

**Forest Certification Advisory Group
Z809-08 Meeting #5
Hidden Valley Resort, Huntsville
June 11, 2012**

Present: Barry Bridgeford, Shaun Dombroskie (minute taker), Lacey Rose, Richard Zohr, Bob Craftchick, Randy Malcolm, Emmett Godin, Bob McRae, Tom Ballantine, Deb Cumming, Irvin Yateman, Keith Fletcher (observer) Joe Yaraskavitch, Tom Clark, Gord Cumming, Terry Mullin, Danny Janke, Dana Shaw, Dan Kohoko, Larry McDermott

Regrets: Clifford Bastein, Anne Mundy, Steve D'eon, Ethan Huner, John Doering, Shari Sokay, Nathan Mieske

Tom C.– introduced Larry McDermott (alternate for the Shabot Obaadjiwan First Nation) and Keith Fletcher (AFA - observer)

Bob C. – led the opening prayer

1. Approval of May Minutes

Tom – started by advising the group to insert Meeting 5 handouts into the binder.

Dan K. – being a relatively new member, Dan asked for an explanation to better understand the CSA certification process to date.

Gord – currently the AFA is going through the re-certification of the Algonquin Park Forest to the 2008 version of the CSA Standard. We are in the process of making changes to the VOIT Matrix, which is a very important section included in the CSA SFM Plan. This will be the last meeting before the summer. Over the summer the draft Plan will be prepared. In the fall we will get together and review the draft. The final Plan will then be prepared in time for the Registration Audit in November.

Dan K. – is there a big economic impact if certification is in place or not? Gord –no, having certification is not a big economic driver, it is however, driven by AFA to demonstrate to the public that we are practicing sustainable forestry. Some client mills have acquired Chain of Custody certification so they can use AFA's CSA certification and market their products as certified forest products.

2. Outstanding Criterion 3 and 4 VOITs

Salted Sand

Tom – circled back to an action item on the use of salted sand. Gord – updated Group that this Thursday FP Innovation will be conducting their last field session before the draft Road Review Report is prepared and submitted in July. We will wait to see if there is any commentary in this report on environmental impacts of using salted sand for winter road maintenance.

Level of Natural Depletion within a Watershed

Gord – shared Joe’s correspondence with David Webster, a Senior Hydro-Geologist with the MNR. He replied back to say that there is not a whole lot of science we can rely on to help answer the question on whether or not 20% of a water shed with a stand-replacing disturbance would have an effect on water quality and quantity. He commented that having 80% forest coverage is a safe amount. David found it also reasonable to set a 10 year time horizon to allow time for the disturbed area to regenerate. In addition, Karen Hartley, with Parks and Protected Areas was consulted on the topic and shared that 30%-50% forest cover is a threshold level for forest cover within a watershed as a guide in Southern Ontario - but this is for developed landscapes in southern Ontario that might have between 7% to 30% forest cover remaining and dominated by agriculture and urban areas. Karen went on and suggest that we use the range of natural variation model outputs to help set the target. Gord assured the Group that this natural benchmark approach is consistent with how we have planned and we can be comfortable with the 20% target.

Direct and In-Direct Employment Numbers

Action item from last meeting - prepare a new table showing direct and in-direct employees that work in the Park. Gord – with Amy’s help an updated table was prepared. To clarify - the total number of employees include those that work in Algonquin Park. The updated numbers were reviewed. Bob M.– the numbers are low right now and are a sign of the time. Terry – pointed out that some may be there for the season (tree markers) or for a short time in the season (tree planters). A lot of past targets were built on strong markets, suggested in the VOIT Matrix that the Target be set at >2500 woodland and mill employees.

Barry – not really hard numbers when you consider the in-direct job numbers because they are not reflective of proportion of jobs tied specifically to Park wood. Joe - In the FMP there is a section that presents economic multipliers for direct and in-direct jobs created when harvest levels are realized. If you really want more detail you can look in to this section of the FMP. Terry – maybe the Target level is too high? Danny – silvicultural employee numbers have increased and going forward this number should continue to increase. Work-share programs at sawmills appear to be ending which should help as well.

Bob M. – speaking of people numbers, the Tourist Impact section in the LTF Report that the Ministry presented was not accurate and are not hard numbers either. The numbers AFA is proposing here are better than those estimates. Joe – if mills like Murray’s did not top up with wood harvested from the Park then eventually 244 employees would be temporarily out of work. Lacey – how are you determining indirect jobs? Gord – we really only have direct jobs presented? Bob C.– can you re-word Target to address both direct and indirect? How do we know that the market downturn is not related to a global trend which is beyond our control? Gord – propose we apply a ratio and present indirect numbers relative to 2500 direct employees? Deb- direct employment is pertinent. In-direct employment is really not as important. Gord – advised to the Group that they will be separated within the Target and will not roll them in together.

Action: Gord to present revised direct and in-direct employee target numbers to the advisory group at the fall meeting.

Carbon Storage

Gord – following up on Joe’s suggestions to change this VOIT wording, updated wording was shared with respect to the Carbon Storage VOIT. The model forecasts net carbon uptake and can measure carbon

stocks over the long term. Suggested we assess this VOIT every ten years and update the projection with each new FMP.

Bob C. – what effect do old growth forests and reserves have on storing carbon? Gord –generally speaking, these have a negative effect on carbon sequestration - an over mature forest state is not as good as a young forest is at sequestering carbon. Bob C. – Target may be hard to achieve based on our current forest state. Gord –Lacey had a similar concern, however, the SFMM model has a lot of natural succession happening and the average age of the forest is becoming younger over the long term and contributing to more carbon sequestration. A post meeting comment was inserted in Meeting 4 minutes regarding this.

Video – Carbon and carbon sequestration

SAR Habitat and Sensitivity around Protecting the Location of Habitat

Gord – In order to protect the location of SAR habitat we needed to modify the minutes to maintain confidentially. Bob C. – expressed discomfort that there is no representative from the Biologist community on the Advisory Group to help us through some of these discussions. Bob M. – why do we not have signs up along the roads and highways to warn drivers of turtles on the road in order to give notice to drivers so that they can adjust their speed? Joe – if the fencing works as intended the turtles won't be on the road. I think campers are also made aware at the gate.

Video – Turtles of Ontario

Bob M. –can the fence be placed closer to the road? Joe – having the fence closer to pond encourages nesting in natural sandy openings away from the shoulder of the road. Bob C. – do they go to a particular nesting place each year? I know of a sandy bank that I observed turtles laying eggs year after year? Tom C. – road shoulders are an ecological trap (same preferred conditions as natural sandy openings) and travel corridors for predators who get their fill going from nest to nest. Bob C. – predators that prey on eggs are in the bush too. Dana – what is the cost of turtle fencing? Joe – it is manageable for drift fencing approximately \$1,000/km versus \$50,000/km for permanent fencing. Bob M. – does not seem to be used much outside the park, maybe there are alternative solutions? Joe – eco passages help and we have a couple in the park. Bob M- I see this as a tremendous cost to Ontario in delays and maintenance. It may be better to spend money now to install a permanent solution. Tom C.- in a current MTO project, snake fencing has been installed along snake travel corridors.

Wood Allocation/Local Production Facilities

Gord – clarified Element 5.2 around the indicator that speaks to the number of production facilities that utilize wood from DFA. Indicator 5.2.1.2.1 speaks to all production facilities and I think is a good indication of overall utilization of park wood and the markets as a whole. The next Indicator 5.2.1.3.1. speaks to the level of utilization by commitment holders. This Target is set up to offer 100% of sawlog and better products to ensure local mill's interests are respected and commit to giving local mills first chance at the wood. Now there are two Indicators instead of one.

Bob C. – recent document passed in Provincial Legislature where AFA will not be exempt from tenure reform. Danny – with respect to Wood Supply commitment holders the Province is reluctant to honour these commitments and sees value to tender at least 25 % of wood being harvested off the licence. Bob C. – how do we protect local mills? I'm a little uncomfortable with the whole tenure reform model. Gord – in the VOIT Matrix we have the text in place to satisfy provincial direction and protect local mill

interest. Joe – main driver is to get the wood back to work. Legislation intent is to prevent hording wood by local mills that are not operating. The available wood would then provide an opportunity for someone else. Tom – is the AG okay with edits made by Gord? I think it is a good balance. Joe – 1974 Master Plan does show a map where a commitment was made to regional mills. This is the only historical reference in a Park document, and the only reference to a commitment of wood to local or regional mills in any Park plan.

Meeting 4 Minutes were approved by the Advisory Group.

3. VOITs - Criterion 5 and 6

Level of investment in training and skills development.

Gord – what we propose is that the ongoing training of woodworkers as per the EMS Training Matrix be the measure for the Target. Shared the EMS Training Matrix and explained it to the Group. It is often a challenge to have a fully trained workforce and keep records up to date. Target presented is quantifiable and measureable.

Dan K.– had a general question on VOITs. For Element 1.1 the ecosystem diversity VOIT the level of variance states 25% range in movement? Is that not built into the Target? Joe – concept of natural benchmark trend was adopted from FMP. You're correct in saying variance is built in to target.

Action: Gord to look to providing more clarity in text for the natural benchmark VOITs in Element 1.

Level of Algonquin participation in the forest economy

Gord – this VOIT has been brought forward from previous Matrix. The target has been updated to reflect recent historical Algonquin involvement and contributions. Main Algonquin employer has been Makwa with some work also completed by Madadjiwan. Bob C.- Preference is to replace the word Aboriginal with Algonquin and remove the text (*from a benchmark set in 2012 =16%*). Only currently two communities harvesting in the Park to date. Some additional communities would like to share the resources and participate. As other Communities develop capacity the number could be ever changing. Suggested a sliding scale measured approach. Tom C.– can you propose a variance? Randy – shared concerns and expressed the need to differentiate an individual community. A suggestion was made to single out individual community and measure separately. Richard – would like to see a better overall level than 16%. We should commit to do better.

Gord – AFA has a procurement section on the website at <http://www.algonquinforestry.on.ca/bid.htm> Tender packages are made available to search and stimulate interest. AFA deals with the outcome of the bid process and implement activities accordingly.

Gord – prefer to follow the wording in the national Standard. Bob C. – can we make reference to Algonquin as the Aboriginal people in the text? Algonquins are the people. Joe – looks like the word Algonquin is referenced in the Objective column. Bob C. – reemphasized that the Algonquins are just asking to be recognized. There needs to be a statement within context of Algonquin Park that the only Aboriginals known are the Algonquins. Deb – suggested that clarification be made in the Preamble of the SFM Plan.

Action: Ensure there is wording in the SFM Plan text that the term Aboriginal in Algonquin Park refers to the Algonquins of Ontario

Tom C.– proposal here is that reference to ANR be changed to the Algonquins of Ontario? Randy – agree with Bob C. Deb – math is within the context of % of harvest, a lot of variation in harvest if levels are down than numbers are down. Suggest a rolling average? Also the two VOITs cover off Silviculture and Harvest but not Road construction? Joe - % is linear, if the harvest doubles than the Algonquins would harvest twice as much. Tom C.– Deb proposed that we include all activities. Joe – most cases the harvest Contractor is the Road Contractor. Gord – suggest three VOITs be included under Element 5.2; one for harvest volume, silviculture completed and \$ amount tracked.

Gord – the VOIT speaks to levels, not capacity. Gord – suggested that the \$ amount tracked for Annual Report, which was not part of last matrix be included as part of this VOIT Matrix? Richard – agreed.

Action: Add another VOIT to the matrix that tracks expenditures to Algonquin communities/organizations/people.

Richard – suggest we add “communities” in front of organizations/people. Bob C. –Development Corporations work at arm’s length from the Community. Emmett - % can be misleading unless we tie it to jobs, or volume. Danny – marketplace is very cyclical which prevent us from committing to jobs/volumes. Emmett - more meaning when tied in but need to have it in a way that can be presented to an auditor. Terry – last plan VOITs were tied in to volume (numbers) and we failed? Randy – could also reference in SFM text the procurement protocol and how to get involved.

Action – identify AFA procurement website address in the SFM Plan text

Element 5.3

Crown Timber stumpage paid to government and consolidated revenues.

Gord – Provincial stumpage revenues are down due to markets - the target has been adjusted to reflect current reality. Suggested \$750,000/year with a 20% variance? We are relying on variance to meet this one for 2011/12. We have some control but it is primarily market driven. Terry – do you need a dollar figure? Danny – if economy is doing well, the Crown will adjust stumpage. Emmett – how do you determine the price for stumpage? Gord – MNR monthly stumpage matrix is prepared to show current charges. Joe – we can provide a link to the stumpage matrix website? Link:

http://www.mnr.gov.on.ca/en/Business/Forests/2ColumnSubPage/STDPROD_092171.html

Gord – suggested we do away with the rolling average – not needed with the new revised target.

Increased Participation (Treaty)

Gord – should we keep this in because it is really outside the scope of this exercise? AFA cannot report on it. The Algonquin’s support keeping it in the Matrix.

Interior Visitor Days per Year

Deb/ Lacey – why is this one in here? Gord – agree that there are so many other factors that influence visitor days? Can remove or open to suggestions? Deb – it has been covered previously in the Matrix. Barry- agree it could be removed because it is handled earlier. Danny – recreation does benefit because of synergy, for example, maintaining access roads on east side facilitates access to Lake Travers. Bob M. – Rock Lake road is also jointly maintained to facilitate recreational access.

Action: Review wording of indicator and replace with an alternate Indicator that highlights road maintenance to facilitate recreational user access.

Lacey – suggest an indicator to add that would promote forest management awareness? Gord – there is a mandatory VOIT along those lines that we will discuss in section 6 of the Matrix.

Element 6.1

Evidence of good understanding of the nature of Aboriginal title and rights.

Tom – began by reviewing the Element within the Matrix. Lacey – in fairness to Bob C. can we delay until he returns to the table? Tom – agree.

Dana – what will be the effect on tenure following new Provincial direction? Danny – new direction is that 25% of the allocated volume will be put out for tender, the whole Province will go this route. Tom C. – Quebec and BC have gone this route, Ontario is playing catch up. Danny –there may also be interest to have more Aboriginal involvement on Boards.

Group skipped ahead to Element 6.3 to wait until Bob C. returned back to the room.

Element 6.3

Evidence that the organization has co-operated with other forest dependent businesses

Gord – Do we need the word “forest” to single out those communities or remove and broaden this Indicator out? The premise is very timber focused, the Standard suggested an example and how we are assisting other communities to respect other activities (i.e. timing restrictions). Suggest adding Recreation dependant businesses too? Lacey – not sure about this indicator. Element speaks to forest community well-being and resilience, that the AFA is to encourage, co-operate with, or help provide opportunities for economic diversity within the community. Dana – does it infer AFA place wood on open market?, there is a lot of opposition to these foreseen changes. Those that are influencing the tenure system are those trying to correct problems that originated from the north. Most SFL holder’s don’t agree to change. Sawmill and Logging companies have made investments on crown licence areas and are oppose a tendered sales approach. Ministry is looking for Tenure System that can provide more jobs, but it is a long way from getting resolved. Barry – seems to not mesh in this location in table? Dana- there are many business to business relationships wood is already being moved to non-commitment holders. Bob M. – the difference is we deal with a lot of pulp in this area, we can produce a lot and could accept to share 25% of the open-market volume if it is pulp. Lacey – is this Indicator not an effort being made to improve communities? Barry – what is the scale of the community, how large and who does it encompass? Lacey – most of the communities surrounding the Park are dependent on harvesting? Emmett – is 25% of the volume only of low quality? Joe – no volume includes everything. Danny- % could be as high as 60%, 20% is relevant to this indicator at this time. Bob M. – providing community opportunities that stimulate the economy can be realized if more wood burning was allowed in the Province. Dan K.– Co-generation plant is one idea, a finger jointing plant is another, both ideas

accumulate wood that is a by-product from local mills. Dana – secondary manufacturing plant is a good idea that would complement current industry. Bob M.- secondary manufacturing plants have helped elsewhere in the Province. A Co-gen Plant would help us all as well. Dana – I have to complement the work being done in Renfrew County, it has been great.

Barry- maybe this VOIT is not measurable just keep a record? Lacey – should get credit with efforts that you make. Joe – comments back from meeting can be included in record. Barry – “Evidence of” sounds like bookkeeping, filing documentation. Lacey – sounds to me more qualitative reference in report and not based on numbers that are measured. There is a linkage to the Local Citizens Committee here also.

Action: Revise target to report on activities/opportunities taken/explored to strengthen and diversify all aspects the local forest-based economy.

Timing Restrictions

Gord – cooperate with other users in Park, we do that on a day-to-day basis and we can build a measureable indicator around that. Showed a map of Algonquin Park showing only that only 15% of the total park area is not under some sort of operational restriction that is applied to accommodate other values/users.

Evidence of Co-operation with workers to enhance safety standards

Barry – what would an auditor look for as evidence? Gord –attendance list and pictures of award winners for example. Danny – words in the Indicator “and affected communities” what does that mean? Tom - Could be like the Nipissing Forest example in Restoule – safety issue of hauling through town.

Evidence that a worker safety program has been implemented and is periodically reviewed and improved

Lacey – why is this included twice? Danny – AFA has a Joint H&S committee and representatives from each office. Safety audits are forwarded from the contractors to AFA.

Element 6.4

Level of Participant satisfaction with public participation process

Gord – idea is to fill out a “Satisfaction Survey” (distributed) and assess your satisfaction with your involvement in the certification process. Asked that each member forward a completed survey and the results will be used to gauge the level of Advisory Group satisfaction. Gord – suggested that 75% (more than 2/3) be the level set in Target.

SFM Public Participation evaluation by the broader public

Gord –reviewed the comments around the broad public participation process. All were fairly straight forward replies.

Bob C. – Returned to meeting.

Element 6.1

Evidence of a good understanding of the nature of Aboriginal title and rights

Tom C.– understand that the Algonquin background information report requirements may be changing. Bob C. shared his frustration with quality of the document, would like to see more resources spent to improve its quality. Joe- I was the main author of this section of the FMP for Algonquin Park. Richard – adequate dollars are not available to properly list native values and properly prepare background report.

Joe – Indicator here is providing evidence that AFA has an understanding? Gord – yes, the existing documents from the FMP process provide evidence that AFA has an understanding of Aboriginal title and rights. Danny is also participating in meetings for the Algonquin land claim. Barry – this 6 pg. background information document is not intended to be an exhaustive study? Gord reviewed the Aboriginal background document with the Advisory Group. Richard – there is a statement in the document that explains that there are inadequate funds. Joe – yes. Danny – question the relevance of a Sept 1 & Oct 1 Hunt map. The hunt is now controlled via a tag system, compared to when the protocol was first put in place, and could last until sometime after Xmas - there could be a better way to communicate active operations, possibly sit down together? Bob C. – it is hard to explain to our community the restrictions being placed on access.

Joe – the summary in the background package documents a very thorough consultation with the Algonquins. How do you propose to have a better understanding?

Emmett- AFA can have an understanding but still works under the direction of the Ministry. Randy – our treaty is not here yet; work can begin now to accommodate interests? Richard – we ask to continue to work towards resolving issues and accommodate. We know the issues, some will be addressed through the Treaty some can be addressed through working relationships. At the end of the day we can then say that we have a mechanism in place to resolve differences when they arise. Richard –having a committee could be a door in to communicate and resolve issues: some concepts to discuss may be aggregate use, access control.....etc. We can invite someone like AFA's General Manager and sit on a committee meeting and resolve issues. Richard –our community asked for a protocol to manage issues four years ago and it did not go anywhere? Emmett – noticed that after the FMP was approved there has been little communications since?

Barry- is the Land Claim process going to resolve these issues now? Scope that you are proposing are short term (in-lieu of) a signed Treaty? Richard – Treaty would speak to a process but not tell us how to implement. We can start doing the leg work now. Bob C. - it is realistic to want to wait until there is a Treaty? If you cannot come to terms on these small issues now, our Community may question efforts made to date and wonder if they sent the right representatives to negotiate a Treaty. Richard – Algonquin's are concerned about access, aggregate not specifically related to the Algonquin Park landbase, but the regional landbase as a whole. We can develop the framework but the challenge will be to implement it. Tom C. – does AFA have to be part of it? Bob C. – yes, looking for AFA to be a member at the table, not just in a supportive role.

Danny – is the indicator here that a meeting will be held and we will attend? We need a target to measure and MNR would have to be there too. Emmett– AFA's decision making is limited. Richard – all I'm suggesting is working towards having a working relationship.

Action: Add target to continue to work towards a positive working relationship to help resolve Algonquin community/AFA issues

Bob C. – Aboriginal Title not Treaty Rights and my version of entitlement is different than anyone else’s. Dan K. – we know what we will be assigned will not be the same as what it was like when first contact was made. We are looking for good participation, looking for accommodation, and don’t want to trump any others interest. Documents out there may not go back far enough to the basic premise of what Algonquin’s originally valued.

Larry – Algonquin Title and Rights that exist now can be learned. My experience under FSC Standard, is that there is language within the Standard where we allow ourselves to step back. Allows us to understand the framework built around those rights. There needs to be a process where there is education, then you can breakdown and view Algonquin Title and Rights at a larger scale. I think teaching “Algonquin Title and Rights 101” could help bring a new level of understanding. Irvin – suggested in the text to separate Algonquin Title and Rights from Algonquin Treaty Rights.

Randy - I read it as two different types of Rights. Bob C. – the Treaty is going to be brought into our Constitution. Richard – it is important to start to develop protocols and mechanisms to deal with the fallout of a signed Treaty now, and start the dialogue, if you’re willing?

Evidence of best efforts to obtain acceptance of management plans based on Aboriginal communities having clear understanding of the plans

Richard – don’t assume that just because the Algonquin’s are at the table we agree. We need to look to see if what is being planned will have an effect on the overall land claim process. Zoning or content in plan may affect future zoning. Danny – VOIT speaks to best efforts. Joe- this VOIT speaks to management plans not just the FMP process? Gord- we have Algonquin’s at the table during the preparation of the FMP and the CSA Plan. Richard – you are not taking in consideration the best interest of the ANR if the Plan is not taken back to Algonquin’s of Ontario table to review and sign off as a Community. Terry – can you share a time frame on this process you are proposing? Richard – no, timeframe we will try to fit it in our schedule and accommodate. Joe – an individual community consultation process was offered during the development of the FMP. All 10 communities were invited and get involved in a customized consultation process. Richard – you would have real Algonquin support if you have the ANR sign off on the plan.

Level of Management and/or protection of areas where culturally important practices and activities (hunting, fishing and gathering) occur.

Gord –shared edits made to Matrix with the Group that focuses on targets that can be measured. Bob C. – there is no moose hunting agreement - we choose to share our Moose Management Plan with MNR. Joe – Gord can remove the word “agreement” and adjust the wording to recognize that Algonquin’s prepare the plan. Is there a Fisheries’ Management Plan? Randy – not one started - have met to start the work. It is more important that we meet once a year, discuss issues and how we resolve issues. All forms of harvesting affect the road strategy. It is a two-way street. Bob C. – questioned the text that refers to all potential birch bark trees? Suggested we need to specify white birch trees not yellow? Suggested to add the text “white” and “canoe quality” to Matrix. These birch trees are rare, 1 of 10 000 trees, that are of canoe building quality.

Evidence of Understanding and use of Aboriginal knowledge through the engagement of willing Aboriginal communities, using a process that identifies and manages culturally important resources and values

Bob C.- sought clarification on Objective text “other Aboriginal” groups? Randy – new terminology to use now is the Algonquin’s of Ontario. Bob C. – lines on maps to distinguish other Aboriginal communities were drawn by European’s. Evidence of Algonquin feet on the ground is proof where the Algonquins were? Gord – edited text to now reference Algonquin’s of Ontario.

Continuing, Element 6.4

Evidence of efforts to promote capacity development and meaningful participation in general and Aboriginal communities

Tom – any issue or concern? Randy – commented to include website procurement opportunities reference in SFM plan text.

Element 6.5

Number of people reached through educational outreach

Tom C.– Target set at >4500 people /yr? How did you come to that number? Gord – we keep track of outreach sessions and put attendance numbers to these events. Dana – how many people go to the logging museum? Bob M. – approximately 50,000 visitors go through the logging museum in one season. Gord – it certainly has been a great venue that brings awareness to forest management in Algonquin Park. Terry – do you know how many people have received Junior Ranger booklet? Danny – should add logging museum attendance to number in table. Deb – museum may be attracting new interest and it is important to capture. It is passive, rather than proactive, should still receive credit. Danny –we have been attracting global attention from visitors from China, Ireland and Germany.

Action: Add Logging Museum annual visitation numbers to the educational outreach summary

Tom C. – other thoughts to add or measure? Barry – is there a way to ring the bell louder? Lacey – shared lots of ideas - suggested to display any research on the AFA website and consider revamping website by making it more attractive and giving it a more modern look? Share good stories of Algonquin Park forestry. The reality is you’re competing against anti-logging, environmentalists that have the means to shed a very dim light on all the positive aspects to managing a healthy forest. Also suggested creating a Facebook page? Danny – offered to the Group to forward website suggestions/ future upgrades.

Action: AFA to consider more active website maintenance and updates. Present to advisory group what will be done at the fall meeting.

Forest research funding and /or in kind assistance.

Gord –reviewed research expenditures to date with the Group. Deb – do you mean total of cash and in kind together? Gord – yes. If so, remove “expenditure” to clear up text.

Promote and market achievement of certification

Tom C.- what has AFA done to demonstrate that the certification is being promoted? Gord- not enough according to the last Surveillance Audit, there was an OFI in the last audit to do a better job promoting the achievement of the CSA Standard. There is the CSA logo, but there are marketing restrictions. Tom C. – suggested we could put the logo on AFA ½ tons?

Action – AFA to identify more opportunities to market CSA certification.

4. Broad Public Consultation Received

Gord – there are eight completed surveys and the due date is set for June 29th. We solicited the public in three different newspapers papers. Larger environmental groups contacted. Not a whole lot of feedback has been received.

Criterion 5 – Mandatory Discussion Item

Proportion of goods and services sourced from local communities (to the extent that they are reasonably cost-competitive)

Gord – discussed with AFA Accountant Tim Doyle - If you exclude the stumpage payments to Queens Park, I would suggest that over 90% of our expenditures are local. Payments to contractors, employees, vehicles and fuel etc are all sourced locally. Bob C – how do we go about making a request for support from the AFA? Danny – prepare a proposal and I can present it to the Board.

5. Other Items:

Location and timing of next meeting:

Mid-September – not sure on location yet

Opportunities for improvement:

None suggested

Upcoming Events:

Loggers' Day at the Logging Museum on the 28th of July from 10am-3pm.

Meet the Researcher Day at the East Beach Pavilion from 9:00 am – 3:00 pm on August 2nd

Lacey – advised of a TedX event happening in September. Talk on Algonquin Park related topics including forestry and only 100 seats are available and you have to apply to attend. Link:

<http://tedxalgonquinpark.blogspot.ca/>

Bob C. – led the closing prayer.

Adjourn