It is good to continue to measure this Target.

Dana- graph shows a decline in Red Pine - is this because of a projected loss of landbase through the introduction of LTF? Gord – no, LTF has not been deducted from landbase for this projection. Declines

are a result of ecological constraints like maintaining old growth. Joe – currently no affect on volume, just an increased cost.

Gord – I'm torn on the approach? Market conditions influence this Indicator. With a 25% variance we would pass all except white birch / hardwood sawlogs. Joe – is that what we want to produce or do we want to make it available? Gord – maybe there should be long-term level to sustain and a short-term level to produce? Danny – could base on average annual volume?

Bob McRae. – restrictions to access area create challenges and complexity. It is an even more complicated world when we introduce markets, and how they influence production. Dana – another example that complicates production is through constraints like LTF where wood is tied up and not available to be allocated. Danny – every time you reduce your wood basket you lose operational flexibility. Bob M. – the Province needs to rely on industry to get out of debt. Joe – legislation is planned to be revised to help. Gord – until a final decision on LTF is made, we are in limbo and have uncertainty.

Joe – in indicator, word “produced” can be interpreted as make available? Gord – what does produce mean? Gord – if we take the lowest level we can sustain, then, we could set another target in what is actually utilized? Deb – not sure how you articulate a production target that is out of your control, production target = meeting demand? Lacey – can't make people cut it if it's not worth anything; it is growing on the stump and available. Volume available in FMP but the question will always be is how accessible is the wood?

Gord – post meeting note- the market dictates what is produced, and this is beyond the control of the forest manager. However, this is the mandatory indicator wording: “produced” - this is a problem with the standard. The forest manager can only control what is available – so set the targets around this – the long term minimum sustainable volume for each of these product groups, as drafted.

Amount of Available Harvest Volume Utilized (short term)

Tom C. – this not a mandatory indicator and has been carried forward from last matrix. Lacey – not a very meaningful Indicator with that big of a variance (50%)? Joe – suggest to remove and take out? Danny – when I look at the AFA Act, to maintain or improve employment, we should consider keeping it. Lacey – maybe consider % of wood utilized by local communities? Gord – the next element speaks to what you're suggesting, the social/employment benefits. Decided to remove this VOIT.

Quantity and Quality of Non-timber Benefits, Products, and Services Produced in DFA: Number of documented public complaints about forestry impacts on back-country recreation

Tom C. – this mandatory indicator has been expanded with the addition of the old indicator inserted after “:” after the DFA. Barry – written comments (i.e. letters) are not always included in the “Experience Comment Form”. Joe - clarified how the system was supposed to work – comment form is available on Ontario Parks website. Overall it has not been well implemented. System was supposed to capture all user comments and then the forestry related ones would get sent to AFA. Need to change the name of the form to remove “Forestry” from the title. Also, all complaints need to be documented for the old VOIT to work. This was supposed to be more of an Ontario Parks comment system that would provide relevant forestry related comments to AFA.

Barry – system set-up did not go as planned. Joe – back of your permit, allows for comment. Don't want to re-enter track all comments even those that are positive. Hesitate to enter all comments into a database. Gord – AFA wanted a rigorous system that documents facts, not hearsay. This was one of the drivers for setting up the system. If Ontario Parks does not have the resources to properly implement this system then we need to change the system.

Tom B. – the name of the form is not right. Dana – it is set up to bait people in putting in forestry comments. Lack of complaints is positive and reflects a good job being done. Tom B- agree with Dana, how is the addition of the Schedule of Operations map on the AFA website worked for Backcountry Recreationalists experience? Barry – it has improved.

Barry – read the history on discussions with OP and suggested that ideas proposed by Algonquin Backcountry Recreationalists (ABR) were not included. Tom C. – change target to numbers, than %? Joe – Ontario Parks ended up building something that we don't feel we need.

Emmett – remove the “Forest management” from form. Ethan – interior user travelling in backcountry usually will not see forest management, but a healthy forest. Barry – form needs to distinguish between front country and back country. Gord – the focus here is on back-country where operations may be present. Barry – log truck can impact you on Hwy 60 on your way to the park, not necessarily in back country. Lacy – trucks could be from outside the park and not even associated with logging in Algonquin Park. Barry – still legitimate complaint, but not handled in this system.

Gord – it's hard to properly address a complaint when facts are missing. Nathan – was the form used for incident on Rock Lake Road? Dana – a lot of complaints? Joe – no, not many using the form, complaints from Rock Lake area were handled outside this system. Barry – gate protocol and having the map at a gate helps. Joe – maps are available on website and at gate.

Deb – seems to me communication is an important piece, and responding to complaints is measurable. Suggest that 100% of all complaints are responded to, would be a reasonable indicator. Emmett– not everyone is offended by hearing a chainsaw, truck. If a camper still chooses to go close to an approved operations than he/she does not have a valid complaint about logging noise.

Barry – still need some mechanism, and measure, we suggested to name it “backcountry incident form”. Dana – out of all the 120,000 camper nights per year in Algonquin Park how many people complained? Gord – showed attendance level and level of complaints = 0.0004 % people had a documented complaint about logging noise. Joe – agree with Deb. Joe – as a minimum, we should take “forestry” reference out of form. Gord – AFA received a best management practice from the Surveillance auditor on our correspondence to valid complaints about logging noise. Barry – form was never intended to single out forestry. Tom B. – looked at blog posts on ABCR website and did not see serious complaints. Barry – not related to logging, a generator was running? Could have been a researcher?

Provision of information with respect to location of planned forest operations on the AFA website.

Barry – can we add detail to this target to specify spring/fall updates for harvest areas and roads to be posted? Gord – explained that markets change quickly and affect where we go and the schedule varies, it is a challenge and much work to maintain a map like that – and accuracy is limited. We have agreed we will attempt to do this, just do not see the need to specify this in the VOIT. Explained the disclaimer included in the map legend for the Group.

Danny – so much change with weather, mill delivery schedules, markets, etc. Barry – so the plan changes within an AWS season? Danny – yes, changes occur sometimes immediately. Gord – so many variables that influence exact operation location. Gord – there are concerns over the real value of the map with so many variables, compared to the work that goes into maintaining it. Lacey – season does not mean too much, it's just a guide. Tom B. – can updates be posted? Gord – once in spring and in fall map can be updated. Tom C. – will you accept that seasons on map are subject to change, and not include season in VOIT Matrix. Barry – can accept to not include the word “seasonal”.

Compliance with Cottage/Lease AOCs

Gord – carried over from previous VOIT Matrix. Bud – no concerns or proposed changes. Some lease holders want to know when the loggers will be back to cut some hazard trees around their cottage. Add a 5% variance to be consistent with other compliance based targets.

Cultural Heritage

Tom B. – AFA in past has complied and contributed, they are in full compliance. Richard – access to information and ensuring it is kept safe is my interest. Gord – showed annual report track record for this VOIT and links to other cultural heritage websites from AFA website.

Bob C. – never approached AFA about including our website link and could help bring more attention to Algonquin culture. Tom B. – drove to Golden Lake and saw the sign to new centre, and a website link. Ethan – could we get into posting interpretative signage? Danny – Algonquins can bring forth a proposal to AFA if they wish and a decision will be made by the AFA Board.

Natural and Spiritual AOC Prescriptions

Tom C – quickly discussed content in indicator. Group agreed that this indicator an appropriate one to keep.

Element 5.2 Communities and Sustainability

Managed Crown Forest Area Available for Timber Production

Gord – carried forward from previous VOIT Matrix. Tom C. – three objectives in this element. Reminded the group that this is not a landuse discussion. Dana – suggest the Board re-visit the LTF issue. Danny – the proposed Park Management Plan amendment- it is ready for Public review, now up to Minister. Joe – if LTF is approved we would fail? Gord – yes I think so. Lacey – production forest area has a big link to economic and sustainable communities - may fail with LTF, but it is a good indicator.

Number of Local Production Facilities

Tom C. – non-commitment holders may receive wood, commitment holders have first chance. Smurfit (Portage) and Grant have dropped off the map since last time we looked at this. Dana – where does Thurso fit. Danny – Thurso is a non-commitment holder. Tom C. – is wood going to other folks that are not considered local: Quebec, States? Lacey – wood that goes to communities having mills that employ people from a local community is what I think is implied here. Gord – with new future tenure

arrangement do we need a new phrase for “commitment holder”? Commitment Letters are all we have to go by. Danny – hope “Commitment Holders” can be kept? Dana – I hope so too.

Danny – what is local? Gord – need to recognize facilities outside “local” and need to recognize these in order to do good forest management – need a home for low-end fiber, not just sawmills.

Tom C.– need to define local as Advisory Group, what do we consider as local. Gord – suggest take local out of this indicator and include local in next indicator. Joe – agree with Gord’s suggestion.

Tom C. – may change the word “commitment holder” to something else through tenure and change text accordingly. Gord – benchmark should be based on the number we have today.

Available wood volume offered to local production facilities

Dana – is the surplus wood (not committed) offered to only commitment holders? Danny – no.

Tom C.– would all the commitment holders receive an offer. Danny- yes. Nathan – it will go locally first?

Danny – no, veneer offered locally but some purchased in Quebec. Nathan – is it based on price?

Danny – yes. Barry – is there a set time limit to express interest. Danny – yes, we expect an answer usually within two weeks of our offer.

Deb – nothing in here that AFA has a right to market, under timber benefits - sell pulp where you can sell pulp? Randy – indicator put in to protect local sawmills, wondering if we have to change the text?

Instead of “local” use “communities in near vicinity” - allowing some flexibility to then go elsewhere.

Livelihoods of local people near the Park need to be looked at first. This is what Jeff Muzzi was intending when he included this Indicator last time. Dana – there is open market wood in FMP? Danny – yes, not all wood that is committed. Dana – when wood is cut then offered to non-clients do you make clients aware. Danny – yes. Clients have a couple weeks to make decision. Tom C. – this is consistent with how Minister is going.

Level of Investment in Initiatives that Contribute to Community Sustainability

This is a new mandatory indicator. Gord – propose to use direct program cost expenses as presented in AFA Annual Report. In report it is 15 million for 2011-12. Nathan – maybe set target higher instead of using the low point for target setting? Danny – we need number that is achievable. It is a direct reflection of volume harvested. Gord – any alternative suggestions? Deb – suggest setting a target that is a % of revenue - program costs relative to revenue. Joe – agree with Nathan. Danny – we are a not-for profit style accounting agency so a % of revenue target may not be suitable. Danny – comfortable with a 5 year average, >16.5 million annually.

Level of Direct and Indirect Employment

Gord – showed a Table of historic actual numbers of those employed from Algonquin Park forestry.

Woodland refers to Algonquin Park. Joe – mill numbers may be overstated. Barry – how meaningful is

indicator if it is not pro-rated for just Algonquin Park wood in mills? Gord – still a good measure -

without Algonquin Park wood some of these facilities would not survive. Tom C.– could split direct and

indirect in Target. Danny – you always want to innovate and mechanize and must think about that when looking at the indicator, number will go down as a result.

Action: Gord – will clarify some questions with the numbers and prepare new table before next meeting.

5. Broad Public Consultation Received

Gord – the minutes of the Advisory Group meetings are being posted on the AFA Certification website. An updated version of the VOIT matrix will also be posted soon to show public where we are at. There were 21 hits on the AFA Certification website this week, 138 hits total to date. We have eight completed surveys that have been submitted. Gord informed everyone at the AFA Contractors Meeting on April 26th about the survey, and Joe is planning to tell the Local Citizens Committee about it.

6. Location and timing of next meeting

Huntsville, Hidden Valley Resort. June 11th –8:30 start. Please let Gord know if you need a room the night before on the 10th.

This will be the last meeting until fall.

Ethan – led the closing prayer.

7. Opportunities for improvement – none brought to attention.

Adjourn