



Nisokapawino Forestry  
Management Corporation

CSA Z809 SFM CERTIFICATION

# 2020 SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT ANNUAL REPORT

of

FOREST MANAGEMENT LICENCE NO. 2

## Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Sustainable Forest Management Committee (SFMC) .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>SFM Performance Framework.....</b>	<b>5</b>
Updates to SFM Plan Indicators.....	5
Review of 2020 Performance Framework.....	5
Summary of Performance Framework Assessment.....	7
<b>Appendix I.....</b>	<b>9</b>
DFA Indicator Performance Reports for 2020.....	9
<b>Appendix II.....</b>	<b>44</b>
2020 Public Concerns Table .....	44

## List of Tables

Table 1: CSA SFM Performance Indicator Staff Champions.....	5
---	---

## Executive Summary

Canadian Kraft Paper and Nisokapawino Forestry Management Corporation (herein referred to as the Organization) are co-operators of a Forest Management System which complies with the requirements of the CAN/CSA Z809-16 certification for the Defined Forest Area (DFA) of Manitoba's Forest Management Licence (FML) Area No.2. FML Area No.2 has been managed by the CSA certification since October 2004 under the Z809-02 standard. The Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) Plan was revised in 2014 to meet the updated Z809-08 standard and again revised in 2018 to meet the Z809-16 standard.

Forest management on the FML Area No. 2 is authorized under the Manitoba Environment Act - Environment Act Licence No. 2302 E R (extended to December 31, 2024). Under that Licence, the existing Forest Management Plan (Repap Manitoba Inc. 1997-2009 Forest Management Plan) has been extended to December 31, 2024. Additional forest management activities and obligations are outlined under the Forest Management Licence Agreement for FML Area No. 2, and *the Forest Act*. In July of 2018, CKP and Nekoté LP signed a partnership agreement under which certain sections of the FML Agreement were assigned to Nisokapawino Forestry Management Corporation (NFMC).

The Sustainable Forest Management Committee (SFMC) met three times in 2020 to discuss different aspects of the SFM Plan and undertake educational presentations and tours. Progress of the SFM plan is reviewed with the SFMC and reported annually within this report. The SFMC is satisfied with the content and conduct of meetings as evidenced in the SFMC feedback surveys.

The CSA Z809-16 certification requires a periodic third-party external re-certification audit with annual external surveillance audits. The SFM plan was audited by SAI Global in November of 2020 as part of the registration audit for the Z809-16 standard.

Documents relating to the SFM activities on the DFA, including this SFM Annual Report, are available on the website at [www.canadiankraftpaper.com](http://www.canadiankraftpaper.com).

## Introduction

The purpose of the 2020 SFM Annual Report is to document the processes and activities undertaken in fulfillment of commitments made in the SFM Plan for the Defined Forest Area (DFA) – Forest Management Licence (FML) Area No. 2. The SFM Annual Report provides an overall review of progress made, successes achieved, shortcomings identified, emerging issues, future plans and corrective actions as required.

The SFM Plan and ongoing implementation processes have been developed by the Organization to demonstrate to the public, government regulators and to its customers, the Organization's commitment to SFM and to public participation in its forest management processes.

The SFM Plan includes implementation of an SFM system to evaluate and improve the SFM performance framework. The SFM performance framework, as detailed in section 7.0 of the SFM Plan, is comprised of a total of 32 indicators, making up 38 targets. Each indicator takes the format of a "fact sheet" stating applicable CSA-SFM Element(s), CSA-SFM Core Indicator(s), and a locally-derived value, objective, and target. The indicators were developed through the Organization's SFM public participation process of the Sustainable Forest Management Committee (SFMC). The SFMC, as described in Section 6.0 of the SFM Plan, is a public advisory group with representation from various backgrounds across the DFA.

Each target of the performance framework is measured and evaluated annually and is referred to as an indicator report. The individual indicator reports are detailed in Appendix I.

For a description of the DFA – FML Area No. 2 – to which this SFM Annual Report pertains, and for details on the SFM system used by the Organization on the DFA, refer to the SFM Plan which is available on the website at [www.canadiankraftpaper.com](http://www.canadiankraftpaper.com). Other reports and publications pertaining to the SFM system and forest management processes on the DFA are also available on the website.

As the Forest Management Licence holder for FML Area No. 2 DFA, the Organization continues to take responsibility for the lead role in maintaining the SFM system for the DFA. The Organization continues to work closely with the various interested parties in planning and implementing sustainable forest management on the DFA. This continues to build on past experiences and developed partnerships, including the development process for the SFM Plan itself.

In addition to this SFM Annual Report, the Organization is responsible to prepare and submit a Forest Management Annual Report to the Government of Manitoba to follow-up on all forest management activities undertaken on the DFA as compared to the proposals of the related Forest Management Operating Plan (FMOP). These annual reports are also available on the website.

As reported in the SFM Plan, the SFM system for the DFA is closely aligned with Canadian Kraft Paper's ISO-14001 registered Environmental Management System (EMS) for forest management activities. The EMS was originally registered in January of 2003 for FML Area No. 2 and has continued its ISO registration to date. As part of the process improvement and adaptive management process Canadian Kraft Paper undertook a review and update of the EMS to more closely integrate the requirements of the CSA Z809 standard within the EMS.

The EMS ensures activities on the FML adhere to the "plan-do-check-act" model, which drives

continual improvement. The roles and responsibilities of the Organization and its staff in terms of implementation and maintenance of the EMS is outlined in the EMS Manual and documentation. The EMS committee reviews EMS documentation, develops action plans to address corrective action for any identified non-conformances, schedules training sessions, reviews and makes recommendations to management of any suggestions for process improvement brought forward and provides for follow-up with appropriate staff on any outstanding tasks for corrective action identified in the EMS. In 2020 the EMS Committee met eight times.

All Organization employees take part in fulfillment of responsibilities to ensure that all legislation and regulations are followed, and that the EMS is adhered to. All employees are responsible to actively participate in environmental management in the fulfillment of the Organization's Environmental and Sustainable Forest Management Policies. This work has included roles in the monitoring and reporting of indicators as reported in this SFM Annual Report.

As described in the SFM Plan, Organization contractors and DFA workers, Manitoba Government staff, timber sale operators on the DFA, and other stakeholders continue to play a role in the implementation of SFM for the DFA.

This SFM Annual Report will be made available to the public via the Canadian Kraft Paper website at [www.canadiankraftpaper.com](http://www.canadiankraftpaper.com).

## **Sustainable Forest Management Committee (SFMC)**

The primary role of the SFMC is the review of the Organization's performance to the SFM Plan as reported through the SFM Plan indicators. It also has a significant role in making recommendations on ways and means to improve the plan for the DFA. This is an adaptive management and continual improvement model for the area. At the same time, it is useful for this same committee to be involved in the other tasks of FMP and FMOP review and other public participation roles in forest management on the DFA in order to assist in discussion and resolution of any issues relevant to SFM on the DFA and to maximize the learning and effectiveness of the committee.

The SFM Committee met three times in 2020:

- February 20, 2020
- September 2, 2020
- December 10, 2020
- The meeting scheduled for May was cancelled due to the outbreak of Covid-19

On February 20<sup>th</sup> the SFMC engaged in a preliminary SFM Plan and Indicator review discussion that would be undertaken throughout the year. They also received a 2019 NFMC Update presentation and Jack pine Budworm Interlake Salvage presentation. On September 10<sup>th</sup>, the SFMC worked through revision changes to the SFM Plan Indicators, received a presentation by Chris Smith on Aquatic Invasive Species & Zebra Mussels, and went on a field tour of the Mill Plant site. On December 10<sup>th</sup>, the SFMC received presentations on the FMOP Annual Report, Latest Audit Report and Responses, 2019 SFM Annual Report presentation, and received Aboriginal Awareness training.

More information on involvement of the SFMC can be found in Appendix 1.

# SFM Performance Framework

## Updates to SFM Plan Indicators

The 2020 SFM Plan Indicators underwent significant revisions that focused on reducing redundancies within the indicators, updating language and formatting, streamlining the indicator factsheet layout, reordering/numbering indicators, and removing indicators that are managed independently within the Organizations EMS. The Organization worked closely with the committee throughout 2020 and part of 2021 on the updates.

Some major changes were:

- Indicator 7 and 8 were merged because the reporting is the same
- “Company caused forest fires”, “Adherence to work permit conditions...” and “Truck haul safety program” Indicators (16, 18, and 33) were removed as they are managed under the EMS ISO certification which is independently audited
- “Evidence the organization has co-operated with other forest-dependent businesses, forest users, and the local community to strengthen and diversify the local economy” Indicator 23 was removed as its purpose predates Indicator 24 “Extent of local involvement in Forest Operation in the DFA” and was specifically created to establish a baseline for indicator 24.
- The “Monitoring and Measurement” section of each indicator was changed to “Annual Reporting Requirements” and the reporting period for each indicator was added
- The “Strategy” and “Means of Achieving Objective” sections were merged, redundancies in each section were removed, and information was streamlined

## Review of 2020 Performance Framework

The performance framework for the SFM System being implemented for the DFA consists of values, objectives, indicators and targets to address each of the CSA-SFM Elements associated with the CSA SFM Z809-16 Standard. This framework was developed through the public participation process associated with the development of the SFM Plan, led by the work of the SFMC for the values in place across the DFA (described in further detail in the SFM Plan).

For each of the targets in the performance framework, a Woodlands staff member, namely a “Champion”, is assigned the responsibility to oversee follow-up and to ensure that monitoring, measurement and reporting is undertaken as required. Table 1 lists the indicators and the associated Champion.

**Table 1: CSA SFM Performance Indicator Staff Champions**

Indicator #	2021 Champion	Indicator Title
1	Jeanne Besaw	Forest cover composition of reforested cutover areas
2	Martina Tekelova	Harvest levels in cubic meters as compared to the AAC
3	Ryan Shewchuk	Abundance of residual stand structure
4	Damien Gilberds	Amount and distribution of coarse woody debris
5	Mike Paddock	Woodland caribou habitat
6	Grant McInnis	Staff awareness of current SARA and MESEA lists for DFA

<b>Indicator #</b>	<b>2021 Champion</b>	<b>Indicator Title</b>
7	Jeanne Besaw	Proportion of regeneration comprised of native species with stock from the same or approved government seed zone
8	Martina Tekelova	Harvest blocks subject to Pre-harvest Forest Investigation (PHFI) surveys
9A	Ame Wunderle	Protected Areas and ASI's recognized in Forest Management Plans
9B	Ame Wunderle	Protected Areas and ASI's recognized in Forest Management Plans
10	Mike Paddock	Proposed all-weather roads reviewed for the potential for the occurrence of heritage resources
11A	Damien Gilberds	Limit extent and duration of in-block seasonal roads and landings (%)
11B	Jeanne Besaw	Limit extent and duration of in-block seasonal roads and landings (renewal)
11C	Ryan Shewchuk *Reported in Indicator 12B	Limit extent and duration of in-block seasonal roads and landings (road closure)
12A	Ryan Shewchuk	Amount of area in all-weather Categories 1 & 2 roads in place at any given time (%)
12B	Ryan Shewchuk	Amount of area in all-weather Categories 1 & 2 roads in place at any given time (closure)
13	Jeanne Besaw	Harvest blocks are regenerated as soon as possible
14	Grant McInnis	Provision of information on insects and disease to the Forestry Branch
15	Jeanne Besaw	Recurrence mistletoe infections in regenerating stands
16	Martina Tekelova	Proportion of watershed or water management areas with recent stand-replacing disturbance
17	Shayne Elliott	Condition of stream crossings and roadways in terms of erosion control
18	Andrew Forward	Net carbon uptake
19	Nicole Anderson	Level of awareness of Woodlands staff of effects of unnecessary vehicle idling
20	Joyce Totte	Extent of local involvement in forest operations
21	Grant McInnis	The Organization's understanding and practices based upon current and emerging knowledge and recommended practices
22	Grant McInnis	Evidence of efforts to promote capacity development and meaningful participation for the public and Indigenous communities
23A	Jeanne Besaw	Training members of the SFM Committee
23B	Jeanne Besaw	Training members of the SFM Committee

Indicator #	2021 Champion	Indicator Title
24	Jocelyn Dorion	Degree of satisfaction with the public participation component of the SFM planning process
25	Mike Paddock	Documentation of public participation process followed, community meetings, concerns raised and strategies/mitigation developed to address concerns of local Indigenous and other communities and non-timber resource users within FMP's and FRDP's
26	Mike Paddock	Access of the public to information on SFM, 20 year and 2 year FMP's and related public participation processes
27	Jocelyn Dorion	Availability of summary information on issues of concern to the public
28	Andrew Forward	Level of investment in training and skills development
29	Joyce Totte	Training and awareness opportunities for contractors
30	Jeanne Besaw	Evidence of co-operation with DFA-related workers and their unions to improve and enhance safety standards, procedures, and outcomes in all DFA-related workplaces and affected communities.
31A	Wally Quiring	Evidence that a worker safety program has been implemented and is periodically reviewed and improved (Contractor's safety plans)
31B	Wally Quiring	Evidence that a worker safety program has been implemented and is periodically reviewed and improved (Staff safety program)
32	Andrew Forward	Percentage of Woodlands staff who have participated in Indigenous, treaty rights and cultural awareness sessions

## Summary of Performance Framework Assessment

This 2020 SFM Annual Report provides the opportunity for the Organization to communicate how the SFM Policy and Plan commitments are being implemented and how continual improvement is being made relating the SFM System. From the assessment of the performance indicators the following discussion summarizes findings in terms of emerging issues being encountered, future plans, corrective actions required, and management commitments for moving forward. Reporting on the 2020 indicators was completed in 2021.

The indicator assessments are based on the reporting period outlined within the "Annual Reporting Requirements" of each indicator.

Of the 38 targets:

- 3 were met using the variance
- 35 were met outright



Highlights from the 2020 audit were:

- Ongoing involvement of CKP/NFMC staff in various forestry educational and communications initiatives
- Contractors interviewed are knowledgeable and well-spoken ambassadors for Forestry in Manitoba
- The SFMC indicated great transparency, openness to ideas, and communication from the Organization
- Very committed long term SFMC members demonstrates satisfaction with objectives of the committee

Issues from the 2019 audit were:

- Minor Non-Conformance: The reporting for Indicator #4 in the 2019 Annual Monitoring Report is referencing debris management for purposes of silviculture and not Coarse Woody Debris as required for the indicator “Amount and distribution of coarse woody debris”.

## **Appendix I**

### **DFA Indicator Performance Reports for 2020**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#1. Forest cover composition of reforested cutover areas</b>
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	1.1.1 Ecosystem area by type 1.1.2 Forest area by type or species composition 1.2.3 and 2.1.2 Proportion of regeneration comprised of native species 2.1.1 and 4.1.2 Reforestation success 5.1.1 Documentation of the diversity of timber and non-timber resources including products and services produced in the DFA
<b>Target</b>	100% of all harvested areas to be reforested to the standards set in the Province of Manitoba FRA requirements.
<b>Variance</b>	Blocks compromised by circumstances outside the Organization's control which would influence renewal, such as flooding, fire, insect or disease outbreaks, land use re-classification (mining, hydro corridor, ASI, WMA), or withdrawal (TLE, park, etc.) or in cases where The Province of Manitoba denies approval for proposed remedial action because of preferable alternative management strategies.
<b>Strategy</b>	Reforestation objectives and strategies for each harvest block are developed based on previous forest cover types (Preharvest data) and government renewal standards to assist in maintaining the forest communities, ecosystem processes and conditions. The intent is to achieve renewed forest stands similar to those expected from natural disturbance by the tree species planted or promoted through natural regeneration. Coupled with harvesting within sustainable levels, the forest renewal program assists to maintain productivity of harvested sites thus maintaining a sustainable supply of timber. Planned forest renewal activities in the 2 year FMOP are developed to meet the renewal commitment of the Organization set out in the FML Agreement; Renewal success is evaluated through the government approved Forest Renewal Assessment (FRA) Any areas requiring additional follow-up treatment from the FRA survey will be treated and re-surveyed for submission to the Forestry Branch within the required timeframe.
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> January-December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A summary of the renewal status for cut blocks harvested 8-14 years earlier for which the renewal commitment has come due</li> <li>• Recommendations for subsequent treatments to ensure blocks that are below standard at the completion of an FRA survey will become fully compliant with the Forestry Branch standards</li> <li>• Evidence of blocks waived by the Forestry Branch from requiring "Sufficiently Performing" status and reason for waiver.</li> <li>• Description of the purpose and types of vegetation management programs implemented; number of hectares treated in each program.</li> </ul>
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met within variance
<b>2020 Progress</b>	<p>In 2020, KBM photo interpreted 11832.66 ha of cutovers according to the standards set out by the Province in the Forest Renewal Assessment Manual. Ten percent of the area was validated by a ground survey (1186 ha) done by Kaskittaw. 148 out of 149 of the blocks received a Sufficiently Performing Status and were granted a "Certification of Reforestation" by the Province.</p> <p>IM-12 received an NSR status due to part of the block burning in a forest fire previously. The province requested the results be tallied minus the burned area to grant certification of the portion of the block that was not burned. This will be given to the Province in 2021.</p> <p>In 2020, herbicide was applied to portions of blocks with significant hardwood competition identified in previous surveys or other assessments in order to ensure softwood status. Glyphosate was sprayed by helicopter on 2017 hectares.</p>

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#2. Harvest levels in cubic metres as compared to the AAC</b>																																																																																																		
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	1.1.3 Forest area by Seral stage or age class 2.1.4 Proportion of the calculated long term sustainable harvest level that is actually harvested																																																																																																		
<b>Target</b>	Harvest levels do not exceed Government approved AAC's based on 5-year cut control period.																																																																																																		
<b>Variance</b>	Government approved AAC levels may include accommodation of underutilized AAC from the previous period. Variation in any given year may occur. No variance in harvest levels not exceeding Government approved AAC levels based upon 5-year cut control periods is acceptable.																																																																																																		
<b>Strategy</b>	<p>The Organization will ensure that all planning and operations for harvesting on the DFA remain within the established AAC levels determined by the Province of Manitoba.</p> <p>FMOP planning process tracks planned harvest block proposals to ensure that the FMOP submission will result in harvest levels that remain within the AAC.</p> <p>Annual tracking of actual harvest volume levels and reporting within the 5 year cut control period prescribed by the Province of Manitoba;</p> <p>Annual reporting to the Province of Manitoba of harvest levels and status within the applicable AAC.</p> <p>Monitoring the harvest levels compared to AAC levels is done by tracking the volumes of timber delivered from harvested blocks to the mill through the scale, and from the harvest volumes from third party operations reported by the Province of Manitoba.</p>																																																																																																		
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> April (previous year) – March (reporting year)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement indicating whether any cut control volumes exceeded AAC; If any have, reason for exceeding AAC and proof of approval by the Province of Manitoba</li> <li>• Table listing each FMU harvest, annual cut control AAC, total 5 year cut control AAC, % of 5 year cut control harvested.</li> </ul>																																																																																																		
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met																																																																																																		
<b>2020 Progress</b>	<p>None of the FMU's harvest volume exceeded Government approved AAC for the cut control period.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">FMU</th> <th rowspan="2">2019-20 Harvest</th> <th rowspan="2">2019-20 AAC</th> <th rowspan="2">% of AAC</th> <th colspan="2">Cut Control</th> <th rowspan="2">% 2015-20 Cut Control</th> </tr> <tr> <th>2015-20 Harvest</th> <th>2015-20 AAC</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>50</td> <td>0</td> <td>26,809</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>134,045</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>53</td> <td>0</td> <td>103,990</td> <td>0</td> <td>35,633.00</td> <td>519,950</td> <td>7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>58</td> <td>45,716.42</td> <td>131,910</td> <td>35%</td> <td>78,177.00</td> <td>659,550</td> <td>12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>59</td> <td>7,966.00</td> <td>93,488</td> <td>9%</td> <td>298,961.00</td> <td>467,440</td> <td>64%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>67</td> <td>0</td> <td>379,371</td> <td>0</td> <td>144,509</td> <td>1,896,855</td> <td>8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>68</td> <td>0</td> <td>62,206</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>311,030</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>69</td> <td>0</td> <td>168,132</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>840,660</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>83</td> <td>0</td> <td>195,550</td> <td>0</td> <td>82,283</td> <td>977,750</td> <td>8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>84</td> <td>0</td> <td>180,330</td> <td>0</td> <td>4,510</td> <td>901,650</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>85</td> <td>0</td> <td>129,610</td> <td>0</td> <td>5,191</td> <td>648,050</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>87</td> <td>0</td> <td>130,900</td> <td>0</td> <td>3,684</td> <td>654,500</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>89</td> <td>0</td> <td>38,920</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>194,600</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>						FMU	2019-20 Harvest	2019-20 AAC	% of AAC	Cut Control		% 2015-20 Cut Control	2015-20 Harvest	2015-20 AAC	50	0	26,809	0	0	134,045	0%	53	0	103,990	0	35,633.00	519,950	7%	58	45,716.42	131,910	35%	78,177.00	659,550	12%	59	7,966.00	93,488	9%	298,961.00	467,440	64%	67	0	379,371	0	144,509	1,896,855	8%	68	0	62,206	0	0	311,030	0%	69	0	168,132	0	0	840,660	0%	83	0	195,550	0	82,283	977,750	8%	84	0	180,330	0	4,510	901,650	1%	85	0	129,610	0	5,191	648,050	1%	87	0	130,900	0	3,684	654,500	1%	89	0	38,920	0	0	194,600	0%
FMU	2019-20 Harvest	2019-20 AAC	% of AAC	Cut Control		% 2015-20 Cut Control																																																																																													
				2015-20 Harvest	2015-20 AAC																																																																																														
50	0	26,809	0	0	134,045	0%																																																																																													
53	0	103,990	0	35,633.00	519,950	7%																																																																																													
58	45,716.42	131,910	35%	78,177.00	659,550	12%																																																																																													
59	7,966.00	93,488	9%	298,961.00	467,440	64%																																																																																													
67	0	379,371	0	144,509	1,896,855	8%																																																																																													
68	0	62,206	0	0	311,030	0%																																																																																													
69	0	168,132	0	0	840,660	0%																																																																																													
83	0	195,550	0	82,283	977,750	8%																																																																																													
84	0	180,330	0	4,510	901,650	1%																																																																																													
85	0	129,610	0	5,191	648,050	1%																																																																																													
87	0	130,900	0	3,684	654,500	1%																																																																																													
89	0	38,920	0	0	194,600	0%																																																																																													

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#3. Abundance of residual stand structure</b>
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	1.1.4 Degree of within-stand structure retention
<b>Target</b>	At least 5 standing alive or dead trees per hectare retained across harvested areas on a forest section basis. Harvest modifications for insect or disease management requirements potentially impacting retention results will be documented.
<b>Variance</b>	While the intent is to field survey 100% of harvested blocks a variance of -10% of total harvest blocks is acceptable for the field survey portion In event that cutover photography is not available in any given year, this indicator will be reported on in the next SFM Annual Report.
<b>Strategy</b>	The Organization will retain at least 5 standing live or dead trees per hectare on harvested areas through operational practices within the FMPOP-OG, EMS GUIDE-970 "Selecting Leave Trees and Coarse Wood Debris", and ongoing awareness and training of contractors. Retention of standing trees will include both hardwood and softwood species, retained as single stems and patches across harvest blocks. The target of 5 standing trees per hectare will be applied broadly across all harvest blocks with exceptions being made to meet specific management objectives such as control of dwarf mistletoe infestations or other insect, disease, wildlife or other mitigation requirements. Standing tree retention targets will be communicated to the harvesting contractor, and appropriate subsequent contractors such as chipping, site preparation or pile burning contractors at the EMS Project Tailgate Meeting. This review will include the need to retain a minimum of 5 standing trees/ha or any modification to regular practices to accommodate other objectives for the harvest block. EMS Operation inspections will be completed to review contractor progress.
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> All Actualized Harvest Blocks whose Harvest Year is in previous reporting year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The estimated number of standing trees per hectare retained in the harvest block will be documented; the estimates will be sampled on all representative forest types of each forest section;</li> <li>• Cutover photography will be used to determine the number of the patches within all blocks to verify that the minimum tree retention target has been maintained.</li> </ul>
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met
<b>2020 Progress</b>	<u>Standing tree surveys</u> Operating year 2019/2020- 100% of DFA blocks surveyed DFA average = 38.5 trees per hectare all blocks were on the Saskatchewan River Forest Section <u>Patches</u> Operating year 2019/2020 DFA average = 106 patches per block all blocks were on the Saskatchewan River Forest Section

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#4. Amount and distribution of coarse woody debris</b>
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	1.1.4 Degree of within stand structural retention 3.1.2 Level of downed woody debris
<b>Target</b>	100% of all harvest, site preparation and debris burning contractors will review the EMS GUIDE-970 "Selecting Leave Trees and Coarse Woody Debris"
<b>Variance</b>	None.
<b>Strategy</b>	In recognition of the potential benefits to forest ecosystems and soil productivity that may be associated with the retention of coarse woody debris across cutover areas, a plan will be developed for each harvest block that identifies the strategy for woody debris management. This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Communication of the plan and any amendments to the harvesting contractor and appropriate subsequent contractors such as chipping, site preparation or pile burning contractors at the tailgate meeting and monitored during block inspections.</li> <li>- Retention of trees on harvest blocks to maintain a minimum of 5 standing trees/ha.</li> <li>- Contractor Awareness of the characteristics of leave trees and coarse woody debris that operators can use to meet the sustainability goals through the EMS GUIDE-970 "Selecting Leave Trees and Coarse Woody Debris".</li> <li>- Guideline for pile burning that include retention of suitable wildlife piles.</li> </ul>
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> All blocks that received a Project Tailgate within January - December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of Project Tailgate forms for harvest, site preparation and debris burning contractors that confirm a documented review of the EMS GUIDE-970 "Selecting Leave Trees and Coarse Woody Debris"</li> </ul>
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met
<b>2020 Progress</b>	100% of all Harvest, and Scarification Project Tailgates had signed off on reviewing the EMS GUIDE-970 Selecting Leave Trees. Burning contractor did not review due to the guide because it was not applicable in the EMS training matrix. The burning contractor did get a review on woody debris instructions in the tailgate that were applicable for their work.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#5. Woodland caribou habitat</b>
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	1.2.1 Degree of habitat protection for selected focal species, including species at risk 1.2.2 Degree of suitable habitat in the long term for selected focal species, including species at risk
<b>Target</b>	Develop and Implement a forest management strategy for one or more operating areas within priority woodland caribou range.
Variance	No variance in initiating the development of such strategy. No variance from agreed-to critical habitat area restrictions is acceptable once implementation occurs unless approved by the Province of Manitoba.
<b>Strategy</b>	The Province of Manitoba is responsible for developing action plans for the recovery or maintenance of caribou populations in the province. Manitoba has prepared a Conservation and Recovery Strategy for Boreal Woodland Caribou (MC 2006). Currently, the Organization and Manitoba develop and implement caribou specific plans on an operating area basis. Through collaring and monitoring, the Province of Manitoba is identifying caribou use within ranges. The Organization works with the regional biologists to maintain important habitat and movement corridors and minimize the impact of road systems through specific FRDP and harvest plans.
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> April (previous year) – March (reporting year)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current status of woodland caribou population in Federal Species at Risk and Manitoba Endangered Species and Ecosystem Act</li> <li>• Description of the current system in place between the Province of Manitoba and the Organization of how a forest management strategy is implemented in potential operating areas known to be used by caribou including a summary of discussions, implementation in FRDP's, list of finalized FRDP's, updates to caribou data from the province, and the Organizations participation in Northwest Region Caribou Management Committee</li> <li>• Compare the caribou strategy and defined critical habitat areas with actual harvest areas by listing harvest operations being managed for caribou harvest records within deferral areas.</li> <li>• Successful findings of the forest management strategy as information is made available by The Province of Manitoba.</li> </ul>
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met
<b>2020 Progress</b>	<p>The Woodland Caribou (Boreal population) is listed as a threatened species under Schedule 1 of the federal Species at Risk Act (SARA) as well as the Manitoba Endangered Species and Ecosystems Act (MESEA).</p> <p>Nisokapawino Forestry Management Corporation – NFMC and Manitoba Agriculture and Resource Development (ARD) staff continued to meet every 2 to 3 months in “pre-mitigation” during which general discussion occurred around several potential operating areas that are known to be used by caribou and, in many cases, have collared individuals generating data. The goal of these discussions is to reach agreement on a forest management strategy within the caribou range and that would come in the form of a Forest Road Development Plan (FRDP). Discussions during 2020 included the Duval Road (Kississing and Naosap-Reed ranges), Dickstone Road (mainly Wheadon range but some overlapping portions of Wimapedi-Wapisu and Naosap-Reed) and Crow Lake Road (Kississing range) areas. A Forest Management Strategy (or FRDP) for the Mossy Portage (Bog range) Operating Area was finalized and signed off in 2017. No forest harvest took place in this area during the 2018-19 or 2019-20 operating years. Caribou kernels (shapes generated from caribou location data to reflect areas with the highest concentrations of caribou use) were updated in 2019 to reflect all of the most recent caribou location data. There was significant expansion of kernel area on the FML which has generated additional discussion between NFMC and ARD. The Mossy Portage FRDP is now on hold or deferred as are the other named operating areas above pending Dynamic Caribou Habitat Scheduling (DCHS) work that is to be done in conjunction with the development of the 20-year Forest Management Plan (FMP).</p> <p>There were no harvest operations in DFA areas being managed for caribou during the 2019-20 year. Harvest records for 2019-20 operating year were compared to harvest deferral areas in Hobbit, Naosap and Mossy Portage Operating Areas. No timber harvest occurred in any of the deferral areas.</p> <p>In 2020 Canadian Kraft Paper (and NFMC) continued to be a member of the Northwest Region Caribou Management Committee but no annual meeting was held due to the pandemic.</p>

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#6. Staff awareness of current SARA and MESEA lists for DFA</b>
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	1.2.1 Degree of habitat protection for selected focal species, including species at risk
<b>Target</b>	All applicable Woodlands staff as identified in the EMS training matrix are to undertake review of SARA and MESEA lists annually
<b>Variance</b>	No variance
<b>Strategy</b>	<p>The Endangered Species and Ecosystems Act (MESEA), Species at Risk Act (SARA) and the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC) is considered in the planning and implementation of forestry operations.</p> <p>The following ensures Woodlands employees are aware of relevant SARA and MESEA listed species and their statuses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Obtain and update the SARA and MESEA lists to include applicable species within the DFA prior to the start of the summer field data collection season;</li> <li>- The updated SARA and MESEA lists will be circulated annually to all Woodlands employees;</li> <li>- The SARA and MESEA list will also be reviewed with contractors during their annual COR.</li> </ul>
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> January - December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all applicable woodlands staff members received training.</li> </ul>
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met
<b>2020 Progress</b>	Eighteen full-time staff reviewed the SARA-MESEA list as well as training materials for species added to the list in the June training session. Four seasonal staff who were hired for the summer also completed training and list review. Twenty-two staff reviewed the list in 2020.



<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#7. Proportion of regeneration comprised of native species with stock from the same or approved government seed zone.</b>
<b>CSA Element</b>	1.2 Species diversity 1.3 Genetic Diversity 2.1 Forest ecosystem condition and productivity
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	1.2.3 Proportion of regeneration comprised of native species. 2.1.1 Reforestation success
<b>Target</b>	100% of planted and seeded areas utilize non-genetically modified stock from the same seed zone, unless otherwise approved by the Forestry Branch.
<b>Variance</b>	No areas are to be seeded or planted with stock from another seed zone without government approval.
<b>Strategy</b>	<p>In recognition of differing ecological conditions, the Province of Manitoba has established seed zones throughout the province, three of which are within the DFA. The seeds zones are meant to ensure maintenance of genetic diversity within seeding and planting programs. Two federal seed zone boundaries exist for jack pine seed collected from seed orchards on the DFA. Spruce seed and general collection pine seed will be managed and planted within the appropriate provincial seed zones. Jack pine seed from orchards will be managed and planted within the federal seed zone boundaries.</p> <p>The Organization is required to plant seedlings originating from the same or otherwise approved seed zone. Transferring seedlings outside of their original seed zone is only permitted as authorized by the Provincial Silvicultural Forester.</p> <p>The Organization co-operates with the Province of Manitoba in managing several seed orchards through the Manitoba Tree improvement co-operative. These activities are non-GMO and genetic gains are obtained through conventional breeding techniques limited to selection and testing for superior growth traits and cross pollination for seed production.</p> <p>Seedlings produced for tree planting are only grown from seed collected within permitted seed zones. No genetically modified stock is used.</p> <p>Tracking the zones of seeds starts at cone collection in the field, to seed extraction, storage, and sowing at the nursery, and ultimately to delivery of seedlings to each harvest block.</p> <p>The Organization will request seedlings by seed zone from the nursery. The nursery will indicate the seed zone that the seedlings originated from on all shipping records.</p> <p>Once seedlings are shipped to the field, the tree planting contractor ensures that multiple seed zones are not stored in the same location unless they are to be planted together with approval from the Forestry Branch.</p> <p>Forest renewal strategies provided to the tree plant contractor will identify the appropriate seed zone to be planted on that block. Forest renewal strategies will be provided to any seeding contractor to assure that seeds from the appropriate seed zone are sown.</p> <p>The Organization uses the original forest cover compositions identified in the PHFI survey data to develop the renewal objective for each harvest block.</p>
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> January - December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement about who is responsible for seed collection and that all seeds are non-GMO from wild stands or seed orchards</li> <li>• Evidence that seedlings were planted in the appropriate seed zone</li> <li>• If seedlings were planted outside of their designated seed zone, give evidence that approval was granted by the Province of Manitoba</li> </ul>
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met
<b>2020 Progress</b>	<p>CKP/NFMC is responsible for seed collection and all seeds to date have been collected from wild stands or conventional (NON-GMO) seed orchards.</p> <p>All seedlings planted in 2020 were from the same seed zone that the seed came.</p> <p>Load slips from the nursery were reviewed at the time of delivery to ensure that all blocks planted in 2020 were planted with seedlings of the correct/approved seed zone. Each batch of seed zone stock was delivered separately.</p>

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#8. Harvest blocks subject to Pre-harvest Forest Investigation (PHFI) surveys</b>																																				
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	1.4.1 Protection of sites of special significance 1.4.2 Protection of identified sites with implemented management strategies 5.1.1 Documentation of the diversity of timber and non-timber resources including products and services produced in the DFA																																				
<b>Target</b>	All harvest blocks will be subject to a PHFI survey prior to submission of a work permit application.																																				
<b>Variance</b>	Blocks may be harvested without a PHFI if approved by the IRMT.																																				
<b>Strategy</b>	PHFI surveys include documenting any observations of special biological, geological, heritage, or cultural features such as Special Concern, Threatened & Endangered and rare species, wildlife habitat, non-timber forest uses, timber values, pre-harvest forest cover composition, soil, etc. Information obtained from PHFI and other sources, such as the public and Indigenous communities, is used in the planning process to make decisions related to the suitability of areas for timber harvest and to mitigate impacts to other non-timber values. The PHFI data is used to develop harvest and access plans, and renewal prescriptions. Mitigation is implemented as per government requirements and as outlined in the work permit. A Cutblock Information Sheet summarizing the PHFI data is submitted either through the FMOP or the work permit application to the IRMT, as per the EMS SOP-040 "Work Permit". Heritage resource information is not shared at the FMOP stage due to the sensitive nature of the information. It is conveyed to the IRMT during the work permit application stage and any mitigation is incorporated during planning and treatment prescriptions.																																				
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> All Actualized Harvest Blocks whose Harvest Year is in previous reporting year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of blocks harvested by CKP contractors and quota holders</li> <li>• Evidence that all blocks received a PHFI survey;</li> <li>• If any blocks did not receive a PHFI survey, evidence of approval by IRMT</li> <li>• Table listing blocks, Harvest Year, PHFI report present, cutblock information sheet present</li> </ul>																																				
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met																																				
<b>2020 Progress</b>	<p>There were four blocks harvested by CKP contractors and quota holders on the DFO during 2019 Harvest year. All PHFI reports were generated and are available. AAT-24 was not harvested by CKP contractors. This is a hardwood allocation block and was harvested under 19027 Operating Permit issued to Anderson logging and Construction Inc.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Block name</th> <th>Start date</th> <th>Actual year</th> <th>PHFI report</th> <th>Cutblock information sheet</th> <th>Other</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>AAT-24-2019-HARV</td> <td>Nov.8/2019</td> <td>2019</td> <td>no</td> <td>no</td> <td>hardwood allocation, Anderson logging OP permit</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LK-16-2019-HARV</td> <td>Feb.1/2020</td> <td>2019</td> <td>yes</td> <td>yes</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>LK-19-2019-HARV</td> <td>Feb.1/2020</td> <td>2019</td> <td>yes</td> <td>yes</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>LK-23-2019-HARV</td> <td>Feb.1/2020</td> <td>2019</td> <td>yes</td> <td>yes</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>SR-1-2019-HARV</td> <td>Sep.16/2019</td> <td>2019</td> <td>yes</td> <td>yes</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Block name	Start date	Actual year	PHFI report	Cutblock information sheet	Other	AAT-24-2019-HARV	Nov.8/2019	2019	no	no	hardwood allocation, Anderson logging OP permit	LK-16-2019-HARV	Feb.1/2020	2019	yes	yes		LK-19-2019-HARV	Feb.1/2020	2019	yes	yes		LK-23-2019-HARV	Feb.1/2020	2019	yes	yes		SR-1-2019-HARV	Sep.16/2019	2019	yes	yes	
Block name	Start date	Actual year	PHFI report	Cutblock information sheet	Other																																
AAT-24-2019-HARV	Nov.8/2019	2019	no	no	hardwood allocation, Anderson logging OP permit																																
LK-16-2019-HARV	Feb.1/2020	2019	yes	yes																																	
LK-19-2019-HARV	Feb.1/2020	2019	yes	yes																																	
LK-23-2019-HARV	Feb.1/2020	2019	yes	yes																																	
SR-1-2019-HARV	Sep.16/2019	2019	yes	yes																																	

Indicator	#9. Protected Areas and ASI's recognized in Forest Management Plans
CSA Core Indicator(s)	1.4.2 Proportion of identified sites with implemented management strategies 5.1.1 Documentation of the diversity of timber and non-timber resources including products and services produced in the DFA
Target	(A) No harvesting proposed in recognized Protected Areas (B) Any proposed harvest of ASI's require specific approval of FMOP and work permits from the Province of Manitoba
Variance	(A) None (B) None
Strategy	<p>The Province of Manitoba is establishing a series of Protected Areas to contribute to conserving a representative sample of biological diversity across the 16 ecoregions across the province. The Organization will not harvest within any established Protected Areas.</p> <p>Areas of Special Interest (ASI) have been established for the ecoregions that have yet to have a designated protected area within them. Within ASI's, areas are classified as Legally Designated or Not Legally Designated in order to allow for some development within the unprotected portions.</p> <p>ASI's and Protected Areas are included on proposed FMP and FMOP harvest maps. Through PHFI surveys, the Organization works closely with the IRMT to document the characteristics of any areas proposed for harvest within ASI's. Harvest of such blocks will only proceed once the IRMT approves the work permit.</p>
Annual Reporting Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference for where the Organization obtains ASI and PA boundaries</li> <li>• Confirmation that ASI and PA boundaries are on the FMOP maps</li> </ul>
A) 2019-2021 Operating Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirm that the current FMOP harvest proposals are not on any PA.</li> <li>• Confirm any proposed harvests on WMA's were reviewed with IRMT and that harvest is contingent on IRMT approval.</li> </ul>
B) All Actualized Harvest Blocks whose Harvest Year is in previous reporting year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that cutover records do not overlap with any PA</li> <li>• If any cutover record overlaps with ASI's provide records of work permit approvals by IRMT</li> </ul>
2020 Status	(A) Met (B) Met
2020 Progress	<p>All ASI and Protected Area boundaries are provided by The Province of Manitoba via the Manitoba Land Initiative (MLI) website. The current FMOP maps show boundaries of all Protected Areas and ASI's including Provincial Parks, Park Reserves, and Ecological Reserves on the FML.</p> <p>(A) Review of the 2019-2021 FMOP indicated no harvest was proposed on the FML in any Park or Protected Area. Three proposed blocks fall within the Tom Lamb WMA and have been discussed with the IRMT. Harvest of such blocks will only proceed once FMOP and work permit approval has been received from the Province of Manitoba.</p> <p>(B) Review of the 2019-2020 harvest (6 blocks) on the FML indicated no harvesting occurred in any ASI, Park or Protected Area on the FML.</p>

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#10. Proposed all-weather roads reviewed for the potential of the occurrence of heritage resources</b>
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	<p>1.4.1 Protection of sites of special significance</p> <p>1.4.2 Proportion of identified sites with implemented management strategies</p> <p>5.1.2 Evidence of open and respectful communications with forest dependent businesses, forest users and local communities to integrate non-timber resources into forest management planning. When significant disagreement occurs, efforts towards conflict resolution are documented.</p> <p>7.2.2 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</p>
<b>Target</b>	100% of new all-weather roads to be reviewed for the potential presence of heritage resources prior to development
<b>Variance</b>	No variance
<b>Strategy</b>	<p>The Organization works with other parties to identify heritage resources for planning, mitigation, and implementation of forestry operations. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participation of local Indigenous and other communities in a review of potential cultural and heritage resource values located on or near proposed new all-weather roads;</li> <li>- A formal archeology evaluation for heritage resources on the planned route.</li> <li>- Development of a Forest Road Development Plan (FRDP) for each new all-weather road proposal to outline any mitigation measures to be used to protect heritage resources judged to be significant by the archeologist and the Historic Resources Branch with reference to the report findings resulting from the archeologist's evaluation.</li> <li>- Incorporating heritage resources and associated concerns identified within the public and Indigenous participation processes at the FMP, FMOP and specific FRDP stages prior to plan finalization including the Organization's response and action plan to address any concerns.</li> <li>- Review and approval of all FMP, FMOP and FRDP's by the Province of Manitoba including The Historic Resources Branch, local IRMT and other government departments. The IRMT incorporates other timber and non-timber values in the approval process.</li> </ul>
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> January - December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List of all-weather roads constructed; the associated mitigation measures taken as outlined in the FRDP's including evidence that a formal archeology evaluation was completed</li> <li>• Summary and evidence of Heritage resource impact assessments and any other communications with HRB</li> <li>• Summary and evidence of any FRDP progress</li> <li>• Summary of heritage resources encountered during PHFI surveys</li> <li>• Summary of blocks that were harvested that had a heritage resource identified during the PHFI</li> <li>• If applicable, summarize any changes made in the Heritage Resource Action Plan</li> </ul>
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met
<b>2020 Progress</b>	<p>No new all-weather roads were constructed on the DFA in 2020.</p> <p>Neither the post impact assessment nor the pre-project heritage resource impact assessment (HRIA) recommended by Historic Resources Branch (HRB) for the proposed Crow Lake Road was performed in 2019 due to the continued uncertain timing of the project. Concerns identified by HRB during review of the 2019-2021 FMOP were responded to in 2020.</p> <p>The Forest Road Development Plan (FRDP) for Phase 2 of the Okaw Road (Okaw Road East) and the Little Cormorant Ice Road were finalized and signed off by the Province in 2020. The Okaw project was assessed by an archaeological consultant for heritage resource potential in 2003 and a second review is planned to cover off the additional road establishment. The Little Cormorant Ice Road project was not, and will not, be assessed as it is a Category 5 winter/ice road involving very little to no sub-surface work.</p> <p>There were no heritage resources encountered during 2020 PHFI surveys. No blocks which had a heritage site noted in the PHFI survey were harvested during the 2019-20 operating year. One block, SR-1, was identified as having a heritage concern in the Heritage Resources query in LRM. The concern was based on review of the 2021-2023 FMOP by MB Historic Resources Branch so the concern was received after the harvest had already occurred. It was also not located within the harvested area but was over 100 m outside of the block boundary and was picked up by the buffering process built into the report whereby blocks and roads are identified if they fall within 500 m of a concern area or feature. The General Manager of NFMFC reviewed the Heritage Resource Action Plan (HRAP) with contractors at contractor meeting September 23, 2020.</p> <p>The Heritage Resource Action Plan (HRAP) was not modified in 2020.</p> <p>NFMFC and Nekté Community Liaison continue to work at establishing contacts in the Nekté communities to facilitate information exchange regarding planned and ongoing forestry activities.</p>

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#11 Limit extent and duration of in-block seasonal roads and landings</b>
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	2.1.3 & 4.2.1 - Additions and deletions to the forest area 3.1.1 Level of soil disturbance
<b>Target</b>	<p>(A) Limit extent of in-block roads, bulldozed landings, and campsites to less than 5% of total harvested area on a Forest Section basis</p> <p>(B) Actively prescribe and conduct renewal treatments to compliment the block renewal strategy on at least 50% of roads and landings to reduce their duration.</p> <p>(C) Reduce disturbance to regenerating in-block roads through access control on applicable Category 2 roads once harvest and renewal operations are completed in operating areas. Road closure to occur within three years following final harvest.</p>
Variance	<p>(A) No variance from the target of less than 5% of total harvested area to be occupied by in-block roads and bulldozed landings and campsites on a forest section and DFA basis. Variation on an individual harvest block basis is expected to occur, particularly related to the placement of any campsites within a given harvest block area.</p> <p>(B) None.</p> <p>(C) Additional two years if needed for completion of silvicultural activities. Government approval is required</p>
<b>Strategy</b>	<p>Given the Crown tenure situation in Manitoba, forestry companies generally have little influence on any additions or deletions to the forest area, which are generally a result of government land use objectives. Where companies can have an influence is through their practices, particularly as it pertains to access structures such as roads and landings. These access structures compact soil, making regeneration difficult, and disrupt the natural connectivity within forest stands. This can be minimized with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Careful access planning to minimize the length of in-block roads and number of landings required for harvesting</li> <li>- Use of proper road construction, maintenance, and deactivation procedures</li> <li>- Ensuring that all applicable operations conform to the Organization's EMS and work permits</li> </ul>
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b>	
A) All Actualized Harvest Blocks whose Harvest Year is in previous reporting year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of areas occupied by roads and landings on the DFA and by each Forest Section</li> </ul>
B) All Tree Planting Actuals Blocks whose Silv Year is in current reporting year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total number of planted blocks and number of these blocks where roads were planted or had plantable sections</li> <li>• Total number of scarified blocks and number of these blocks where roads were scarified</li> <li>• Confirm all blocks had a renewal strategy addressing roads and landings</li> </ul>
C) January-December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refer to Indicator 12 B for report.</li> </ul>
2020 Status	<p>A) Met</p> <p>B) Met</p> <p>C) Met- with variance</p>
2020 Progress	<p>A) All blocks in FML no.2 has less than 5% of area occupied by roads. Average of 2.12% throughout FML 2.</p> <p>B) Of the 4 blocks planted in 2020, three had all roads planted (or plantable sections) and one had part of the roads planted leaving a road untreated where future harvest operations would take place. All of the blocks had a renewal strategy that addressed the roads and landings In some cases, only shoulders and edges of roads were able to be planted because of compression of road bed soils. One block was scarified in 2020. The majority of the roads were scarified with only one small road left open for future harvest.</p> <p>C) Reported in Indicator 12 B</p>

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#12. Amount of area in all-weather Categories 1 &amp; 2 roads in place at any given time</b>
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	2.1.3 & 4.2.1 -Additions and deletions to the forest area 3.1.1 Level of soil disturbance
<b>Target</b>	(A) Total amount of Organization Category 1 and 2 all-weather roads across the DFA not to exceed half of one percent (0.5%) of the total productive forest land base (B) Road closure to occur within three years following final harvest
<b>Variance</b>	(A) No variance (B) Additional two years if needed for completion of silvicultural activities. Government approval is required
<b>Strategy</b>	Given the Crown tenure situation in Manitoba, forestry companies generally have little influence on any additions or deletions to the forest area, which are generally a result of government land use objectives. Where companies can have an influence is through their practices, particularly as it pertains to access structures such as roads and landings. These access structures compact soil, making regeneration difficult, and disrupt the natural connectivity within forest stands. This can be minimized with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Careful access planning to minimize the length of permanent roads required for harvesting and number of landings required for harvesting</li> <li>- Use of proper road construction, maintenance, and deactivation procedures</li> <li>- Ensuring that all applicable operations conform to the Organization's EMS and work permits</li> </ul>
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b>	
A) January-December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total % of productive forest land base in current year that Category 1 and 2 roads occupy</li> </ul>
B) January-December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List of roads decommissioned in current reporting period</li> <li>• List of roads that are open passed the required timeframe with the reason and evidence of government approval</li> </ul>
<b>2020 Status</b>	A) Met B) Met- with variance
<b>2020 Progress</b>	<p>(A) Category 1 &amp; 2 roads occupy 0.0275 % of the total productive forest landbase in 2020</p> <p>(B) No roads were decommissioned in 2020. At the end of 2020 there were 2 roads not listed as decommissioned on the ledger that the harvest is complete on. The Talbot and Spruce roads were identified for closure in the FMOP public meetings and there was objection from the public and other resource users. The MB Gov was present at the meeting and the company response was that we would not close the road without clear direction from the government on the issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Talbot – harvest complete in 2004, road has been re-vegetating naturally, there are no high risk (from safety or environmental perspective) crossings on this road, some commercial activity (outfitting) taking place, mixed response from the community on road decommissioning, no permit from the Province</li> <li>• Spruce – harvest complete in 1996, tertiary road off Talbot Road, has been re-vegetating naturally, there are no high risk (from safety or environmental perspective) crossings on this road, potentially mis-categorized as Category 2 road, should have been a Category 3 road, would be effectively cut off with decommissioning of the Talbot Road</li> </ul>

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#13. Harvest blocks are regenerated as soon as possible</b>
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	2.1.3 & 4.2.1 -Additions and deletions to the forest area 3.1.1 Level of soil disturbance 5.1.1 Documentation of the diversity of timber and non-timber resources, including products and services produced in the DFA
<b>Target</b>	100% of all harvest blocks, for which the Organization has renewal responsibility, will receive a forest renewal treatment within 3 years of harvest
<b>Variance</b>	Minor variances may occur in scheduling of initial renewal treatments for small areas to be combined for treatment or for areas with limited access. No areas will be left beyond 5 years without receiving initial prescribed treatment.
<b>Strategy</b>	Expeditious re-establishment of new stands can assist in preventing erosion and other forms of soil displacement. A number of planning and operational programs ensure that 100% of all harvested blocks are renewed in a timely manor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pre-harvest Forest Investigation (PHFI) data includes forest cover composition, soil depth and type, and other characteristics required for developing the renewal prescription for each block;</li> <li>- The renewal prescription allows the Organization to plan and arrange for initial renewal treatments to be conducted promptly following harvest.</li> <li>- The need to access harvested areas for renewal treatments is considered in the timing of these renewal treatments and in the development and removal of access.</li> <li>- Initial treatments can include scarification to promote natural regeneration, site preparation for planting or leaving the site for unassisted natural regeneration to occur. Treatment types are dependent upon the forest renewal objectives and site conditions.</li> <li>- The forest renewal component of the FMOP is developed to meet the renewal commitment of the Organization set out in the FML Agreement to meet Province of Manitoba renewal requirements;</li> </ul>
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> All Actualized Harvest Blocks whose Harvest Year is within 3-5 years prior to current reporting year.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of blocks harvested three years prior and number of those blocks that have received a renewal prescription treatment. Follow-up plan of blocks that have yet to receive a renewal prescription treatment at year 3 to ensure they meet the 5-year variance.</li> <li>• List of blocks that were renewed after the 3-year target that meet the 5 year variance, and list of blocks that did not meet the 5 year variance if any.</li> </ul>
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met
<b>2020 Progress</b>	All blocks that were harvested between the years 2015 and 2016 have received a renewal treatment – all of which were treated within three years of harvest. Only 4 out of 19 blocks harvested within 2017-2019 have not received an initial renewal treatment, all of which are scheduled to be treated in the summer of 2021.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#14. Provision of information on insects and disease to the Forestry Branch</b>
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	2.1.3 Additions and deletions to the forest area
<b>Target</b>	Provide information annually to the Forestry Branch on insect and disease concerns compiled from PHFI and FRA surveys
<b>Variance</b>	Data submission may be delayed until the following year if more time is required for processing of field data.
<b>Strategy</b>	<p>Communication between the Organization and the Province of Manitoba regarding forest health and forest protection issues has been occurring over the term of operations on the FML Area.</p> <p>Providing information on insect and disease infestations that are of concern to productivity and forest health to the Forestry Branch is ensured by the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Data collection forms for PHFI and FRA surveys include opportunity for surveyors to take note of any insect or disease concerns encountered and corresponding locations;</li> <li>- Training of contractors and crews conducting these surveys includes awareness of the requirement to observe and record data about the insect and disease concerns encountered.</li> <li>- Data from the PHFI and FRA surveys is summarized annually to include recorded insect and disease concerns.</li> <li>- Findings related to insect and disease concerns are reported to the Province annually following the conclusion of the field season.</li> </ul>
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> January - December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that data collected through PHFI and FRA surveys was shared with the Province</li> </ul>
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met
<b>2020 Progress</b>	<p>PHFI survey reports are submitted with all harvest work permit requests. The 2020 PHFI health data was forwarded to the Forest Health Branch of SD on July 6th, 2021.</p> <p>Ground FRA Surveys were conducted on 6 harvest blocks for a total of 842 ha during 2020. Our field personnel collected forest health concerns as per the Manitoba 2020 Forest Renewal Assessment MoU. The FRA Ledger has been sent to the Forestry Branch on January 13th, 2021</p>



<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#15. Recurrence mistletoe infections in regenerating stands</b>
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	2.1.3 Additions and deletions to the forest area
<b>Target</b>	Prevent re-infection of regenerating jack pine stands to achieve FRA certification status.
<b>Variance</b>	No variance
<b>Strategy</b>	<p>The Organization works closely with the Province of Manitoba to identify mistletoe infections in jack pine stands within operating areas and takes measures to prevent re-infection of regenerating jack pine stands through harvesting and renewal operations. All parties have a stake in maintaining forest ecosystem productivity and productive capacity by taking steps to reduce the effects of disease and to protect the investment made in the regenerating stand. To obtain FRA status the regenerating stand must be free of mistletoe infection at the time of survey.</p> <p>In situations where jack pine dwarf mistletoe infections are identified, sanitation and/or planting of resistant tree species will be used to control the infestation and to ensure that FRA certification status will be achieved. As per the FMPOP-OG, this includes a variety of tactics including surveying, planning, harvest operations, forest renewal mitigation, sanitation and monitoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PHFI data identifies areas infected with dwarf mistletoe;</li> <li>- Planning uses PHFI data to mitigate/schedule infected stands and prescribe appropriate harvesting and renewal treatments.</li> <li>- Modified harvesting will include dwarf mistletoe sanitation by harvesting merchantable infected trees and knocking down non-merchantable infected trees;</li> <li>- Post-harvest sanitation to knock down any infected trees not taken during the harvest of the stand;</li> <li>- Forest renewal treatment to eradicate the infection, such as the planting of disease resistant species;</li> <li>- Follow-up monitoring in conjunction with the FRA surveys will result in action plans as required to eliminate the infection and to achieve FRA certification.</li> </ul>
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> January - December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List of harvested blocks identified as requiring special treatment for dwarf mistletoe management</li> <li>• List of blocks that were prevented from meeting FRA certification due to mistletoe infection</li> </ul>
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met
<b>2020 Progress</b>	<p>Severe mistletoe infections were identified in PI-13, SR-1, SR-3 in 2020. Special conditions to fall all operable jack pine near infection center and follow up with the Province if needed on operable infected areas beyond the permitted block boundary were identified in the Executive summary.</p> <p>No blocks surveyed in 2020 were prevented from meeting Forest Renewal Assessment status due to mistletoe infection.</p>

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#16. Proportion of watershed or water management areas with recent stand-replacing disturbance</b>
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	3.2.1 Proportion of watershed or water management areas with recent stand-replacing disturbance 3.2.2 Proportion of forest management activities, consistent with prescriptions to protect identified water features
<b>Target</b>	Monitor the total percentage of forest stand disturbances within productive Manitoba crown forest land in all watersheds over the last 7 years. Develop and implement an action plan within one year to protect watershed if forest stand disturbances exceed 30% of productive Manitoba crown forest land.
<b>Variance</b>	The Organization may require a one-year variance for certain operational needs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Time required to survey, plan, mitigate and permit replacement harvest area</li> <li>– Time required to create digital spatial records of new harvest areas, burn areas and residual areas within the burn.</li> <li>– Time required to wind down operating areas in an orderly manner (allowing for road closures, rehabilitation or decommissioning)</li> <li>– Meet contractual requirements with contractors</li> <li>– Time required to construct access roads to replacement areas</li> </ul> During the 'variance year' some of the enhanced practices could be implemented as practical.
<b>Strategy</b>	Water quality and quantity can be affected by forest stand disturbances both human and natural caused. The effects are highest in the initial post-disturbance years — the first seven years and diminish over time as regenerating forest cover is established. The critical threshold at which the disturbance begins to effect water values varies according to topography, soil properties, vegetation types, and climate.  Watershed considerations will be incorporated into planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting of forest management activities. Using the Sub-basins of Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration (PFRA) Watershed Project, the Organization will monitor the percentage of productive Manitoba crown forest land in any watershed that has had a forest stand disturbance caused by harvesting or forest fire within the last 7 years. Any additional depletion records beyond harvest and forest fire the Province of Manitoba is able to provide the Organization will be incorporated into the analysis.  Most of the identified watersheds continue outside of the DFA, therefore, forest stand disturbances occurring outside of the DFA will be included in the calculations, including FMU 57 and 60. However, this indicator applies only to portions of watersheds within Manitoba. The Province of Manitoba provides spatial data for fire depletions within Manitoba and any applicable harvest depletions outside of the DFA.  Where the forest stand disturbance is reported as being greater than 30% of the total productive crown land, an Action Plan will be developed within one year for that watershed. The Action Plan will consider enhanced operational practices for the purposes of limiting any further impact on the watershed and may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Limiting operations to low risk erosion areas</li> <li>– Wider riparian buffers</li> <li>– Enhanced protection and mapping of ephemeral drains</li> <li>– Logging restricted to the winter season</li> <li>– Salvage logging</li> <li>– Increased culvert maintenance</li> <li>– Prioritizing silviculture effort to the watershed for timely renewal</li> <li>– Move operations out of the watershed</li> </ul>
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> Seven-year reporting period. All Actualized Harvest Blocks whose Harvest Year is within 1-7 years prior to current reporting year.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of GIS analysis extent and timeframe</li> <li>• List of any watersheds that reached the disturbance level of 30% and any action plans made as a result</li> <li>• Statistics on the disturbance level of each watershed and breakdown of disturbance by harvest and fire watersheds that have the highest</li> </ul>
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met
<b>2020 Progress</b>	<p>Tabulate Intersection ArcGIS analysis tool was used to calculate percentage of all available disturbance data on all watersheds intersecting the DFA. Currently, there are disturbance data available for harvest, fire and Bipole III Transmission Line (Table 2).</p> <p>The most current data sets used were April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2013 - March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2019 for harvest and fire, and 2018 data for Bipole III (Table 2).</p> <p>No watershed reached the disturbance level of 30% of productive land, therefore no action plans were required. The watershed with highest disturbance level was Saskatchewan River at The Pas (05KJ001). The analyses showed almost 6% from total productive land was disturbed, with under 1% of the disturbance caused by harvesting. Forest fires contributed to most of the disturbance in this watershed (Table 1). More than half of all watersheds had larger disturbance caused by forest fires than harvesting activity.</p> <p>The maximum disturbance caused by harvesting in any single watershed for the 7-year reporting period was 5.19% within Lake Winnipeg Shoreline watershed (05SGS05) (Table 1).</p> <p>For the 7-year reporting period the total percentage of productive forest land harvested was 0.33% (Table1).</p>

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#17. Condition of stream crossings and roadways in terms of erosion control</b>
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	3.2.2 Proportion of forest management activities, consistent with prescriptions to protect identified water features
<b>Target</b>	Construct and maintain stream crossings and roadways in a way that prevents siltation and blockages that can result in serious impacts to commercial or recreational fish bearing water courses.
<b>Variance</b>	No variance
<b>Strategy</b>	<p>The EMS and Road Inspection Reports are the mechanisms ensuring that construction of all stream crossings and road development adjacent to watercourses are constructed and monitored to the applicable SOP's (032, 033, 050, and 051), work permits and HADD authorization or Letter of Advice from DFO under the Navigable Waters Protection Act and the Fisheries Act. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Contractor and operator awareness and training through the Annual Contractor's Meeting and the FMPOP-OG;</li> <li>- Expectations of contractor responsibilities in adhering to the EMS and to work permit conditions in construction of roads and stream crossings is communicated during the COR;</li> <li>- The specific expectations related to SOP's and work permit conditions will be reviewed with the contractor at the Project Tailgate Meeting prior to the commencement of any stream crossing and road development.</li> <li>- Construction practices for mitigating impacts to adjacent watercourses may include retention of vegetation, timing of construction, and placement of materials and structures to control water run-off and drainage.</li> <li>- Ongoing supervision of construction activities through EMS Operation Inspections to ensure conditions are adhered to;</li> <li>- The Road Inspection Report is a formal checklist that must be completed annually for each all-weather Category 1 and 2 road and crossing that are under the control of the Organization. It includes the condition of crossings and roads in terms of erosion control and other measures necessary to prevent siltation into watercourses.</li> <li>- The Road Inspection Reports, follow-up action plans that address any identified concerns, and resulting post-inspections will be maintained within the Road Filing System.</li> <li>- Regular monitoring enables timely follow-up actions in order to minimize the potential for road or crossing deterioration that could lead to impacts on adjacent watercourses</li> </ul>
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> January - December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Road Inspection Reports, follow-up action plans, and resulting post-inspections for all Organization all-weather Category 1 and 2 roads and crossings.</li> </ul>
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met
<b>2020 Progress</b>	<p>All 36 active roads were inspected in 2020. There were 5 inactive roads that were inspected as well, totaling 42 altogether.</p> <p>Road maintenance work was done on: Crossing Bay, East Arm, Buckingham, McLaren Creek, Radar, Bruneau, Namew Mine/Sturgeon Landing, Dickstone, Ruddock, Batty Lake, Transit, Limestone, Mitchell Lake, North Jonas, Syme, South Jonas, Wintering Peninsula, 3 Finger, Thicket Portage Lucky Bay and Halfway roads. This included repair, grading, widening, brush clearing, sign replacement, culvert clearing and beaver trapping.</p>

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#18. Net carbon uptake</b>																								
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	4.1.1 Net carbon uptake																								
<b>Target</b>	Track the volume of hog fuel produced in the field for use in the pulp and paper mill. Report annually on amount of fossil fuel displaced by its use.																								
<b>Variance</b>	No variance																								
<b>Strategy</b>	<p>The Organization burns fossil fuels for energy production in the pulp and paper mill. It tries to replace fossil fuel with hog fuel and poplar and is currently using a mix of both. The efforts are both positive for fuel costs and carbon uptake. The hog fuel is either purchased hardwoods or acquired from slash piles from operations.</p> <p>The Organization will maximize the use of hog fuel and poplar for energy needs of the pulp and paper mill where operations can be effectively and efficiently implemented</p> <p>Tracking of hog fuel consumption will be compared to fossil fuel consumption. Records will be obtained from the pulp and paper mill and the scaling records.</p>																								
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> Three-year reporting period January - December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe the two power systems at the CKP paper mill, power boiler and lime kiln, and what the power boiler is able to burn as a fuel source</li> <li>Table identifying the following data spanning the last three years:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total green tonnes of hog fuel, waste oil, and Bunker C. burned</li> <li>How many litres of Bunker C. and waste oil is displaced by hog fuel and poplar hog;</li> <li>How much CO2 was reduced by using hog fuel</li> <li>Three-year average of total hog fuel used</li> <li>Conversion assumptions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>																								
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met																								
<b>2020 Progress</b>	<p>There are separate power systems at the CKP pulp/paper mill: a power boiler and a lime kiln.</p> <p>The power boiler can generate heat using a combination of hog fuel, waste oil and bunker c.</p> <p>In 2020, the power boiler burned 165,900 green tonnes of hog fuel, 5,319,626 litres waste oil and 1,235,409 litres bunker C.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Hog (GT)</th> <th>Bunker C (L)</th> <th>Waste Oil (L)</th> <th>Bunker C Equivalent from Hog (L) (1 GT Hog = 237 L Bunker C)</th> <th>CO2 Reduced (T) (1L Offset = 3.0228 kg CO2)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2018*</td> <td>110,266</td> <td>1,193,633</td> <td>12,337,603</td> <td>26,133,042</td> <td>78,995 Tonnes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2019</td> <td>159,788</td> <td>828,819</td> <td>5,012,449</td> <td>37,869,756</td> <td>114,473 Tonnes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2020</td> <td>165,900</td> <td>1,235,409</td> <td>5,319,626</td> <td>39,318,300</td> <td>118,851 Tonnes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*VCG installation project took hog burning capability down from May 1 to Sept. 25 increasing consumption of Bunker C.</p> <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hog fuel, 1 green tonne displaces 270 l waste oil or 237 l bunker c</li> <li>1 l of bunker c produces 3.0228 kg of CO<sub>2</sub> when burned</li> <li>Burning hog is carbon neutral, as the wood would decompose and release the same amount of carbon naturally, fossil fuels would not release carbon if left in the ground.</li> </ul>	Year	Hog (GT)	Bunker C (L)	Waste Oil (L)	Bunker C Equivalent from Hog (L) (1 GT Hog = 237 L Bunker C)	CO2 Reduced (T) (1L Offset = 3.0228 kg CO2)	2018*	110,266	1,193,633	12,337,603	26,133,042	78,995 Tonnes	2019	159,788	828,819	5,012,449	37,869,756	114,473 Tonnes	2020	165,900	1,235,409	5,319,626	39,318,300	118,851 Tonnes
Year	Hog (GT)	Bunker C (L)	Waste Oil (L)	Bunker C Equivalent from Hog (L) (1 GT Hog = 237 L Bunker C)	CO2 Reduced (T) (1L Offset = 3.0228 kg CO2)																				
2018*	110,266	1,193,633	12,337,603	26,133,042	78,995 Tonnes																				
2019	159,788	828,819	5,012,449	37,869,756	114,473 Tonnes																				
2020	165,900	1,235,409	5,319,626	39,318,300	118,851 Tonnes																				

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#19. Level of awareness of Woodlands staff of effects of unnecessary vehicle idling</b>
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	4.1.1 Net carbon uptake
<b>Target</b>	Increase level of awareness of Woodlands staff of the importance of reducing unnecessary vehicle idling
<b>Variance</b>	No variance
<b>Strategy</b>	<p>Awareness training will be provided to Woodlands employees of the importance of reducing vehicle idling time in order to lessen the use of fossil fuels with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An annual distribution of an awareness memo to Woodlands employees to minimize vehicle idling times;</li> <li>- A discussion of this topic with documentation in the minutes of the Annual Contractor's Meeting each year.</li> </ul>
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> January - December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all woodlands staff received an anti-idling awareness memo, date of distribution, and reference of memo used.</li> <li>• Evidence that anti-idling awareness was discussed at annual contractor meeting</li> </ul>
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met
<b>2020 Progress</b>	<p>A link was sent to all staff January 27, 2020 to review two videos bring awareness to effects of idling.</p> <p>A link was reference in the Annual Contractor meeting on September 23, 2020.</p>

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#20. Extent of local involvement in forest operations</b>																								
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	5.2.1 Level of participation and support in initiatives that contribute to community sustainability 5.2.3 Level of direct and indirect employment 7.2.1 Evidence of efforts to promote capacity development and meaningful participation for Aboriginal individuals, communities and forest-based companies.																								
<b>Target</b>	To have at least 75% of the financial value of work completed under Woodland’s service contracts, held by local contractors																								
<b>Variance</b>	A 15% variance of the financial value of implemented contracts to be conducted held by local contractors, provided that local contractors are cost competitive and possess the capabilities and capacity to conduct the work.																								
<b>Strategy</b>	<p>There are a number of benefits to both the communities and to the Organization in building a strong local contractor presence in the DFA. The Organization has actively pursued building relationships with Indigenous and other communities and individual contractors to encourage development of a local contractor base. There will be a preference for contractors on the DFA but “local” will include any Manitoba based contractor and will be determined based on the contractors address within the signed agreement.</p> <p>The Organization will continue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discussions with interested local parties to maintain a local contractor base.</li> <li>- To encourage the success of its local contractors and work closely with the operators</li> <li>- Ongoing work with Indigenous contract operations to encourage their development and success</li> </ul>																								
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> January - December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of signed Woodlands Service Agreements that were acted on; Breakdown of the number of these agreements that were held by contractors on the DFA, in the greater Manitoba area, and outside of Manitoba; Number of these agreements that were held by an Indigenous contractor on the DFA and greater Manitoba.</li> <li>• Breakdown of the financial value of total contracts by DFA, greater Manitoba, and non-Manitoba contractors.</li> </ul>																								
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met																								
<b>2020 Progress</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were 27 signed Woodlands Service Agreements on the DFA that were acted on. Contractors on the DFA held 21 of the agreements with none held in the greater Manitoba area. The remaining six agreements were held by contractors outside of Manitoba; Eight of the 27 agreements were held by Indigenous contractors on the DFA with none from the greater Manitoba area.</li> <li>• Breakdown of the financial value of contracts by DFA, greater Manitoba and non-Manitoba contractors:</li> </ul> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 40%;">DFA</td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: right;">\$4,839,066</td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: right;">88%</td> <td style="width: 20%;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Greater Manitoba</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 0</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0%</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Combined DFA/MB</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$4,839,066</td> <td style="text-align: right;">88%</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-Manitoba</td> <td style="text-align: right;"><u>\$ 636,596</u></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><u>12%</u></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Value of DFA Contracts</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$5,475,662</td> <td style="text-align: right;">100%</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Value of Indigenous DFA contracts</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$3,024,385</td> <td style="text-align: right;">55%</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	DFA	\$4,839,066	88%		Greater Manitoba	\$ 0	0%		Combined DFA/MB	\$4,839,066	88%		Non-Manitoba	<u>\$ 636,596</u>	<u>12%</u>		Total Value of DFA Contracts	\$5,475,662	100%		Value of Indigenous DFA contracts	\$3,024,385	55%	
DFA	\$4,839,066	88%																							
Greater Manitoba	\$ 0	0%																							
Combined DFA/MB	\$4,839,066	88%																							
Non-Manitoba	<u>\$ 636,596</u>	<u>12%</u>																							
Total Value of DFA Contracts	\$5,475,662	100%																							
Value of Indigenous DFA contracts	\$3,024,385	55%																							

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#21. The Organization's understanding and practices based upon current and emerging knowledge and recommended practices</b>
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	5.2.2 Level of participation and support in training and skills development
<b>Target</b>	Representatives of Woodlands employees will attend conferences, workshops and field trips related to current and emerging knowledge and recommended practices and bring forward any relevant recommendations.
<b>Variance</b>	Attendance to any given function is dependent upon scheduling related to staff work responsibilities, budgets and other factors.
<b>Strategy</b>	<p>Woodlands employees have an important role in implementing the SFM policies through planning and directing forest management activities. Therefore, maintaining staff awareness and training of current and emerging knowledge and recommended practices is a key component of the SFM process.</p> <p>Within the EMS, a training matrix identifies training requirements for each staff member. Beyond this, Woodlands employees will participate in a number of training opportunities including conferences, workshops and field trips. The Organization has a policy on performance reviews of employees, and it addresses professional development of staff. Annual Performance reviews evaluate any training the employee has undergone and identifies upcoming opportunities for employee attendance at awareness and training events; Participation in these training opportunities will be evaluated by their contribution to SFM in addition to work schedules and budget. Woodlands employees will update their training records with a brief description of the training they received.</p> <p>EMS Process Improvement Forms (PIF's) are used by staff to bring forward any suggestions for SFM improvement based off of any training received of new and emerging knowledge.</p>
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> January - December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of all training opportunities taken by woodland staff that relates to increasing awareness of current and emerging knowledge and recommended practices as documented in staff training records</li> </ul>
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met
<b>2020 Progress</b>	<p>As documented in the staff training records the following courses or training opportunities were attended by members of woodlands.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ArcGIS Training – AGOL Developer Summit</li> <li>ATV "Train the Trainer" by safety services Manitoba</li> <li>Drone Related Training <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport Canada Pilot Certificate</li> <li>M3 Aerial Ground School</li> </ul> </li> <li>DUC Wetlands 101</li> <li>Forest Health and Plant ID training for PHFI and FRA surveys</li> <li>Traditional Plant and Medicine Identification</li> <li>Lean 101 Training</li> <li>How to think like a Project Manager</li> <li>PLT Green leader Mentor Training</li> <li>University of Alberta Indigenous Canada Course</li> </ul>

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#22. Evidence of efforts to promote capacity development and meaningful participation for the public and Indigenous communities</b>																																																																																																
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	<p>6.1.2 Evidence of efforts to promote capacity development and meaningful participation in general</p> <p>6.1.3 Availability of summary information on issues of concern to the public</p> <p>7.1.2 Evidence of ongoing open and respectful communications with Aboriginal communities to foster meaningful engagement, and consideration of the information gained about their Aboriginal title and rights through this process. Where there is communicated disagreement regarding the organization's forest management activities, this evidence would include documentation of efforts towards conflict resolution</p> <p>7.2.1 Evidence of efforts to promote capacity development and meaningful participation for Aboriginal individuals, communities, and forest-based companies</p>																																																																																																
<b>Target</b>	Woodlands employees will provide at least three days of forest education annually in an effort to inform and educate groups or individuals.																																																																																																
<b>Variance</b>	The three days annually may be averaged over a two-year period, totalling 6 days in two years.																																																																																																
<b>Strategy</b>	<p>Open lines of communication with the public and Indigenous communities allow forest licensees to maintain an awareness of social values and concerns and to respond accordingly. Members of the public and Indigenous communities can also provide local knowledge that contributes to socially and environmentally responsible forest management.</p> <p>One way the Organization promotes meaningful participation for stakeholders in the forest industry is to provide forest education to groups or individuals. This may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Field trips for Natural Resource Management Technology program students (University College of the North) in The Pas</li> <li>- SFMC field tours (Indicator #23)</li> <li>- Provision of guest speakers on topics of interest to SFMC (Indicator #23)</li> <li>- Outland Youth Employment Program</li> <li>- Manitoba Envirothon</li> <li>- Presentations to Resource Management Boards</li> </ul>																																																																																																
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> January - December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total number of days woodlands staff volunteered for educational training</li> <li>• Table of Date, Event, Estimation # of participants, estimated # of indigenous participants, # of staff involved, duration (days), total staff time in days</li> </ul>																																																																																																
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met																																																																																																
<b>2020 Report</b>	<p>In 2020 the woodlands staff volunteered for a total of 16.95 days.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Date</th> <th>Event</th> <th>Est. # of Participants</th> <th>Est. # of Aboriginal</th> <th># Staff Involved</th> <th>Duration (days)</th> <th>Staff Time Days</th> <th>Staff involved</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>27-Jan</td> <td>Tutoring UCN students in Forestry</td> <td>3</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>0.25</td> <td>0.25</td> <td>Ryan</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6-Feb</td> <td>Forestry Presentation</td> <td>20</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>0.2</td> <td>0.4</td> <td>Mike/Grant</td> </tr> <tr> <td>27-Feb</td> <td>UCN Cutblock Design Presentation UCN</td> <td>15</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> <td>0.3</td> <td>0.9</td> <td>Mike/Grant/Martina</td> </tr> <tr> <td>16-Jun</td> <td>Seedling give away at arena</td> <td>12</td> <td>0</td> <td>5</td> <td>0.6</td> <td>1.8</td> <td>Andrew/Martina/Jeanne/Mira/Mike M/Jocelyn</td> </tr> <tr> <td>17-Jun</td> <td>Seedling give away at arena</td> <td>850</td> <td>385</td> <td>6</td> <td>0.6</td> <td>1.8</td> <td>Andrew/Mike P/ Jocelyn/ Fallon/ Joyce/ Wally/ Andrew</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7-Jul</td> <td>Kelsey rec day tree plant</td> <td>18</td> <td>12</td> <td>2</td> <td>0.4</td> <td>0.8</td> <td>Mike/Martina</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4-Aug</td> <td>OYEP (company intro, traditional medicine walk)</td> <td>15</td> <td>15</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>Mike M/ Floyd</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5-Aug</td> <td>OYEP (logging yard tour, field gear demo)</td> <td>15</td> <td>15</td> <td>3</td> <td>1</td> <td>3</td> <td>Mike M/Grant /Carlee</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6-Aug</td> <td>OYEP (PHFI training)</td> <td>15</td> <td>15</td> <td>4</td> <td>1</td> <td>4</td> <td>Mike M/ Grant/ Carlee/ Martina</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7-Aug</td> <td>OYEP (brush saw demo)</td> <td>15</td> <td>15</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>Mike M/Carlee</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><b>Total 13 Events</b></td> <td>978</td> <td>464</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>16.95</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Date	Event	Est. # of Participants	Est. # of Aboriginal	# Staff Involved	Duration (days)	Staff Time Days	Staff involved	27-Jan	Tutoring UCN students in Forestry	3	1	1	0.25	0.25	Ryan	6-Feb	Forestry Presentation	20	3	2	0.2	0.4	Mike/Grant	27-Feb	UCN Cutblock Design Presentation UCN	15	3	3	0.3	0.9	Mike/Grant/Martina	16-Jun	Seedling give away at arena	12	0	5	0.6	1.8	Andrew/Martina/Jeanne/Mira/Mike M/Jocelyn	17-Jun	Seedling give away at arena	850	385	6	0.6	1.8	Andrew/Mike P/ Jocelyn/ Fallon/ Joyce/ Wally/ Andrew	7-Jul	Kelsey rec day tree plant	18	12	2	0.4	0.8	Mike/Martina	4-Aug	OYEP (company intro, traditional medicine walk)	15	15	2	1	2	Mike M/ Floyd	5-Aug	OYEP (logging yard tour, field gear demo)	15	15	3	1	3	Mike M/Grant /Carlee	6-Aug	OYEP (PHFI training)	15	15	4	1	4	Mike M/ Grant/ Carlee/ Martina	7-Aug	OYEP (brush saw demo)	15	15	2	1	2	Mike M/Carlee		<b>Total 13 Events</b>	978	464			16.95	
Date	Event	Est. # of Participants	Est. # of Aboriginal	# Staff Involved	Duration (days)	Staff Time Days	Staff involved																																																																																										
27-Jan	Tutoring UCN students in Forestry	3	1	1	0.25	0.25	Ryan																																																																																										
6-Feb	Forestry Presentation	20	3	2	0.2	0.4	Mike/Grant																																																																																										
27-Feb	UCN Cutblock Design Presentation UCN	15	3	3	0.3	0.9	Mike/Grant/Martina																																																																																										
16-Jun	Seedling give away at arena	12	0	5	0.6	1.8	Andrew/Martina/Jeanne/Mira/Mike M/Jocelyn																																																																																										
17-Jun	Seedling give away at arena	850	385	6	0.6	1.8	Andrew/Mike P/ Jocelyn/ Fallon/ Joyce/ Wally/ Andrew																																																																																										
7-Jul	Kelsey rec day tree plant	18	12	2	0.4	0.8	Mike/Martina																																																																																										
4-Aug	OYEP (company intro, traditional medicine walk)	15	15	2	1	2	Mike M/ Floyd																																																																																										
5-Aug	OYEP (logging yard tour, field gear demo)	15	15	3	1	3	Mike M/Grant /Carlee																																																																																										
6-Aug	OYEP (PHFI training)	15	15	4	1	4	Mike M/ Grant/ Carlee/ Martina																																																																																										
7-Aug	OYEP (brush saw demo)	15	15	2	1	2	Mike M/Carlee																																																																																										
	<b>Total 13 Events</b>	978	464			16.95																																																																																											



Indicator	#23. Training members of the SFM Committee
CSA Core Indicator	6.1.2 Evidence of efforts to promote capacity development and meaningful participation in general
Target	<p>(A) SFMC members will receive forest management presentations and information updates from the Organization at least 3 times per year</p> <p>(B) SFMC will be provided with the opportunity to place a representative on SFM audits</p>
Variance	<p>(A) None</p> <p>(B) None</p>
Strategy	<p>The SFMC plays an important role in the on-going development of the SFM plan. Maintaining the committee members awareness and training of forest management processes is necessary to support effective participation and deliberations.</p> <p>The SFMC will receive presentations on the following forest management activities at least three times per year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed Forest Management Operating Plan (FMOP) for the upcoming year for input and feedback from the committees prior to finalization;</li> <li>- The Forest Management Annual Report</li> <li>- ISO and CSA audit reports and responses.</li> <li>- SFM Annual Report</li> </ul> <p>The Organization will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Arrange a forestry field tour on the DFA once per year for all SFMC members</li> <li>- Provide the opportunity for a representative of the SFMC to act as an observer during SFM audits and report back to the committee about it;</li> <li>- Provide the SFMC the opportunity for Indigenous Awareness Training</li> </ul> <p>The agenda and minutes of SFMC meetings will document presentations about forest management, field trips, and SFM audit observer reports. Participation in audits will be reported in the minutes of subsequent SFMC meetings. A summary of the findings of any field trips or audits will be captured in the follow-up discussion of the committee within the meeting minutes.</p>
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> A) January - December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence through meeting minutes and agenda of presentations the committee received</li> <li>• Evidence of any field trip the SFMC participated in</li> </ul>
B) January - December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the committee was invited to participate in the SFM external audit; And confirmation of whether or not anyone participated</li> </ul>
2020 Status	<p>A) Met</p> <p>B) Met</p>
2020 Progress	<p>A) The committee met three times in 2020 – February 20<sup>th</sup>, September 10<sup>th</sup>, and December 10<sup>th</sup>. The meeting in May was canceled due to covid and the following meetings were held virtually. The committee received many presentations throughout the year including Jack pine Budworm Salvage harvest findings, Aquatic Invasive Species and Zebra Mussels Presentation by special guest Chris Smith, FMOP annual report presentation, Audit Report presentation, and 2019 SFM Annual Report presentation.</p> <p>The Field Tour took place at the mill itself on September 10<sup>th</sup> and was guided by the environmental staff at CKP. The SFMC got an outdoor tour of Plant Site Innovations including a tour of the plant effluent treatment system, settling basins, aerated lagoon, and sludge land spreading and seeding pilot project.</p> <p>B) Three members of the SFMC were interviewed by an auditor during the 2020 CSA audit in November as documented in the Audit Report.</p>

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#24 Degree of satisfaction with the public participation component of the SFM planning process</b>
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	6.1.1 Level of participant satisfaction with the public participation process 6.1.3 Availability of summary information on issues of concern to the public
<b>Target</b>	Within the "SFMC Meeting Assessment", the majority of the members responding to the question "Overall Satisfaction with Participation Process of the SFMC" indicate a minimum of "Satisfactory".
<b>Variance</b>	None
<b>Strategy</b>	In order to maintain a high level of public participation and interest in the SFM planning process, the Organization will facilitate a review of the SFMC process with the committee members, at least once a year with the "SFMC Meeting Assessment" survey. Through this review, the Organization will request input as to ways of maintaining the interest of participants and areas requiring improvement. The degree of satisfaction that the SFMC has with the public participation of the continual SFM plan development is evaluated based on their feedback from the "SFMC Meeting Assessment" surveys. Input received through the survey will be reported back to the SFMC, including overall results, suggestions, and any action plans developed from the results if required. The "SFMC Meeting Assessment" survey framework will be reviewed every two years with the SFMC to assess the ongoing satisfaction of the participants with the process and will be updated as required.
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> January - December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summary of results from the "SFMC Meeting Assessment" survey</li> </ul>
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met
<b>2020 Progress</b>	A SFMC Meeting Assessment Survey was provided to participating members in 2020 for the following meeting dates: February 20, 2020; September 10, 2020 and December 10, 2020. Each meeting an agenda item to review overall results of the Meeting Assessment Survey with the committee is listed. The overall satisfaction continues to be "Satisfactory" or better in 2020 and the committee continues to provide feedback of maintaining the interest of participants.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#25. Documentation of public participation process followed, community meetings, concerns raised, and strategies/mitigation developed to address concerns of local Indigenous and other communities and non-timber resource users within FMP's, FMOP's and FRDP's</b>
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	<p>5.1.2-Evidence of open and respectful communications with forest dependent businesses, forest users and local communities to integrate non-timber resources into forest management planning. When significant disagreement occurs, efforts towards conflict resolution are documented.</p> <p>7.1.1 Evidence of a good understanding of the nature of Aboriginal title and rights</p> <p>7.1.2 Evidence of ongoing open and respectful communications with Aboriginal communities to foster meaningful engagement, and consideration of the information gained about their Aboriginal title and rights through this process. Where there is communicated disagreement regarding the organization's forest management activities, this evidence would include documentation of efforts towards conflict resolution</p> <p>7.2.1 Evidence of efforts to promote capacity development and meaningful participation for Aboriginal individuals, communities, and forest-based companies</p> <p>7.2.2 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</p> <p>7.2.3 Level of management and/or protection of areas where culturally important practices and activities occur</p>
<b>Target</b>	Forest management planning will take into account Indigenous and other Community and stakeholder interests and concerns for development of SFM Plans, FMP's, FMOP's and FRDP's
<b>Variance</b>	No variance is acceptable in making reasonable efforts to incorporate the interests and concerns of communities and stakeholders in the planning process. Although differences in view may occur, all concerns brought forward, and the response of the Organization will be documented.
<b>Strategy</b>	<p>The public participation processes include a number of mechanisms to take into account the interests and concerns of communities and stakeholders in planning and implementing forest management activities.</p> <p>Formal Community Information Meetings give the public and Indigenous communities opportunity to receive information and give feedback about FMP, FMOP, FRDP proposals. The Community Information Meeting process includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meeting agenda items include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Presentation of the developing plan under consideration;</li> <li>o Question and answer period;</li> <li>o Opportunity for open-house detailed review of planning materials (maps, etc.);</li> <li>o Discussion of any local plant and animal species of interest to the community;</li> <li>o Other non-timber values;</li> <li>o Heritage values;</li> <li>o Opportunity for sharing of Indigenous forest values including traditional ecological knowledge from participants.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Meeting minutes will capture items of interest and concern raised by participants, including any enquires raised by participants through one-on-one discussions during the open-house portion of the meeting for inclusion and use in the plan review</li> <li>- Any follow-up input from the public (meeting minutes, one-on-one enquiries, letters, emails and phone calls) will be documented and included within the submission of the plan for review.</li> <li>- Resource user group meetings and one-on-one informal meetings, as required, during the planning process to present maps and associated data for feedback</li> <li>- Raised issues and concerns will be addressed by the Organizations Planning Team within the mitigation proposed as applicable for cutblocks in the FMOP or FRDP</li> <li>- The public participation process followed will be documented in each respective plan. This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o the communities and stakeholders participating</li> <li>o meeting attendance levels</li> <li>o number of contacts made</li> <li>o efforts made to inform communities of the meetings such as advertising</li> <li>o opportunities provided for participation</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Each plan will include a Public Concerns Table to document the concerns identified during the public participation process. These tables will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o the concerns raised</li> <li>o identify the party concerned where available</li> <li>o describe the Organizations response and action plan for follow-up, including how the concern was addressed and situations where a difference in view may have prevailed</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Concerted and documented effort to meet with all Indigenous communities to review plans</li> <li>- Indigenous cultural resources or values identified through these processes will be tracked through a table similar to the public concerns table. Although this table will be provided to the Province as part of the planning process, due to the sensitive nature of the information it will not be made public.</li> </ul>

	<p>Other ways public and Indigenous participation is integrated into forest management includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Group meetings, one-on-one informal meetings, and field visits with resource users</li> <li>- Any Public concerns brought forward throughout the year and how they were addressed will be documented in the Public Concerns Table for summarizing in the SFM Annual Report;</li> <li>- The SFMC has a dual role of being the Public Advisory Committee for CSA certification and the FML Area Forest Resource Advisory Committee (FRAC) to provide a forum for broad exchange of views and interests for the DFA and to provide input into forest management plans;</li> <li>- Participation in public awareness programs to promote public awareness of forestry and forest management on the DFA, including support for the Manitoba Forestry Association.</li> <li>- Appropriate Woodlands staff will make themselves available as requested by members of the media to provide information regarding forest management on the DFA to the broad public.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> January - December</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summary of all public participation programs conducted for FMP, FMOP and FRDP's</li> <li>• Summary of Public Concerns table</li> <li>• Indicate and reference the number of instances where plans were modified or jointly developed with other stakeholders or communities in response to public participation findings</li> </ul>
<p><b>2020 Status</b></p>	<p>Met</p>
<p><b>2020 Progress</b></p>	<p>With the move to a two-year Forest Management Operating Plan (FMOP) with the development and submission of the 2013-2015 FMOP, the FMOP community information meetings only occur every second year in conjunction with development of the plan. Community information meetings on the 2019-21 FMOP covering the period of June 1, 2019 to May 31, 2021 occurred between January 7 and February 25 of 2019. There was no FMOP submitted in 2020 and therefore no FMOP community information meetings were held during 2020. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic starting in March of 2020 there was less personal interaction with the public than there would otherwise have been.</p> <p>With the formalization of the partnership between CKP and the Nekoté Limited Partnership, the creation of Nisokapawino Forestry Management Corporation (NFMC), establishment of the NFMC Board and Environmental Management Committee (EMC) during 2018 to represent the Partnership, and the appointment of a Nekoté Community Liaison, the public participation process has taken a huge step forward. Much effort was put toward establishing contact, building relationships, and providing opportunity to the Nekoté communities in 2020. All FRDP and permit proposals were circulated to the EMC and Nekoté Community Liaison for review and comment.</p> <p>Numerous activities, meetings, discussions, and inquiries occurred throughout the year, some of which resulted in modification of plans or operating directions. See below.</p> <p>Many of these communications are noted in the issues and concerns table for follow-up. A summary of the issues and concerns that have been documented throughout 2020 are listed in the Summary of Public Issues and Concerns Table (excluding Aboriginal Concerns) January 1 to December 31, 2020 (Appendix II). Instances where plans were modified as a result of these communications are indicated in the table and totaled 2 in number.</p> <p>In 2020, Company staff meetings with individual or group to discuss concerns or provide information included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assist Sno-Drifters Snowmobile Club with locating possible routes and supplying map products for their trail extension project</li> <li>• Gave Cutblock design presentation to UCN NRMT class</li> <li>• Gave 1 Forest Industry presentation to Grade 10 Geography class at MBCI</li> <li>• Supplied Bignell FRDPs (Phase 1 and 2) to DUC upon request</li> <li>• Presentation of partnership information and proposed operations update to OCN community gathering organized by the OCN Natural Resource Council</li> <li>• NFMC GM gave presentation on the partnership at a Nekote workshop</li> <li>• Work with KTSR to facilitate their access using the Halfway Road to a location on their trail network for the purpose of setting up a new warm-up shack</li> <li>• Many emails, letters and phone conversations with representatives of OCN NRC</li> <li>• Canceled Bignell Road tender upon request from OCN</li> <li>• Met with the Cormorant Resource Management Board regarding the potential Little Cormorant Ice Road establishment and associated timber harvest</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Several emails, phone conversations and 1 meeting with the mayor of Cormorant regarding the potential Little Cormorant Ice Road establishment and associated timber harvest – focus on minimizing the traffic coming through the community</li><li>• Provide work plans for Crossing Bay Road activities to Mosakahiken Cree Nation representative in charge of controlling access into the community during the Covid-19 pandemic and advise when we are going back and forth</li><li>• Performed and distributed as requested a diversity survey on CKP/NFMC employees</li><li>• Assisted with communicating an employment opportunity with CKP contractor to OCN band member</li><li>• Took OCN NRC term employee on 2 ride-alongs, flying drone and PHFI survey</li><li>• Met with Chief Tobacco of Mosakahiken Cree Nation to discuss operational transition from one area to another</li><li>• Assist mining exploration company with access information and map products</li><li>• Contact KTSR representative to communicate winter activities</li><li>• Participate in the Outland Youth Employment Program</li><li>• Employed 4 Nekote community members as mentored workers in a timber volume sampling project completed for the Province of Manitoba</li><li>• All external job postings are circulated to the 7 Nekote communities</li><li>• Assisted 2 Nekote communities with preparing applications for FireSmart funding</li><li>• Working on a pre-employment mill readiness training program with OCN</li><li>• Work with 2 OCN-based potential trucking owner/operators to help them understand that business</li></ul>
--	--

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#26. Access of the public to information on SFM, FMP's, FMOP's and related public participation processes</b>
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	6.1.2 Evidence of efforts to promote capacity development and meaningful participation in general
<b>Target</b>	Sufficient information sharing mechanisms so the public will have access to the most recent SFM Plan, SFM Annual Report, FMP's and FMOP's
<b>Variance</b>	None
<b>Strategy</b>	<p>Several mechanisms promote information sharing to the public:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Formal Community Information Meetings give the public and Indigenous communities opportunity to receive information and give feedback about FMP, FMOP, FRDP proposals. Including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Provide and review the FMP, FMOP, and FRDP draft maps and associated data outlining proposed operations at public meetings with Indigenous and other appropriate communities</li> <li>o Provide opportunity for open-house detailed review of planning materials (maps, etc.) and documented input from participants;</li> <li>o Inform attendees of the existence of the SFM Certification and to invite everyone to join the SFM Committee;</li> <li>o Provide information to attendees on the status of the SFM Plan and its implementation for the DFA, including reporting on progress made towards objectives and targets;</li> <li>o The public participation activities and associated information sharing mechanisms, conducted for the preparation of each FMP, FMOP and FRDP are documented and summarized in the respective plan documents including a description of the planning materials (maps, etc.) provided at meetings and mail correspondence.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Resource user group meetings and one-on-one informal meetings, as required, during the planning process to present maps and associated data for feedback</li> <li>- The SFMC has a dual role of being the Public Advisory Committee for CSA certification and the FML Area Forest Resource Advisory Committee (FRAC) to provide a forum for broad exchange of views and interests for the DFA and to provide input into forest management plans;</li> <li>- SFM Plan, FMP, and FMOP planning materials are presented to the SFMC on an ongoing basis to share further with their constituents;</li> <li>- Participation in public awareness programs of forestry and forest management, including support for the Manitoba Forestry Association.</li> <li>- The Organizations website has been developed to provide access to the SFM plan, FMOP's, and other planning documents.</li> <li>- A newsletter is produced annually and made available through the Organizations website to highlight ongoing forest management activities</li> <li>- FMP documents, including the plan and the associated Environmental Impact Statement, are available on Manitoba Public Registries across the DFA;</li> <li>- The Organization will respond to individual requests for information related to planning by providing direction to available information or supplying further information as appropriate;</li> </ul>
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> January - December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All public participation programs conducted in preparation for FMP, FMOP and FRDP's, including the information sharing mechanisms employed.</li> <li>• Refer to Indicator 23 report for SFMC access to information</li> <li>• Refer to Indicator 27 report for a description of the information available to the public online including social media and the CKP website</li> </ul>
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met
<b>2020 Progress</b>	<p>See indicator 25 report for public participation programs conducted in preparation for FMP, FMOP and FRDP's</p> <p>See Indicator 23 report for SFMC access to information</p> <p>See Indicator 27 report for a description of the information available to the public online including social media and the CKP website</p>

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#27. Availability of summary information on issues of concern to the public</b>
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	6.1.3 Availability of summary information on issues of concern to the public
<b>Target</b>	Make available summary documents on topics that are requested by stakeholder groups.
Variance	At least one summary document provided annually.
<b>Strategy</b>	<p>The Organizations website makes the following information available to the public:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Forest Management Operating Plan</li> <li>- Forest Management Annual Report</li> <li>- CSA-SFM Plan</li> <li>- Sustainable Forest Management Annual Report</li> <li>- Newsletters</li> <li>- SFMC minutes</li> </ul> <p>The website is discussed at public meetings and other opportunities. Any requests for additional suitable topics can be made at public meetings and through the SFMC. Summary documents may be produced in-house or through external parties and will be posted on the website. The Organization has memberships in a number of organizations which have an educational component who may be asked to provide summaries or links to their own documents.</p>
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> January - December	Description of the information available to the public online including social media and the CKP website
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met
<b>2020 Progress</b>	<p>In 2020, the following have been posted on the Organizations website to make available to the public:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Forest Management Operating Plan</li> <li>- Forest Management Annual Report</li> <li>- CSA-SFM Plan</li> <li>- Sustainable Forest Management Annual Report</li> <li>- Newsletters</li> </ul> <p>The meeting minutes for 2020 have not been posted to the Organizations website. However, the minutes were sent out via email or mail to an active member listing, including those participating members. The minutes are also reviewed with participating members at each meeting.</p>

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#28. Level of investment in training and skills development</b>
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	5.2.1 Level of participation and support in initiatives that contribute to community sustainability 5.2.2-Level of participation and support in training and skills development
<b>Target</b>	Document efforts to promote economic development and meaningful participation for communities in the forest industry.
<b>Variance</b>	None.
<b>Strategy</b>	<p>It is important to provide opportunities for members of the public to provide input into forestry planning. Open lines of communication allow forest licensees to maintain an awareness of social values and concerns and to respond accordingly. Members of the public can also provide local knowledge that contributes to socially and environmentally responsible forest management. The ability of people to share information, discuss and solve problems, and set and meet objectives is key to achieving and maintaining meaningful participation. Many types of initiatives (e.g., two-way information exchanges, educational opportunities, etc.) can be used to help promote meaningful participation.</p> <p>The Organization has developed a number of mechanisms of documenting the efforts to promote economic development and meaningful participation for communities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meetings and Agreements with Resource Management Boards or Councils</li> <li>- The planning public participation process including invitation letters and public announcements</li> <li>- Public Concerns and Indigenous Concerns</li> <li>- Meetings with resource users</li> <li>- The SFMC, as well as other community advisory committees as required including travel support for committee members</li> <li>- Woodlands section on the Organization website</li> <li>- The publication of the Forestry newsletter</li> <li>- Training programs and other educational events</li> <li>- Agreements with local contractors</li> </ul>
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> January - December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minutes of meetings with Resource Management Boards or Councils and list of agreements with Resource Management Boards or Councils</li> <li>• Refer to Indicator 25 and 26 report for Public participation for planning which are contained within the FMOP and/or FMP</li> <li>• Refer to Indicator 25 report for the Public Concerns and Indigenous Concerns Tables.</li> <li>• Refer to Indicator 25 report for minutes from meetings with resource users</li> <li>• Refer to Indicator 23 report for Minutes of SFMC and /or community advisory committee meetings</li> <li>• Refer to Indicator 27 report for Access to the website</li> <li>• Refer to Indicator 27 report for The Forestry Newsletter</li> <li>• Refer to Indicator 22 report for attendance for any training or educational events</li> <li>• Refer to Indicator 20 report for the value and number of contracts with companies on the DFA; level of employment within the Organization.</li> </ul>
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met
<b>2020 Progress</b>	<p>Multiple point of evidence through indicator reports above.</p> <p>Additionally, NFMC undertook an external project (Volume Sampling) and implemented a Mentee / Mentor work environment and were able to hire local people that did not have relevant formal education or experience in the Mentee roles (and mentor roles in some instances) to undertake the work. 6 weeks of capacity building employment for 4 mentors and 4 mentees.</p> <p>Cormorant RMB meetings re potential winter harvest – minutes recorded; meeting noted in the public concerns table.</p> <p>Skownan First Nation – Community Based Monitoring Agreement development – Created a Community agreement with Skownan for the West Devil's Lake Operating Area in the Budworm salvage in the Interlake. Unfortunately, a forest fire took out the wood in spring 2021 before the area could be operated.</p> <p>CKP Employee diversity survey – indication of trend towards understanding the workforce diversity and establishing a baseline and future targets.</p>



<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#29. Training and awareness opportunities for contractors</b>
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	5.2.2-Level of participation and support in training and skills development
<b>Target</b>	Provide annual information sessions to 100% of all applicable contractors
Variance	Some contractors may not be able to attend an annual contractor meeting, however there shall be no variance in ensuring that all contractors are provided with meeting minutes and all handout materials.
<b>Strategy</b>	<p>Contractors play an important role in achieving SFM as they implement a large component of the forestry operations. Contractors are involved in road development, harvesting, forest renewal operations, and data collection used in harvest planning (PHFI, forest inventory) and renewal monitoring (FRA surveys).</p> <p>The Organization hosts an Annual Contractor's Meeting each year to keep all applicable contractors providing a Woodlands service on the DFA informed of SFM processes and to enable adaptive management and continual improvement in their operations. This will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Scheduling the meeting to maximize the opportunity for contractor attendance</li> <li>- Contractors will be contacted directly by the Organization and requested to attend the meeting;</li> <li>- Agenda items will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Update on EMS awareness;</li> <li>o Update on SFM progress</li> <li>o CSA awareness</li> <li>o Safety issues and/or safety presentation including review of the Safety plan requirement</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Presentations may be put on by outside experts in topics relating to forest ecosystem processes and the potential impacts and interactions that contractor operations can have;</li> <li>- The Organization will maintain planning records for the Annual Contractors Meeting, including contacts made for scheduling, invitation of contractors and confirmation of arrangements.</li> <li>- The meeting minutes will be prepared to include recorded attendance, copies of presentations, question and answer discussions, and any items requiring follow-up action.</li> <li>- Meeting minutes of each Annual Contractor's Meeting will be distributed to all contractors. Any contractors who are unable to attend will receive a review of the meeting minutes during their "COR".</li> </ul>
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> January - December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Date and location of Annual Contractor Meeting</li> <li>• Number of contractors represented and number of contractors unable to attend</li> <li>• Any follow-up actions required</li> <li>• Evidence of all efforts to invite contractors to the meeting.</li> <li>• Evidence that meeting minute's package was sent to all contractors</li> </ul>
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met
<b>2020 Progress</b>	<p>Due to Covid restrictions the contractor meeting was held virtually through the Microsoft Teams App on September 23/20. A letter of invitation along with instructions on how to join the meeting was emailed to contractors and company staff on September 3/20. Contractors were contacted by phone the week before the meeting as a reminder and to see if they had any questions.</p> <p>Agenda topics included: Woodlands Update, Market Update/Challenges, Safety, Idling Awareness, Environment Act License, Truck Haul Safety/Radio Policy/Fire Program, Bud Worm Update, Reminders to Contractors, Geotabs, EMS/CSA/SAR/COSWIC Update, Heritage Resource Action Plan Review, and NFMLP update.</p> <p>Seventeen contractors were invited to the meeting with 13 contractors represented in the meeting. Of the remaining four contractors invited two had no current agreement with the Company so attendance was optional; the COR's for remaining two contractors were expired and had to be redone with a review of the meeting minutes prior to working.</p> <p>The meeting minutes and related documents were emailed to the contractors on November 9/21.</p>

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#30. Evidence of co-operation with DFA-related workers and their unions to improve and enhance safety standards, procedures, and outcomes in all DFA-related workplaces and affected communities</b>
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	6.2.1 Evidence of co-operation with DFA-related workers and their unions to improve and enhance safety standards, procedures, and outcomes in all DFA-related workplaces and affected communities 6.2.2 Evidence that a worker safety program has been implemented and is periodically reviewed and improved
<b>Target</b>	At the annual contractors meeting, safety topics will be discussed
Variance	No variance
<b>Strategy</b>	Safety is important for the continuance of economic diversity; therefore, a safety component will be included in the Annual Contractor's Meeting.
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summary of the safety topic(s) discussed at the Annual Contractors Meeting</li> <li>• Refer to Indicator 29 report for a more details on the Annual Contractors Meeting</li> </ul>
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met
<b>2020 Progress</b>	<p>On September 23, 2020 during the annual contractors meeting the following safety topics were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covid impacts, Employer Responsibility, CKP precautions</li> <li>• Wally talked about 2019 and 2020 YTD safety records, what an RIR is, and Levels of commitment to safety</li> </ul>

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#31. Evidence that a worker safety program has been implemented and is periodically reviewed and improved</b>
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	6.2.2 Evidence that a worker safety program has been implemented and is periodically reviewed and improved.
<b>Target</b>	A) 100% of woodlands contractors working have Workplace Safety and Health plans. B) 100% of Woodland employees are involved in an annual review of the Workplace Safety and Health plan.
<b>Variance</b>	A) None B) None
<b>Strategy</b>	<p>As a contract condition, contractors are required to have a workplace safety and health plan in place when working on behalf of the Organization. The Organization maintains a Workplace Safety and Health program for Woodlands Employees. This is both an Organization policy and a legal requirement to promote the safety of Woodlands employees and contractors.</p> <p><u>Contractor Safety Plan</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organization checks that workplace safety and health plan is in place for each contractor</li> <li>• Contractor is responsible review of appropriate safe work practice at start of employment and through the year</li> <li>• Contractor and employees will complete an Annual review of the safety plan by the contractor and their employees</li> <li>• Monitored through EMS with Contractor Employee Training Records, COR, Project Tailgates, and a reminder at Annual Contractor's Meeting</li> </ul> <p><u>Woodlands Safety Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monthly safety meetings for the woodlands staff</li> <li>• Review of appropriate safe work practice through the year</li> <li>• Annual review of the safety plan by the safety committee and woodlands staff</li> <li>• Monitored through Woodland's monthly safety meeting minutes, Safety Committee meeting minutes, and employee training records</li> </ul>
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> A) January - December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmation that all contractors have current safety plans on file</li> </ul>
B) January - December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmation that all woodlands staff have reviewed the WS&amp;H plan as documented in staff training records</li> </ul>
<b>2020 Status</b>	A) Met B) Met
<b>2020 Progress</b>	<p>A) <u>Contractor Safety Plan</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All contractors are required to have a safety plan in place as a contractual requirement. During 2020 all active contractors had a current digital safety plan on file with CKP.</li> <li>• Contractors were reminded at the Sept 2020 Contractor Meeting that we do check to make sure they are following their safety plan they have on file with us.</li> <li>• Checks are also made during COR and Tailgate meetings with contractors that they have a workplace safety and health plan in place that they follow.</li> </ul> <p>B) <u>Woodlands Safety Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A review of SWP's or Guidelines is included on the agenda for each monthly staff safety meeting.</li> <li>• An annual review of the safety plan was done by staff through self study. Newly hired staff reviewed the safety plan as part of their orientation.</li> </ul> <p>A summary is maintained detailing the training and attendance at each meeting. Staff are responsible to enter their training records in CKP CorePoint.</p>

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>#32. Percentage of Woodlands staff who have participated in Indigenous, treaty rights and cultural awareness sessions</b>
<b>CSA Core Indicator</b>	7.1.1 — Evidence of a good understanding of the nature of Aboriginal title and rights
<b>Target</b>	100% of all Woodlands employees will receive annual Indigenous title and rights, treaty rights and cultural awareness training
Variance	None
<b>Strategy</b>	An Indigenous title and rights, treaty rights and cultural awareness training workshop is incorporated within the training program for all Woodlands employees as a requirement within the EMS training matrix. This training workshop assists staff in their interaction with Indigenous people and contractors, communities, and other interested parties. It is viewed as an important component to the overall public participation process of the Organization. Training may be in the form of a workshop or a video. The presentation of an updated Indigenous, treaty rights and cultural awareness workshop will occur annually
<b>Annual Reporting Requirements</b> January - December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirm that all woodlands staff participated in Indigenous awareness training as documented in staff training records</li> </ul>
<b>2020 Status</b>	Met
<b>2020 Progress</b>	All staff completed Module 1 of the Indigenous Canada course (Coursera) through the University of Alberta.

## **Appendix II**

### **2020 Public Concerns Table**

## Public Issues and Concerns Table

1/1/2020 to 12/31/2020

Date	Concern, Issue or Question	Company Response	Plan Modification or Operational Direction
<b>2017 Carryover</b>			
2/8/2017 Phone call	Dolomite Road - Snow Lake area outfitter was concerned about plans to decommission the Dolomite Road as he has some bear baits in the area that he accesses using the road – when and how will we be decommissioning the road?	We can let him know when we have a date in mind and can design the closures such that ATV traffic can safely pass (no berm or flatter berm, reduce the slope on the excavation), copied the Province on the e-mail dialogue and copied the e-mail string into the folder with Dolomite Decom Plan.	No Decom activity on this road in 2017 through 2020.  Concern transferred over into new Land resource management system (LRM).
3/17/2017 Phone call	Duval Road - Hobbit area trapper had heard that we were planning to re-open the decommissioned portion of the Duval Road for harvesting operations in the near future.	Nothing imminent, blocks were included in the proposed operating plan as contingency, focusing on JP budworm salvage areas south of Grand Rapids in the near future and some winter areas closer to The Pas around Pothier Lake and Namew Lake, will let him know before we open the road to access these blocks – added Issue statement in Planner for each planned block in this trapper’s area.	Concern transferred over into new Land resource management system (LRM).

3/17/2017 FMOP meeting	Athapap Winter Road - Is that the exact trail the Sno-Man Flin Flon group uses? The road and snowmobile trail won't be right together?	Yes, our plan would be to push an adjacent trail for the snowmobile club, and we'd use the existing road. They would be parallel but not on the same road as the trucks. We looked at a few options. We are definitely aware of their use of the trail.	No additional communication took place with the snowmobile club on this issue in 2017, no work took place or has taken place on the road.  Concern transferred over into new Land resource management system (LRM).
3/17/2017	Bignell Road - Does that road go on top of the snowmobile trail? That is just a proposed location. It goes all the way up to the Lesko Road?	It crosses the trail and there is one stretch where we will need to create a new location for the trail. No right-of-way has been cut or road developed yet. Explained the location of the road, where the road intersects the snowmobile trail, the plan for managing use with the snowmobile club including cutting a new adjacent trail on the south portion of the road for the snowmobile club to use.	No work on the road took place in 2017 through 2020.  Concern transferred over into new Land resource management system (LRM).
<b>2018 Carryover</b>			
4/27/2018	South Jonas - Wabowden trapper expressed concern over spraying	Agreed to defer spray in his trap line for a few years until the lynx population	JO-61, JO-69, and JO-71 were not be sprayed in

	in his trapline on the South Jonas due to the high peak of the lynx population. He requested deferring the spray within his trap line until the lynx population crashes.	crashes.	the 2018 herbicide program and have not been sprayed through 2020. Will revisit in the future. Concern transferred over into new Land resource management system (LRM).
<b>2019 Carryover</b>			
	Wabowden - Would like ATV access maintained through Setting/Bah Lake Road and front portion of the South Jonas Road decommissioning when this takes place to facilitate berry picking that has been taking place for many years.	We will note this and will bring it forward to the Province when we are discussing these road decommissioning projects with them but ultimately it is up to their discretion to approve it.	Concern transferred over into new Land resource management system (LRM).
<b>2020</b>			
2/6/2020 Phone call	Halfway Road - KTSR representative would like us to leave the Halfway Road open so that they can move a new warm up shack in on the road and over to Slippery Corner.	See if Province will allow us to leave road open until club has moved their shelter in.	Push up temporary snow berm at front of Halfway Road and return later to do excavation. This was completed.



3/30/2020 Phone call	Hardwood operation - Why are hardwood trees left behind following CKP harvest?	Explained CKP does not have harvest rights to hardwood and when they exist in a softwood dominated stand we try to leave them standing as much as possible, they break up line of sight for wildlife purposes and make good perch trees for various birds. Contact on the Province was provided.	
3/30/2020 Phone call	Bignell Road - DUC representative was interested if we had initiated construction of the Bignell Road, what the location was and what type of road was to be constructed, he would like to be advised when we are commencing construction activities	We have not initiated construction at this point, we may harvest some road ROW this winter, it is to be all weather road, Planner emailed him the FRDPs and maps for Phase 1 and 2 recorded in WTS a note to inform him when activities are set to take place	
5/14/2020 Email - received	General - Truckers told an outfitter to leave	Harvesting superintendent contacted the outfitter and informed him that this was not acceptable and CKP would deal with the drivers who were within this incident.	
5/27/2020 Phone call	Wabowden - Individual wanted to rent log cars in Wabowden to send firewood to Churchill and asked for contact.	You would have to pay for getting them serviced and certified. We would need to know how many cars you would need, how long you would need them and when, and then we would figure out rental and get back to you.	
9/21/2020 Phone call	Chisel Railbed - Caller advised the person that has been minding the	NFMC followed up on the current status and whether the replacement is	

	Chisel gate has sold his home and is presumably leaving Snow Lake, Caller would like to put his name forward as replacement.	needed. No replacement being sought at this time, caller was advised.	
9/21/2020 Phone call	General - Inquiry about Jack Pine Budworm infestation.	Talked about JP budworm infestation and salvage, explained to him the life cycle of the pest and sent him a scan of the Province's information pamphlet.	
10/22/2020 Email - received	Crossing Bay Road, East Talbot Road, block access trails - Looking for access info and road use agreement to access drill location east of Talbot Lake	Emailed information and shape files, referred him to Harvesting department to discuss road use agreement.	