



Forest Management Public Summary

for

Eastern Ontario Model Forest

Certification Code: SW-FM/COC-232

Date of Certification: January 1, 2003

Date of Public Summary: December 2002, updated for 2004

This document was produced according to the guidelines of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) and the SmartWood Program. No part of the report should be published separately.

Certifier:

SmartWood Program¹
c/o Rainforest Alliance
665 Broadway, 5th Floor
New York, New York 10012 U.S.A.
TEL: (212) 677-1900 FAX: (212) 677-2187
Email: info@smartwood.org
Website: www.smartwood.org

¹ SmartWood is implemented worldwide by the nonprofit members of the SmartWood Network. The Network is coordinated by the Rainforest Alliance, an international nonprofit conservation organization. The Rainforest Alliance is the legally registered owner of the SmartWood certification mark and label. All uses of the SmartWood label for promotion must be authorized by SmartWood headquarters. SmartWood certification applies to forest management practices only and does not represent endorsement of other product qualities (e.g., financial performance to investors, product function, etc.). SmartWood is accredited by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) for the certification of natural forest management, tree plantations and chain of custody.

To earn SmartWood certification, a forest management operation must undergo an on-site field assessment. This Public Summary Report summarizes information contained in the initial assessment report, which is produced based on information collected during the field assessment. Annual audits are conducted to monitor the forest management operation's activities, to review the operation's progress toward meeting their certification conditions, and to verify compliance with the SmartWood standards. Addenda providing the updated information obtained during these annual audits are included as attachments to the Public Summary Report.

1. GENERAL SUMMARY

1.1. Name and Contact Information

Source Name: Eastern Ontario Model Forest
Contact Person: Scott Davis
Address: PO Bag 2111, Kemptville, Ontario Canada K0G 1J0
Tel: 613 - 258-8422
Fax: 613 – 258-8363
E-mail: sdavis@eomf.on.ca

1.2. General Background

A. Type of operation

The Eastern Ontario Model Forest (EOMF) is seeking certification as a Resource Manager for their group of forest managers and owners that carry out forestry on private forest lands in eastern Ontario. The primary purpose of the EOMF operation is to promote good forest management. There is a wide range of programs promoted and administered by EOMF in the area. The EOMF has set itself up so that various clusters of property owners can join the EOMF certified property pool. All properties under the EOMF certificate will be managed by EOMF.

In the future, if FSC policy allows, the EOMF could become an 'umbrella' of groups. Each group would have its own manager who would manage under the policies and procedures of the EOMF. The EOMF is already proceeding in this direction; however, they cannot actualize their structure since FSC does not yet allow this innovation. Domtar Forest Resources—Cornwall (DFR—C) with 37 properties achieved its own FSC Resource Manager certificate in 2002. In fact the assessment team conducted the assessments of the EOMF and DFR-C concurrently. DFR-C has its own manager, therefore, by FSC policy, they must have their own certificate. However, they work under the same policies and procedures as the EOMF. SmartWood views this as a 'business' relationship at this time. This assessment report will make reference to DFR-C, however, it should be emphasized that DFR-C has its own FSC certificate and the DFR-C properties are not part of the EOMF pool.

The Lanark Forest Owners Group (LFOG) of twenty individual property owners totalling 4202 acres is the proposed certified pool managed by EOMF. Most properties in LFOG are small properties ranging from 40 to 800 acres.

Another property owner with a larger property of 6,000 ha, is also working with the EOMF. This individual has not yet agreed to work under the EOMF policies and procedures which form the basis of their certifications structure. This individual is not

part of the certified pool. The EOMF has an objective to grow its certified pool of properties.

B. Years in operation

EOMF has been developing their certification pilot project since June 2000, but they have been actively involved in forest management for more than a decade in eastern Ontario.

C. Date first certified

January 1, 2003

D. Latitude and longitude of certified operation

Operations centre from Kemptville, Ontario – Latitude 45° N Longitude 76 ° W.

1.3. Forest and Management System

A. Forest type and land use history

This forest area is referred to as the Great Lakes St. Lawrence forest region (Rowe 1971²). In the south, the woodlots in the program are small hardwood stands in the agricultural landscape of southern Ontario, some on quite rich soils (Upper St. Lawrence, Rowe 1971). The primary issue for most landowners is the value of the agricultural land. This drives harvest pattern, and all landuses in the area.

In the north, in Lanark County, the effects of the underlying Precambrian granite is more noticeable with less viable agricultural activity, in fact a significant proportion of the forest is reclaimed farmland. The surface is characterized by interspersions of glacial till and outcrops of granite bedrock. The terrain varies from lowland flat to rolling uplands.

In the south tree species include primarily hard and soft maple, with white and yellow birch, green and white ash, American beech, white elm, red and bur oak. Shade intolerant species are primarily trembling and largetooth aspen, balsam poplar. Basswood, butternut and hickory are also present. In the north conifer species are more common and mixed wood is typical. White and red pine, white cedar, eastern hemlock occur widely.

B. Size of management unit and area in production forest, conservation, and/or restoration

LFOG has twenty properties ranging from 40 to 800 acres (approx. 16 ha to 320 ha) all totalling 4202 acres. LFOG owners names and property statistics are listed in Appendix IV.

Of the 37 properties in the DFR—C pool, 35 are less than 40 ha, most less than 10. One property is 150 ha, and one large county forest has been brought into the group. The DFR—C members are listed in appendix of the DFR-C certification assessment report.

² Rowe, J.S. 1971. Forest Regions of Canada. Canadian Forest Service, Dept. of the Environment. 172 pp.

C. Annual allowable cut and/or annual harvest covered by management plan

EOMF is preparing for harvest operations on some of the LFOG properties in 2002. At this time they cannot forecast a likely annual harvest. This will be dependent on the success in bringing new members into the group, and on the interest current members have in harvest.

The DFR—C members are described in the DFR-C assessment report. Primarily, the WMP work by DFR—C is pre-commercial in nature. The harvest is limited by budget, not available harvest area (AHA). As such, AHA for the WMP is best expressed in budgeted hectares, with a forecast volume based upon past results. Currently the DFR-C budget allows for 110 hectares within the county Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry Counties, and 20 hectares in Lanark County for 2002. Based upon average volume figures, this will generate 4600 m³ of high density pulpwood, 750 m³ of low density pulpwood, and 400 m³ of hardwood sawlogs, with an incidental volume of conifer sawlogs and pulpwood. DFR--C WMP harvests only a small percentage of the available harvest area from private land in eastern Ontario which has a total forest area of 70,372 hectares.

D. General description of details and objectives of the management plan/system

It is important to note that the long-term vision for the group is to provide a system for multiple forest managers who wish to manage according to the standards of the FSC. The project is managed by a group called the Certification Working Group (CWG), and the details of the process that the CWG has undertaken is documented by EOMF Information Report No. 49, (“Introduction to sustainable forestry certification”). The guiding document for the EOMF system is the Policy and Procedures Manual (DRAFT 25/11/01).

This means that the EOMF group could be the umbrella organization for a number forest managers. These forest managers would manage according to FSC principles, and may already have an established client pool that they would bring to the EOMF group. They would follow the certified EOMF policies and procedures. In the FSC lexicon this could be considered an “umbrella” or a “group of groups”. This format is not currently allowed by FSC. Therefore, although EOMF has plans to work towards a more complex organization (see Appendix V for a diagram), the current structure is simple and requires that EOMF has direct supervision of all operations and members of groups (below).

The current structure shown in Figure 1 includes twenty individual properties (LFOG) under the direct supervision of EOMF which is the object of this assessment. The 37 properties are presently managed by DFR—C under a separate certificate. This redundancy is ideal for the development of policies and procedures of a more complex system. The fact that there is a separate certificate for DFR—C ensures that the FSC standards will be met during procedural changes that may occur while the new organization develops. The LFOG group is not covered by a separate certificate, and is the main focus of this assessment. The limited number of planned operations in the near future by LFOG also ensures that the forest is not at risk.

By agreement between Domtar and EOMF DFR—C will follow EOMF policies and procedures. EOMF in fact works with the managers of DFR-C to ensure that DFR-C follows the EOMF policies and procedures. DFR—C and EOMF have been coordinating

their policies and procedures in anticipation of this assessment. While this structure and relationship seems complicated for a small number of properties SmartWood commends Domtar and the Eastern Ontario Model Forest as well as the other EOMF partners for their innovative structure. The structure allows the EOMF certification project to grow into the future.

EOMF anticipates that they will provide a range of services to the landowners from planning, tree marking, harvest supervision, monitoring etc. The primary intention at this time is to provide the service only to owners wishing to be certified, as this is the goal of the current project. In practice, a number of the LFOG owners have not yet decided that harvesting will occur. Their interest is in long term planning and in belonging to a group that can provide good advice on a wide variety of forest issues, not just harvesting. Although several properties in LFOG are in the process of preparing for harvest operations, none were as yet complete. In effect, this assessment was the first step in the certification process for EOMF, and will provide a reality check as their system develops. A further assessment was scheduled for late summer, 2002. At that time the DFR—C system and EOMF are expected to be aligned.

Currently, EOMF activity includes: advising LFOG on good silviculture and forest management practices; preparation of LFOG properties for harvest (tree marking, selection and training of supervisor, and operator); supervision of DFR—C system for compliance with FSC P&C's. EOMF does not include a track record of harvest operations, except for the DFR—C properties which have already been assessed. This assessment will include a review of the EOMF system as it has been demonstrated on the ground (primarily treemarked stands); but not for aspects related to the management of the DFR—C properties. The DFR—C properties will be reviewed as part of the overall system, and the way in which EOMF exercises control and supervision.

By way of summary of the companion certification, the DFR--C Woodlot Management Program (WMP) manages properties owned by many landowners each with their own goals and objectives for their property, developed with the assistance of DFR--C. Therefore there is not a single goal or set of objectives for WMP properties. However, the underlying mandate of DFR—C's WMP is to follow good forestry practices for their clients and to promote sustainable forestry principles to forest owners in the area. Domtar corporately has a well-defined forest and environmental policy.

EOMF follows the standard silviculture for the area described basically in the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (OMNR) silvicultural guide. EOMF uses primarily selection, and shelterwood silvicultural management systems, but small clearcuts have occurred. All of their harvest operations are preceded by stand inventory and harvest prescriptions. If partial cutting systems are prescribed, certified tree markers are employed to mark trees to be harvested as prescribed. If a full harvesting system or clearcut is prescribed the cut block and values are identified and appropriate buffers are established prior to harvest. Road layout and main skid trails are also located prior to harvest. Generally, skidders are used to withdraw products from forest to landings where trained operators sort and cut logs the logs, optimizing the value of the harvested product.

Woodland plans include landowner objectives, stand history, harvest prescription, etc. All of the LFOG properties have current Managed Forest Tax Incentive Program (MFTIP) plans and include updated stand analysis and digital inventory maps. Cruise data and plan information is formatted as required by MFTIP. MFTIP is an Ontario tax

incentive program promoting forestry education and fair taxation of forested lands. Most of the preparation of the MFTIP is done under the supervision of EOMF, by consultants.

1.4. Environmental and Socioeconomic Context

The EOMF works within a defined area and covers much of eastern Ontario including the Counties of Lanark, Leeds, Grenville, Dundas, Stormont, Glengarry, Prescott and Russell, the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton and the lands of the Mohawk community of Akwesasne. The Certification Pilot Project has been undertaken on properties within Lanark County. When the Pilot Project has been completed the private landowners within the remainder of the EOMF area will be eligible to participate (if they meet the requirements of the program). EOMF has also expressed a desire to apply the certification initiative outside of its area but there are no concrete plans to this effect at this time. The EOMF Certification Pilot Project is the first in Canada to develop this sort of template for small private woodlot owners to participate in FSC Certification.

Located along the north shore of the St Lawrence River, along the Québec border in the east up to the Ottawa River along the north boundary and south along the Lanark --Leeds County boundary line this area totals about 1.5 million hectares (Information Report #42, EOMF 1989-99 State of the Forest Report). The Cities of Ottawa and Cornwall fall within its boundaries. From either of these centres it is about a one-hour drive to Montreal.

Most of this area especially along the St Lawrence River was inhabited by what is known as the Eastern Woodlands Farmers who were the only native people in Canada to live primarily by farming. This area unlike the Northern Woodlands territory is located on arable soil. At the time of Champlain in the early 1600's the Woodlands people were made up of five tribes the Seneca, Cayuga, Oneida, Onondaga and Mohawk. The Iroquois Wars of the 1600's resulted in the eventual negotiated treaty of the Iroquois Confederacy in 1701. During the 1700' and early 1800's what is known now as the Six Nations was settled by a group of Mohawk in the Brantford area while other Mohawk settled along the St Lawrence outside Montreal and the Bay of Quinte.

Areas in the northwest portion of the EOMF were inhabited by the Eastern Woodlands Algonquins. The Algonquin grew some crops but relied mostly upon hunting and fishing to provide the bulk of their food. The Algonquins traveled efficiently in canoes of birch bark in the summer and on snowshoes during the winter. They traveled to visit family and to trade goods. During the late 1600's most Eastern Woodlands Algonquins would have been directly or indirectly involved with the fur trade.

Cornwall and the surrounding area along the southern reaches of the EOMF are one of the oldest settled areas in English Canada. Founded by loyalist soldiers in 1784 and joined by settlers from the Scottish Highlands in 1786 it was known as New Johnstown and later changed to Cornwall in honour of King George III eldest son. Cornwall became a town in 1834 when work began on the canal that would allow ships to pass the Long Sault Rapids. When the canal opened in 1842 it brought prosperity to the area. Waterpower from the canal was used to run local mills and later when the Grand trunk Railway joined Montreal and Toronto through Cornwall it put the area in a great position to attract industry. A paper mill was established in 1881 which rapidly expanded; today it is known as Domtar Cornwall, and is one of the city's largest employers.

Also lying within the EOMF area is the nations' capital, Ottawa and smaller centres, Perth, Kempville, Casselman and Hawksbury to name a few. These areas were settled later than the centres along the St Lawrence but have their own rich history. The square timber trade in the early 1800's and later the sawlog industry replaced the fur trade and altered the forested landscape; today most of the original forests are gone due to past logging and agricultural practices.

Information Report # 42 indicates that the reduction in the forest cover due to human settlement, by the 1880's within the Model Forest area was significant. About seventy percent of the area had been surveyed and less than 30% of that area remained forested. The forest cover within the EOMF has increased slightly and at present is about 34%. Within the area there are 20 species found that have been classes as vulnerable, threatened or endangered and another 24 at risk.

Of the forested area in the EOMF about 12% is Crown lands and about 88% private lands. About 2% of the landbase is currently protected. Additional areas have been identified for protection as ANSI's (these are areas that have a natural value of significance recognized on the site). ANSI's occur on private and Crown land however; the status of these sites is still under discussion. The ANSI sites located on private lands are eligible for 100% tax rebate if left undeveloped; this offers some protection of the sites. As of 1999 about 45% of the landowners that are eligible for a tax reduction under this program had enrolled. (Information Report #42, State of the Forest 1998-1999)

The natural resources of the area are many. Agriculture, forestry and some mineral extraction occur on the lands within the EOMF area. According to Chapman and Putnam 1984 the physiography of the area includes precambrian shield overlain with shallow till, precambrian shield with clay deposits (Leeds Knobs and Flats). These represent the areas underlain by the Canadian Shield. The interface between the shield and the St Lawrence River are underlain by paleozoic bedrock and are characterized by limestone plains, till plains, clay plains, till and clay plains (Lancaster flats), sand plains, and clay and sand plains with drumlins.

The forest region falls completely within the Great Lakes St. Lawrence Forest Region. The forests are dominated by sugar maple and beech, red maple, yellow birch, basswood, white ash, large tooth aspen, red and bur oak with some scattered white oak, red ash, rock elm, blue beech and bitternut hickory. Poorly drained soils will support Black ash, black spruce and some eastern white cedar. On the acidic soils or shallower soils eastern hemlock, eastern white pine and white spruce are common. The drier soils will support white and red pine and red oak.

Aside from human disturbances referenced, there are two major types of natural disturbance that have occurred in this forest type and they are attributed to weather events. They are ice storm damage and wind damage. Also possible and less common but a more intense disturbance are crown fires. The uneven aged – tolerant hardwoods of the area adapt quickly to the weather type disturbances and quickly grow to replace the damaged area. Where there has been greater disturbance due to fire and /or clearing of the forest, even aged stands of poplar and white birch now occur.

Information Report Number 42, State of the Forest Report 1998-1999 states that the sawmills and pulpmills in Eastern Ontario utilized over 460,000m³ of sawlogs and pulpwood in 1998. Pulpwood makes up 80% of the volume, sawlogs 17% and conifer

sawlogs 3%. Local private lands provide about 25% of that volume, crown lands 2% and the remainder is imported from the New York State. Regional wood prices in the EOMF area for the most valuable species (black cherry, red oak and hard maple) are about \$540 per 1000 board feet for #1 common. Yellow birch, soft maple, ash, white oak, basswood and butternut average \$330 per 1000 board feet for #1 common. Number 1 common prices may be up to 80% higher than #2. Prices were compared with those in Bancroft and they appeared to be similar. Maple syrup products are the most common non-timber related forest product that is produced in the EOMF area.

Information Report Number 42, State of the Forest Report 1998-1999 also contains the following information regarding employment in the forest industry across the EOMF: An analysis was undertaken and indicated that employment in forest related industries represents .82% of total employment in all industries in Eastern Ontario compared to 1.4% for the rest of the province. This means that the economy in Eastern Ontario is less dependant upon the forestry sector than the rest of the Ontario economy. Forestry related employment is higher in Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry and Lanark Counties where it is 3.92% and 1.55% of the total employment respectively. This high percentage for Stormont, Glengarry and Dundas is attributed to the mill in Cornwall.

While forest related jobs are important within the area research in the larger EOMF area reflect the overall decrease in forest sector related job opportunities, having declined by 18% between 1991 and 1996 (information Report 42, Eastern Ontario Model Forest). Strategic Projections Inc. supports this data and proposed that jobs within the primary sector (including forestry) will continue to decline.

Another background document that is useful in getting an overall picture of forests and forestry in this area is: Healthy Forests, Healthy Business, Central Ontario, and Eastern Ontario; contact Ottawa Valley Economic Development Office, Renfrew Ontario.

1.5. Products Produced and Chain of custody

A. Species and volumes covered by the certificate

| Species | Scientific name | Estimated Volume (m ³ per yr) | Product |
|--|---|---|----------|
| High density pulp (primarily hard and soft maple, white and yellow birch, green and white ash, American beech, white elm, red and bur oak) | <i>Acer saccharum</i> , <i>Acer rubrum</i> , <i>Betula papyrifera</i> , <i>Betula alleghaniensis</i> , <i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i> , <i>Fraxinus americana</i> , <i>Fagus grandifolia</i> , <i>Ulmus Americana</i> , <i>Quercus rubra</i> , <i>Quercus macrocarpa</i> . | 4600 | Pulpwood |
| Low density pulp (primarily trembling and largetooth aspen, balsam poplar, basswood, butternut) | <i>Populus tremuloides</i> , <i>Populus grandidentata</i> , <i>Populus balsamifera</i> , <i>Tilia Americana</i> , <i>Juglans cinerea</i> . | 750 | Pulpwood |
| Hardwood Sawlogs (primarily hard and soft maple, white and yellow birch, green and white ash, | <i>As above</i> | 400 | Sawlogs |

| | | | |
|---|---|------------|-------------------|
| American beech, white elm, red and bur oak, trembling and largetooth aspen, balsam poplar, basswood, butternut) | | | |
| Conifer (primarily white and red pine, white cedar, eastern hemlock, and balsam fir) | <i>Pinus strobus, Pinus resinosa, Thuja occidentalis, Tsuga Canadensis, Abies balsamea.</i> | Incidental | Sawlogs and pulp. |

B. Description of current and planned processing capacity

Some members of LFOG have some processing capability for lumber. None of these individuals are in the certified pool. The largest of these, Opeongo, is incorporated company and has a kiln drying facility. Their capability for producing lumber far exceeds the anticipated volume coming from EOMF certified properties for the foreseeable future.

Sawlogs and veneer are sold into local markets.

The market for the hardwood pulp for the members of EOMF is to the Domtar pulp and paper mill at Cornwall. As described in the companion report, Domtar's Cornwall facility is an integrated pulp and paper mill with annual production capacity of 260,000 tons. The mill, which initiated production in 1882, currently produces high end coated and printing papers for sale in Canada and the USA. The Cornwall mill purchases 240,000 oven dry metric tonnes of hardwood fibre each year from both Canada and the USA. The majority of the fibre comes from private lands, although Domtar also receives fibre from its 105,000 acre freehold landbase in New York State, and crown land sustainable forest licences in Ontario.

2. CERTIFICATION ASSESSMENT PROCESS

1.1. Assessment Dates

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| September 25, 2001 | Stakeholder public notices distribution starts (email, telephone and mail) |
| October 29 | Initial planning at EOMF offices in Kemptville Ont. |
| November | Public stakeholder meeting at county offices in Perth (in conjunction with EOMF meeting). |
| November 4 | Begin report write-up and continue stakeholder interactions (emails and interviews) |
| November 27, 28 | Field assessment of 15 properties of the 37 in both DFR-C and EOMF pools |
| November 29 | Closing meeting and review EOMF office in Kemptville, Ont. |
| April 15 | Draft report to EOMF for initial review & fact-checking/comment |
| May 1 | Draft report to peer reviewers and SmartWood headquarters |
| May 23 | Comment back from peer reviewers |
| May 27 | Final draft submitted to SmartWood for Decision Memo |
| December 9-10, 2002 | Precondition verification audit |
| December 12 | Precondition verification audit draft submitted to EOMF for fact checking and comment |
| December 16 | Precondition audit review by SmartWood |

1.2. Assessment Team and Peer Reviewers

Tom Clark, Team Leader, M.Sc. Zoology (wildlife ecology), has 20 years experience in wildlife ecology; environmental impacts on wildlife, particularly forestry. Tom is the certification coordinator for Westwind Forest Stewardship Inc. He has been lead assessor on several other SmartWood assessments, and is an experienced auditor using the Ontario Independent Forest

Audit Protocol. Recent projects include a review of the Ontario Forest Management Guidelines for the Ontario Government, as well as a review of Ontario's Independent Forest Audit system.

Barb Boland, H.B.A. (physical Geography), over 20 years experience in resource management, municipal and natural heritage planning on both private and Public lands. Barb is a registered approver for the Managed forest Tax Incentive Program. Recently, Barb was a member of the Lands for Life round Table for the Great Lakes St. Lawrence Planning Area. This panel formulated recommendations for land use planning on Ontario's Public lands following extensive consultation with many varied interest groups.

Rob Keen, B.Sc.F., R.P.F., 19 years forest management experience in the Great Lakes St. Lawrence forest region. Rob provides forest management services to landowners in Central Ontario and has extensive experience in developing Crown forest management plans. He has participated in other FSC assessments and has training in ISO14000 Environmental Management System auditing procedures.

Tom Clark (team leader and ecologist) and Rob Keen (forester) conducted the precondition verification audit.

1.3. Assessment Process

During the field phase of the assessment process, the team conducted the following steps as part of the normal SmartWood certification process. This process was slightly modified because the assessment was conducted on both the Domtar and EOMF systems during the same week. The operations are linked since both operations have committed to following the EOMF policies and procedures. Both operations are geographically close and occur on similar ecotypes with similar management systems.

- 1) **Pre-Assessment Analysis** – EOMF and DFR—C have jointly worked towards their certifications for several years. Several reports have been prepared and were available to the SmartWood team. The lead auditor met with both EOMF and Domtar on October 29, 2001 prior to the field assessment. At that meeting a sample of the EOMF LFOG woodlots was selected. EOMF made available the MFTIP plans for all of the forests. Part of the assessment was a mail survey. The survey was provided with return postage, and asked five open questions intended to solicit response on general issues rather than specific issues. There were 200 surveys sent out and 21 responses. Respondents were screened for those with a conflict of interest with the certification.
- 2) **Selection of Sites** – LFOG Woodlots were selected according to activity – only tree marked properties were available at this time. Four properties were chosen for the field visit.
- 3) **Field Interviews and Site Reviews** – Field visits occurred on the LFOG properties on 26, 27, 29 and 30 of November 2001. The assessment team met with three LFOG landowners on their properties, as well as the EOMF certification forester. In addition the team met with local government staff including biologist, and stewardship coordinator. On November 26 an evening public meeting was held with the landowners. This was well attended and provided an opportunity for discussion about FSC, as well as about the administration of the EOMF program directly with the landowners.
- 4) **Assessment Report Development** – The assessment report was developed over a thirty day period after the completion of the DFR—C assessment in March of 2002. Although this made for a protracted assessment, this made the project simpler for the assessment team who

needed to come to an understanding of the structure with regard to FSC policies. Throughout this write-up period the assessors continued to conduct stakeholder interviews and other research.

- 5) **Peer and Candidate Operation Review of the Report** – The final draft report was reviewed by EOMF and one independent peer reviewer. Normal FSC requirement is two, but because DFR--C is planning to be part of the EOMF assessment their operation was subjected to two further reviews. These peer reviews essentially reviewed the EOMF policy and procedures as applied by DFR-C.
- 6) **Certification Decision** – The certification decision was taken by SmartWood headquarters. This was completed after review of comments made on the draft report by operation and peer reviewers.
- 7) **Precondition Verification Audit** – The assessment indicated a precondition. Since EOMF none of the property owners in the EOMF proposed property pool had harvested under the EOMF policies and procedures the full extent of the standards could not be assessed. In the fall of 2002 two properties in the pool were harvested. The precondition verification audit was held on December 9-10, 2002. A draft of the report was forwarded to EOMF personnel for review and comment and subsequently submitted to SmartWood. The team adjusted the assessment report to add information regarding the issues raised by the precondition.
- 8) **Precondition Verification Audit Review** – SmartWood reviewed the precondition verification audit report. SmartWood updated the public summary section of the assessment report to reflect the results of the precondition verification audit.
- 9) **Certificate**

**Table 2. Summary of Forest Areas & Areas Visited by SmartWood Assessors
(Property numbers from file in Appendix IV)**

| Forest/Block Name | Total Area in Hectares |
|--|------------------------|
| Assessment | |
| Property #8 | 120 |
| Property #16 | 137 |
| Property #20 | 6000* |
| Precondition verification audit | |
| Property #4 | 237 |
| Property #18 | 165 |
| TOTALS | 6659 |

1.4. Guidelines

The DFR-C certification assessment was conducted using the draft Great Lakes-St. Lawrence FSC Regional Standards (March 2001). The GLSL standards were used after consultation with FSC Canada and the regional standards committee. Because these regional standards are draft, SmartWood has reviewed the assessment to ensure they are consistent with their own generic standards (March 2000). The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence draft regional standards meet or exceed the SmartWood generic standards.

1.5. Stakeholder consultation process and results

The purpose of the stakeholder consultation strategy for this assessment was threefold:

- a) To ensure that the public is aware of and informed about the assessment process and its objectives;
- b) To assist the field assessment team in identifying potential issues; and
- c) To provide diverse opportunities for the public to discuss and act upon the findings of the assessment.

This process is not just stakeholder notification, but wherever possible, detailed and meaningful stakeholder interaction. The process of stakeholder interaction does not stop after the field visits, or for that matter, after even a certification decision is made. SmartWood welcomes, at any time, comments on certified operations and such comments often provide a basis for annual field auditing.

In the case of DFR--C and EOMF Pilot Project, prior to the actual assessment process a public consultation stakeholder survey was developed and distributed to 200 individuals; adjacent landowners, private operators, contractors, the Pilot Project Membership, government officials, municipal and County staff and additional individuals who expressed an interest in the certificate.

This list also provided a basis for the assessment team to select people for interviews in person or by telephone or through email. A list of stakeholders that were notified, and those interviewed, is included in Appendix 1. Fourteen were interviewed in the field and 15 by phone, of these 4 were related to First Nation's issues.

A Public Meeting was held in Perth on Monday November the 26th; with 23 individuals attending the meeting. This meeting was related to the EOMF certification.

No additional stakeholder consultation was conducted during the precondition verification audit.

Issues Identified Through Stakeholder Comments and Public Meetings

The stakeholder consultation activities were organized to give participants the opportunity to provide comments according to general categories of interest based upon the assessment criteria. The table below summarizes the issues identified by the assessment team with a brief discussion of each based upon specific interview and/or public meeting comments.

| FSC Principle | Stakeholder Comments | SmartWood Response |
|---|---|--|
| P1: FSC Commitment and Legal Compliance | Numerous positive comments about the commitment to community and forest health. | Not necessary. |
| P2: Tenure & Use Rights & Responsibilities | General comments on survey and discussion with landowners indicated satisfaction that EOMF will manage the forest sustainably. | |
| P3 – Indigenous Peoples’ Rights | Mohawks Council of Akwesasne were positive about involvement with EOMF. One comment was obtained asking for more involvement of elders. | SmartWood team attempted to contact more than one individual at Golden Lake band. Regarding the elders comment, SW attempted to contact other individuals. At the time of the final report no response was obtained. This was the only comment relative to this issue. |
| P4: Community Relations & Workers’ Rights | Many positive comments about the response of EOMF to the ice storm. | |
| P5: Benefits from the Forest | No comments | . |
| P6: Environmental Impact | No comments | |
| P7: Management | No comments | |

| | | |
|--|-------------|--|
| Plan | | |
| P8: Monitoring & Assessment | No comments | |
| P9: Maintenance of High Conservation Value Forest | No Comments | |
| P10 - Plantations | NA | |

3. RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1.1. General Discussion of Findings

| Principle/Subject Area | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|--|---|
| P1: FSC Commitment and Legal Compliance | EOMF well networked; excellent Agreement procedure in place; have experience of DFR—C to draw on. | Need to designate a person to keep legislation up to date and staff trained. Inform new members of access risks |
| P2: Tenure & Use Rights & Responsibilities | Private ownership; few customary rights; | Managers must consider traditional uses |
| P3 – Indigenous Peoples’ Rights | Excellent relationship and active engagement with the Mohawk Council of Akwesasne | Need to work out procedure on mapping cultural values with FN rep. Contact with Golden Lake would be useful. |
| P4: Community Relations & Workers’ Rights | Good high profile agency; Community supporters; Long term commitment as far as gov’t can make long term commitments. | Still developing operator contacts. Limited experience means a limitation on the size of properties that can be brought in. Weakness addressed, see precondition summary below. |
| P5: Benefits from the Forest | Actively identify non timber values; program to assist high value added products; | Still need implementation. Weakness addressed, see precondition summary below. |
| P6: Environmental Impact | Follow natural disturbance through selection and shelterwood harvest; follow good tree marking standards. | Still need implementation so a number of criteria will be evaluated in precondition audit. Also need to review ecosystem classification; conservation value; completion of policy on tending and herbicide use. Weakness addressed, see precondition summary below. |
| P7: Management Plan | Good basic plans in place, qualify for MFTIP. | Some administrative improvements are required. |
| P8: Monitoring & Assessment | Completion of State of the Forest report for big picture monitoring | Will follow DFR—C procedure; needs to be implemented. Weakness addressed, see precondition summary below. |
| P9: Maintenance of High Conservation Value Forest | Good awareness of the issues | HCVF must be evaluated prior to properties inclusion in pool. HCVF must be monitored annually. |

1.2. Precondition Compliance

The precondition was applied since none of the property owners in the proposed EOMF property pool had completed a harvesting operation. The assessment was able to consider EOMF planning but not their forest practices. The following precondition was applied:

EOMF must implement harvest operations within the Lanark Forest Owners Group (LFOG) to provide a track record for assessment of their system of forest planning and management.

Two of the original assessment team members conducted the precondition verification audit. Tom Clark (team leader and ecologist) and Rob Keen (forester) conducted a field visit of two properties on December 9th and 10th, 2002. They were accompanied by EOMF foresters, a forester from the OMNR, one property owner, a harvesting contractor and the contractor who marked the trees and supervised the harvesting operations as well as other observers.

Table 3 describes the precondition verification audit findings. The table presents the relevant subcriterion and a very short description of what the subcriterion is about. The findings describe in general how the EOMF met the standard.

The EOMF provided a significant revision to their policies and procedures manual. The policies and procedures manual is an innovative document which guides the forest management planning and forest practices for the pool of certified operations. The policies and procedures manual impacted virtually all of the subcriterion involved in the precondition verification audit.

Table 3. Precondition audit findings

| Subcriterion | Subcriterion description | Findings |
|--------------|--|---|
| 1.1.b | Satisfactory record of compliance | Harvesting without any compliance issues has established a basic track record. |
| 4.1.f | Worker remuneration | Worker remuneration compares favourably to local standards. A recommendation is provided. |
| 4.2.a | Worker safety | The standards were met except where these matters relate to skid trails. Snags which represent significant worker safety were observed adjacent to skid trails. A high density of skid trails (existing trail network prior to logging) not designed for logging may have resulted in significant residual damage. Condition 12 has been applied. |
| 6.3.g | Maintain large trees, snags and coarse woody debris | |
| 6.5.a | Residual stand damage | |
| 5.3.a | Maximize utilization | Harvesting practices met the standards. EOMF carefully sorted logs to maximize the veneer log sort. Utilization is excellent since there is a market for the pulp. |
| 5.3.b | Limit size and number of processing sites, use or dispose of waste | |
| 5.3.c | Levels of maximum stand damage specified | |
| 5.6 | Rate of harvest | Applying an AAC on small properties is problematic. Applying the selection system limits the amount of wood |

| | | |
|---------------|--|---|
| | | harvested on a site. |
| 6.3.d | Target for the conservation of white pine | Very little white pine in areas harvested in 2002. |
| 6.3.e | Late seral, old growth or mature forests retained where they occur | None encountered in the areas harvested in 2002. |
| 6.5.b | Standard for soil rutting | Policies and procedures manual provides a good framework for monitoring impacts on forest resources. Post harvest inspection forms were completed according to the manual. |
| 6.5.c | Roads, trails and landings planned to minimize soil erosion and loss of productive forest area | |
| 6.5.d | Mitigate against soil erosion | |
| 6.5.e | Mechanical site preparation does not affect forest resources | |
| 7.1.e and 8.1 | Monitoring | |
| 7.3.b | Clear guidance and training given field staff and contractors | Policies and procedures manual were followed with the exception of dangerous snags left alongside skid trails as noted under subcriteria 4.2.a, 6.3.g and 6.5.a with a condition applied. |
| | | |

The SmartWood precondition verification audit team found that EOMF had met the precondition and were recommended for certification.

1.3. Certification Decision

Based on a thorough field review, analysis and compilation of findings by this SmartWood assessment team EOMF is recommended to receive joint FSC/SmartWood Forest Management and Chain of Custody (FM/COC) Certification with the stipulated conditions and contingent.

In order to maintain certification, EOMF will be audited annually on-site and required to remain in compliance with the FSC principles and criteria as further defined by regional guidelines developed by SmartWood or the FSC. EOMF will also be required to fulfil the conditions as described below. Experts from SmartWood will review continued forest management performance and compliance with the conditions described in this report, annually during scheduled and random audits.

1.4. Conditions and Recommendations

Conditions are verifiable actions that will form part of the certification agreement that DFR-C will be expected to fulfill at the time of the first audit or as required in the condition. Each condition has an explicit time period for completion. Non-compliance with conditions will lead to de-certification.

As explained earlier in section 1.3 D, EOMF is attempting to start an innovative new approach to grouping forest management. In undertaking a full assessment the managers were aware that the system was only partially complete, but opted to proceed in order to know the full requirements of the FSC standard on their progress to date. This means that a pre-condition was expected. The following pre-condition is repeated throughout the report for each criterion which needs to be evaluated during the pre-condition audit later in 2002. In Appendix III the table also summarizes these criteria.

Precondition: EOMF must implement harvest operations within the Lanark Forest Owners Group (LFOG) to provide a track record for assessment of their system of forest planning and management

The precondition was met and condition 12 was added to the eleven original conditions.

Final Conditions

- Condition 1 As part of the administration of their system EOMF will designate a person to be responsible for keeping up to date information about regulatory requirements, and informing group members.
- Condition 2 As part of the administration of their system, in future EOMF will explicitly review access issues with landowners when properties are added to the certified pool to ensure new access is appropriate, and to suggest methods for control and limitation of liability. Access will be decommissioned if there are sensitive areas, or High Conservation Value Forest that will be compromised by the increased access.
- Condition 3 As part of the administration of their system, in future EOMF is to ensure new properties are reviewed in light of Cultural Values Mapping and will develop a procedure to achieve this, in cooperation with a First Nations representative.
- Condition 4 As part of the administration of their system EOMF must ensure that for public properties, traditional use, public interest and the need for appropriate public notice are met prior to the property being brought into the certified pool.
- Condition 5 As part of the administration of their system EOMF will not include properties of greater than 1000 ha in the certified pool until a further review, and a track record is established.
- Condition 6 Immediately, attendance at forestry workshops should be mandatory for all forest managers including those contracted to assist landowners.
- Condition 7 As part of the administration of their system, in future EOMF will review site classification systems and include either soils information or an appropriate FEC description as part of the pre-harvest inspection (stand analysis) procedure.
- Condition 8 As part of the administration of their system, in future EOMF is to review the conservation value of properties being included in the certified pool, and record these on the GIS system.
- Condition 9 EOMF will immediately amend the P&P manual to clearly indicate that the procedure for tree marking requires direct supervision by certified tree marker following an approved prescription consistent with provincial silvicultural guidelines.
- Condition 10 As part of the administration of their system EOMF is to immediately complete the policy on tending, use of herbicides, insecticides and exotics.
- Condition 11 As part of the administration of their system in future EOMF will undertake annual monitoring of any property designated HCVF.
- Condition 12 Prior to the first annual audit, EOMF must address skid trail layout as it relates to worker safety procedures near wildlife trees; and use of exiting trail networks as it related to stem damage.

Twelve nonbinding recommendations were provided. The precondition verification audited added a thirteenth recommendation.

**SmartWood Certification Annual Addendum to the Public Summary for
Eastern Ontario Model Forest, 2004**

1.1. Audit Process

A. Audit year: 2004

B. Dates of Audit: Feb 9, 2004 (report finalized Dec 31, 2004 by R. Donovan)

C. Audit Team: Tom Clark B.Sc. M.Sc. Tom is an ecologist with thirty years of experience in wildlife and forestry in Ontario. He has led six audits for SmartWood, and participated in a number of others. He also does Independent Forest Audits in Ontario using the provincial protocol.

D. Audit Overview: Preliminary discussion with EOMF about the audit procedure occurred a week prior to the field visit. The field portion of the audit was scheduled for the morning of Feb 9, and two properties were visited where harvest had occurred recently. One of the sites still had active operations, and the logger was interviewed. At both properties the landowners were contacted by EOMF and arrangements made to accompany the auditor. Mid afternoon, the auditor and EOMF staff returned from field visits and began discussion of changes to the forest, growth of the group membership, and reviewed documentation. Meeting adjourned at 7 PM.

E. Sites Visited: The first property visited was the Dolan Property where an active operation was occurring and the logger (Randy Warren) was interviewed. The owners are typical of the client group of EOMF, well educated, and not dependent on financial return from their forest. This is a group notably hesitant to allow inappropriate uses of their property. The second property, Pritchard's, is similar. For both operations EOMF had the central role in setting up and overseeing the tree marking, harvest and post harvest inspections. EOMF contracts a supervisor (Brian Clayton) on a day rate to meet the requirements of the EOMF system.

At each site, the various elements of the operation were reviewed and compared with the operating procedures that EOMF has set up. Compartments where active operations have occurred recently were visited.

F. Personnel Interviewed:

The following people were consulted during this audit:

| Person interviewed | Position/Organization |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Brian Barkley | EOMF GM |
| Scott Davis | Forest Certification Coordinator |
| Ted Pritchard | Landowner |
| Patricia Dolan | Landowner |
| Mike Dolan | Landowner |
| Randy Warren | Logger at Dolan property |
| Linda Touzin | Forester OMNR |

| | |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Martin Streit | Domtar Forester |
| Martha Copestake | Forester EOMF |

G. Documentation reviewed:

- Management Plan (and MFTIP) for Pritchard
- Management Plan (and MFTIP) for Dolan
- EOMF Report 51 Dec 2003 -- Policies and Procedures
- Certification Working Group -- Strategic Plan
- Updated list of landowners -- EOCFO
- New MOU for group
- Minutes of EOMF Certification working group (last two)
- Minutes of EOCFO
- HCVF report for EOMF (author Kathy Neilson)
- FN involvement in EOMF -- Sustainable Forest Certification notes
- Minutes of joint EOMF Domtar Akwasasne discussion about values

1.2 General Audit Findings and Conclusions

The following discussion is an overview of the issues and changes facing the EOMF currently. For further information about the EOMF program and circumstances, the main assessment and precondition audits should be consulted, as well as the EOMF website.

In the time since the assessment there has been an administrative change with the institution of a Board of Directors for EOMF certification group. Officially it is called the Eastern Ontario Certified Forest Owners Group (EOCFO). This evolved out of Lanark Forest Owners Group. This group is not incorporated. They have instituted a membership fee of \$50. Membership has risen to 30, from the original 20. The group is now much more interested in active harvest operations than when it was first constituted. EOMF had originally set the group up to engage people with high expectations and a need to understand and have a degree of control over their woodlands. The interviews conducted showed that this was exactly what was expected and obtained by the owners.

Specifically owners wanted access to education, support for each other, forest tours, and professional oversight that is independent of the person buying the wood. The membership has a strong relationship with the EOMF forester, Scott Davis. EOCFO is building a track record of harvest operations that provide encouragement to new members. New members are coming from close friends and relations of the current members, as would be expected. The ten new members are evidence of growth without being overextended.

All members of EOCFO are members of EOMF. All EOCFO members have MOUs with the Eastern Ontario Model Forest. One of the EOCFO Board members is also a member of EOMF Certification Working Group and acts as a liaison to both groups.

EOMF funding stability is always a concern in tough fiscal times. EOMF is in its third year of its third five year phase. EOMF maintains a vigorous programme of new initiatives, and certification is still a prominent part of that. It maintains an active intern programme. There has been no turnover among permanent staff. Current projects include the next State of the Forest report in which there will be a greater emphasis on socio- economic indicators. EOMF has an eye on stable funding for EOCFO, and has instituted an annual membership fee.

With regard to communications, it is one of EOMF strengths. For example, EOMF maintains a certification website (www.eomf.on.ca/certification) which has a record of all the minutes available from EOCFO. They share the policies document which is the central document of the certification program.

Immediately following this audit, the companion audit of the EOMF member, Domtar was conducted. The auditor noted some small differences in the approach used by the two organizations. This is normal. At this time there is no formal exchange of ideas and procedures, although the two informally discuss issues. The auditor suggests that there would be some benefit to a more formal meeting to review all of the procedural differences. Obviously policy matters are discussed regularly already.

Suggestion: EOMF and Domtar should formally review procedures annually to ensure consistency between the systems and seek efficiencies.

1.3 Status of Conditions and Corrective Action Requests (CARs)

A. Compliance Summary of Previously Issued Conditions and CARs

- 1) Closed
- 2) Closed
- 3) Closed (new CAR)
- 4) Closed
- 5) Met / ongoing CAR -- As part of the administration of their system EOMF will not include properties of greater than 1000 ha in the certified pool until a further review, and a track record is established.
- 6) Closed
- 7) Closed
- 8) Closed (new CAR)
- 9) Closed
- 10) Closed
- 11) Closed (rewritten) CAR: By the second annual audit EOMF will undertake annual monitoring of any property designated HCVF.
- 12) Closed (new CAR)

B. New CARs Issued in this Audit

CAR 1-2004: By the second annual audit, EOMF and Domtar will jointly provide a training session on cultural values for management and operational staff involved in forest operations.

CAR 2-2004: As part of the administration of their system EOMF will not include properties of greater than 5,000 ha in the certified pool unless explicitly approved in writing by SmartWood.

CAR 3-2004: By the second annual audit EOMF is to review the conservation value of properties currently included in the certified pool and implement appropriate prescriptions and monitoring when required.

CAR 4-2004: By the second annual audit EOMF shall confirm with Ministry of Labour that the use of girdling for silviculture is allowed in central Ontario.