

DEVELOPMENT & PROPERTY  
DEPARTMENT



9 INTERNATIONAL DRIVE  
PEMBROKE, ON, CANADA  
K8A 6W5  
(613) 735-3204 or (613) 735-0091  
Toll Free: 1-800-273-0183  
FAX: (613) 735-2492  
[www.countyofrenfrew.on.ca](http://www.countyofrenfrew.on.ca)

June 11, 2007

To Whom It May Concern:

**RE: Recommendations of the Ontario Parks Board – Lightening the Ecological Footprint of Logging in Algonquin Provincial Park - Registry Number 010-0445.**

Attached please find the County of Renfrew's Position Paper regarding the above named document. The County of Renfrew believes that the Parks Board Report is seriously flawed, and if its recommendations are implemented, there will be serious job losses in communities around Algonquin Provincial Park. The Parks Board report can be found at [www.ebr.gov.on.ca](http://www.ebr.gov.on.ca), Registry Number 010-0445.

Please write the Minister to express your concerns. Send your letters to both;

1. The Honourable David Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources  
6630-99 Wellesley St W  
6th Floor, Whitney Block  
Toronto, Ontario M7A 1W3
2. Dorothy Shaver, District Planner  
Ministry of Natural Resources  
Parry Sound District Office  
7 Bay Street  
Parry Sound, ON P2A 1S4

Phone: (705) 773-4231  
Fax: (705) 746-8828  
Email: [dorothy.shaver@ontario.ca](mailto:dorothy.shaver@ontario.ca)

**The last day comments will be accepted is Friday, June 15, 2007, so act now.**

Request a response from the Minister.

Sincerely,

Jeff Muzzi  
Manager of Forestry Services  
[jmuzzi@countyofrenfrew.on.ca](mailto:jmuzzi@countyofrenfrew.on.ca)

JM

## SECTION 1

### County of Renfrew Review of the Ontario Parks Board Document “Recommendations of the Ontario Parks Board - Lightening the Ecological Footprint of Logging in Algonquin Provincial Park”

#### Executive Summary and Recommendations of Renfrew County

At the direction of the Development and Property Committee of the County of Renfrew, County Forestry and Economic Development staff reviewed the Ontario Parks Board document “Recommendations of the Ontario Parks Board - Lightening the Ecological Footprint of Logging in Algonquin Provincial Park”.

Parks Board Recommendation 1 – “Protection zones should be expanded by 241,032 hectares to include a total of 409,482 hectares or 54 % of the park.”

County staff concluded that if Recommendation 1 of the Parks Board Report were implemented, it would result in serious job losses in the County by reducing the amount of productive forest available for harvest in Algonquin Provincial Park. This loss of wood fibre clearly cannot be mitigated from other sources. Further, the reduction in available harvest area would halt the forest industry economic opportunities for First Nations communities in the County that have been developing in Algonquin Park for several years. Additionally, current and future economic development and sustainability in local communities would be irrevocably damaged. For example, the City of Pembroke has lost almost 1,000 jobs in the forestry (manufacturing) sector in the last five years. *The loss of employment in the forest industry, which is already facing unprecedented challenges in Ontario, cannot be mitigated by any other sector. The manufacturing sector in Eastern Ontario has been hit very hard with lay-offs in the last decade.*

Parks Board Recommendation 2– “The Ministry and AFA should develop an action plan with targets to reduce the impacts of logging operations considering the 7 strategies outlined in Table 4, including a review of roads standards, aggregate use, size of pits, and use of temporary bridges.”

In fact, AFA and MNR have been successfully addressing these issues for several years. The Report presents a negative impression of logging, when in reality, the logging “footprint” is negligible. There is no public outcry against Algonquin Park logging; it is our understanding, based on discussions with Parks staff, that there are very few complaints directed to Park staff about logging activities. The Report blames logging for ecological “footprints” such as the introduction of invasive species, pollution, sedimentation of lakes and streams, large-scale aggregate extraction, etc. without substantiating these allegations in any way. Algonquin Park logging operations leave much less of an ecological impact than do the 1 million people who visit the Park annually.

Parks Board Recommendation 3– “The Ministry should partner with the AFA in a pilot project to test the effectiveness of more detailed forest resource inventory and a spatial computer modeling to enhance the accuracy of planning and better integrate the protection and harvesting objectives where logging continues.”

The Parks Board Report Recommendation 3 recognizes that there may be deficiencies in forest inventory and the computer modeling used to calculate allowable harvest volumes, and that these deficiencies need to be addressed in order to adequately analyze the affect changes in allowable harvest areas may have on wood supply. It is therefore self-evident that both the inventory and the modeling need to be improved and/or enhanced before the implications of harvest area reduction (increasing the amount of protection zone) can be assessed with any degree of confidence. The County of Renfrew supports Recommendation 3; *better inventory and forest management modeling is required prior to any decisions being made to reduce allowable harvest areas.*

County staff feels that there are many misleading or erroneous statements in the Parks Board Report. A detailed Wood Supply Analysis was completed by MNR to study the effect of the Park Boards’ initial recommendations; however, a subsequent wood supply analysis, applying to the final report, does not appear to have been completed. The initial Wood Supply Analysis unequivocally stated that the wood supply reduction would occur, and that the *loss of forest products could not be made up for from areas outside the Park.*

County staff disagrees with the Parks Boards’ contention that since the AFA has not historically utilized its allowable harvest area, it does not therefore require it. This is a simplistic view of a very complex issue. The AFA has commitments representing volumes, specified by species and product type, that will be made available to client mills. These volumes must be available within an economically viable haul distance in order to supply these commitments at a competitive cost. Shortfalls of product volumes in one part of the Park cannot always be mitigated from another part of the Park. In Algonquin Park the sawlog and other high-quality product volumes are totally committed, while low-quality product volumes are not. Some of the proposed protection areas are forecast to provide significant volumes of the higher-quality products. Increased protection zones will reduce the volume of lower-quality material (which can be mitigated), but it will also remove the high-quality material that is fully committed, and cannot be replaced.

*Forest industry and communities surrounding Algonquin Park have a deep, long-term attachment to Algonquin Park that goes beyond resource extraction.* The Parks Board and non-logging Park users do not have a monopoly on emotional connections to Algonquin Park. There are many loggers who are the 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> generation of their families to work in the Park. Many forest industry people have family ties to the Park that precede the Park’s establishment. Many of these people have used the Park for recreational activities such as fishing, canoe trips and summer camps, as well as for timber harvesting, for generations and have a profound emotional link to Algonquin Park. First Nations have used the Park for its timber and wildlife resources for possibly

thousands of years, and their spiritual and emotional attachment to the Park cannot be overstated.

Forest industry is the backbone of many Renfrew County communities. It provides the highest paying jobs, and offers opportunities to County youth. Sawmill owners and logging companies support minor sports, hospitals, schools and many of the other activities and facilities that make small towns viable. These companies are primarily owned by local families, and are not large, faceless corporations.

Tourism is, of course, an extremely important industry in Renfrew County. Tourism and the forest industry have peacefully coexisted in the County and Algonquin Park for a very long time. The attached letter from the Ottawa Valley Tourism Association will confirm that.

The County of Renfrew proposes a number of recommendations for the Minister, and would urge the Minister to adopt these recommendations rather than those of the Ontario Parks Board.

## County of Renfrew Recommendations

1. The County of Renfrew recommends that the Minister not implement Parks Board Recommendation 1, and do not expand protection zones in Algonquin Park until the impacts can be accurately assessed.
2. The County of Renfrew recommends that the Minister appoint an Algonquin Park Subcommittee to the Ontario Parks Board comprised of stakeholders who have a particular interest in Algonquin Park. Such a subcommittee should be structured similarly to Algonquin Forestry Authority's Canadian Standards Association Forest Certification Advisory Group, which has representatives from First Nations organizations, forest industry, communities, recreationalists, tourist operators and other stakeholders directly affected by activities and management decisions in Algonquin Park. The composition of the Subcommittee that produced the report is not reflective of the stakeholders.
3. The County of Renfrew recommends that the Minister direct the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Algonquin Forestry Authority to continue to encourage and enhance First Nations economic opportunities in Algonquin Park.
4. The County of Renfrew recommends that the Minister begin a public education campaign designed to showcase the outstanding success that has been achieved in implementing the multi-use strategy in Algonquin Park. The Park model is an excellent example of where recreation, ecological, First Nation and economic values have been successfully integrated for the benefit of all Ontarians.
5. The County of Renfrew recommends that the Minister disregard Parks Board Recommendation 2. These strategies have been implemented for many years prior to the Parks Board Report.
6. The County of Renfrew recommends that the Minister direct the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Algonquin Forestry Authority to improve forest inventory and computer modeling to enhance the accuracy of planning as per Parks Board Recommendation 3. The enhanced inventory and modeling capability can be used to assist in making management decisions.
7. The County of Renfrew recommends that the Minister direct considerably more funding toward Fish and Wildlife law enforcement within the Park to address the issues of illegal access.
8. The County of Renfrew recommends that the Minister also study the ecological footprint of the close to 1,000,000 yearly visitors to the Park, and study means of reducing this footprint (increased carbon dioxide emissions, litter, environmental impacts of overused campsites, vehicle accidents involving wildlife, mortality of wildlife as a result of human interaction, etc.)

9. The County of Renfrew recommends that the Government of Ontario examine ways to make the Environmental Registry more accessible to rural residents who do not have access to high-speed Internet service. The Environmental Registry is an ineffective public input mechanism for rural Ontario residents and other stakeholders.
  
10. The County of Renfrew recommends that the Minister halt the entire EBR process that is currently underway regarding the “Footprints” report. The process is seriously flawed. There has been no consultation with communities, First Nations, or forest industry prior to the release of the report. The Parks Board Subcommittee that produced the report represents only one small special interest group, and does not present recommendations that are in the best interest of the majority of Ontarians.

## SECTION 2

### **County of Renfrew Detailed Review of the Ontario Parks Board Document “Recommendations of the Ontario Parks Board - Lightening the Ecological Footprint of Logging in Algonquin Provincial Park”**

#### Background

The Ontario Parks Board is appointed by the Minister of Natural Resources “to provide advice on planning, management and development of the provincial park system”. Chair of the Board is Ron Vrancart, a former deputy Minister of Natural Resources. On April 26, 2005, the Honourable David Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources, met with Mr. Vrancart and requested that the Board, as a high priority, provide advice about how to lighten the ecological footprint of logging in Algonquin Park. There were no written terms of reference provided to the Board.

In September 2005, the Ontario Parks Board established a subcommittee to produce the report. The subcommittee prepared a map of the Park identifying proposed new protection zones. After discussion, the Minister requested that the Board develop the concept more fully. It was agreed that further development should include an analysis of wood supply impacts. The subcommittee commissioned four reports to assess the impacts the Board’s proposed changes in Park zoning would have:

1. Assessment of Algonquin Park Zoning Changes Proposed by the Ontario Parks Board of Directors: Wilderness Recreation, Tourism and Cultural Heritage Values (Ontario Parks – September 25, 2006)
2. Wood Supply Analysis of Zoning Changes Proposed by the Ontario Parks Board of Directors’ Algonquin Park Subcommittee (MNR Southern Region Planning Unit – October 2, 2006)
3. Algonquin Park Forest Wood Supply Analysis Evaluation (KBM Forestry Consultants – October 18, 2006)
4. Assessment of Ecological Considerations

The final report was delivered to the Minister on December 8, 2006, and was released to the public for review and comment on May 2, 2007.

*Note - Quotes from the report, with the appropriate page number, are followed by Renfrew County staff comments*

#### The Board’s Vision of Algonquin (page 5 and 6)

- The Report recognizes that “logging in the Park is managed effectively by AFA”. However, it goes on to question whether “78% of Algonquin be zoned to allow logging...”

*Comment:*

*The Board recognizes that AFA is effectively managing logging, yet wishes to reduce the area available for logging. The Board claims that 78% of the Park is available for harvest; however, that figure includes the entire Recreation/Utilization Zone, which includes swamps, lakes, and other unforested area. The area where harvesting actually can occur is about 56% of the Park, and less than 1.5% of that area is harvested in any given year.*

*Further, the Board does not believe that logging “conducted in much the same way it is conducted ...outside the Park” should be permitted. Logging operations in Ontario (both inside and outside of Algonquin Park) are subject to the Crown Forest Sustainability Act, which is one of the most stringent sets of rules governing timber harvesting in the world. Additionally, almost all harvesting in the Park uses partial harvest systems (very few clear-cuts – less than 5% of area harvested).*

#### Physical Impacts of Logging (page 6)

- “The footprint of roads...”

*Comment:*

*Historically, logging roads occupied a much larger percentage of the Algonquin Park landbase than they do now. Prior to mechanized logging, a much larger number of roads were required much closer together, as horses were the chief means of moving felled timber. Further, roads were generally constructed through and along swamps and creeks to facilitate skidding and winter hauling. In many cases, these roads are now used as portage trails. The current system of establishing permanent roads in areas where they are more efficient and more environmentally sound actually leaves much less of a footprint than was ever the case.*

- “Creation of edge habitat, and changes in species...”

*Comment:*

*All silvicultural systems used in Algonquin Park are designed to mimic natural disturbances such as forest fires. Logging duplicates, as much as possible, what would happen if fires were allowed to burn; hence, changes in species and forest composition approximate what nature would do in the absence of human intervention.*

- “mining of large quantities of aggregate...”

*Comment:*

*Gravel pits in Algonquin Park are subject to the regulations of the Aggregate Resources Act and the Algonquin Park Management plan, which restrict the size of pits and require rehabilitation when operations are complete (replanting, sloping of faces, and other operational restraints). Gravel pits in the Park are strictly for building and maintaining logging roads – no aggregate is taken out of the Park.*

- “introduction of invasive non-native species”

*Comment:*

*The Reports’ authors provide no evidence to substantiate this claim. A statement of this nature should be backed up with some evidence. It is far more likely that invasive species have been introduced along the Highway 60 corridor by Park visitors than by logging operations.*

- “animal mortality including species at risk”

*Comment:*

*The Reports’ authors provide no evidence to substantiate this claim. A statement of this nature should be backed up with some evidence. Far more animals are killed along the Highway 60 corridor as a result of high traffic volume than are killed as a result of logging operations.*

- “pollution – noise, exhaust emissions, sediment, etc.”

*Comment:*

*Logging operations are subject to strict environmental guidelines, including spills action plans, timing restrictions to minimize the impact of noise, sedimentation, etc. The AFA also has an Environmental Management System, the ISO 14001 Standard, which requires extensive environmental risk management practices. The amount of pollution generated by logging equipment in the Park is far less than that generated by Park visitors with their cars, recreational vehicles and boats.*

- “sedimentation of stream and lakes”

*Comment:*

*Streams and lakes in Algonquin Park, and on Crown lands in Ontario have slope-generated no-cut reserves applied to prevent erosion or sedimentation into adjacent waterways. These reserves have been applied consistently for over 20 years. In fact, no-cut shoreline reserves were regularly applied as early as the 1950s. Where roads must cross creeks or enter any area of concern, there are stringent guidelines in*

*place to ensure that sedimentation does not occur. This includes the extensive use of portable bridges, the construction of water bars, and the use of mitigative measures (i.e. filter cloth) to prevent sediment from entering waterways.*

- “opportunities for unauthorized public access to fish and game”

*Comment:*

*Blaming the logging industry for the illegal activities of some members of society is hardly fair. The failure of the Provincial government to provide sufficient enforcement staff does not help.*

- “Social and spiritual cost of logging...”

*Comment:*

*The Parks Board and non-logging Park users do not have a monopoly on emotional attachments to Algonquin Park. There are many loggers who are the 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> generation of their families to work in the Park. Many forest industry employees have family ties to the Park that precede the Park’s establishment. Many of these people have used the Park for recreational activities such as fishing, canoe trips and summer camps, as well as for timber harvesting, for generations and have a deep emotional attachment to Algonquin. First Nations have used the Park for its timber and wildlife resources for possibly thousands of years, and their spiritual and emotional attachment to the Park cannot be overstated.*

- “complete cessation of logging ...at this time...without serious economic and social fallout...”

*Comment:*

*It is evident the Park Board has a long-term goal of completely eliminating logging from Algonquin Park. Their current proposals will have serious economic impacts on an industry that has faced enormous challenges in the past several years.*

- Report urges expansion of protected areas to “lighten the footprint of logging”

*Comment:*

*What is the footprint of logging? The report does not actually define it. The vast majority of Park users are unaware that logging occurs in the Park. Complaints about logging activities are so minimal they are not even tracked by Parks Staff. The footprint left by logging operations is minimal compared to the footprint left by Park visitors.*

## Recommendation 1 – Enlargement of Protection Zones (Page 7)

- Report recommends the expansion of protected areas by over 240,000 hectares, broken down into 5 Components;
  - Component 0 – Areas identified to protect representative ecosystems;
  - Component 1 – Core areas to connect and expand existing protection zones;
  - Component 2 – 200 m setbacks for key self-sustaining brook trout lakes and primary canoe routes (including lakes);
  - Component 3 – 120 m setbacks for remaining canoe routes (including lakes) and remaining self-sustaining brook trout lakes;
  - Component 4 – Additional setbacks of 200 to 500 m for high priority areas and creation of blocks to connect and expand existing protection zones;
  - Component 5 – Areas within remaining recreation/utilization zone (i.e. after Components 0 through 4 are incorporated in protection zones) that would not be *subject to logging (lakes, wetlands, rock outcrops, Area of Concern Reserves, etc.)*

### *Comment:*

*Components 1 and 4 should not be considered without a good deal of study. The potential socio-economic impacts of increased protection zones have not been adequately assessed.*

*Components 2 and 3 are not reasonable. At the present time (AFA Forest Management Plan 2005-2010) brook trout lakes have a 500 metre “area of concern” (AOC). Within this AOC, there are no-cut reserves protecting both the water body and associated nursery creeks. No roads may be built within the 500 metre AOC without the Park Superintendent’s approval in order to restrict access to these water bodies. Further, when a sensitive brook trout waterbody is within an area planned for operations, they are field-inspected by an MNR biologist who may impose additional reserves where required. In summary, brook trout habitat is more than sufficiently protected in Algonquin Park. Larger protection zones on canoe routes are not required, as harvesting operations do not impact the canoe routes in any way, shape or form.*

*Component 0 is reasonable and would have minimal impact on the area lost to logging; however, improved and updated inventory to identify these components is needed.*

*Component 5 is not reasonable, as it would create a bureaucratic nightmare for forest management planning. There are systems in place in the Forest Management Plan to deal with these situations as they arise.*

*The addition and/or enlargement of protection zones will also create serious access problems. The “available for harvest” forest area will be fragmented, and road costs will increase as less harvest area is available per kilometer of road built. Further, the necessity of crossing “protection” zones will create a whole suite of new problems for the forest industry.*

#### Implementation of Board Recommendations (page 9)

- Report recommends “consultation with potentially affected aboriginal peoples”

*Comment:*

*Aboriginal communities are benefiting from Algonquin Park logging operations. In 2005, Algonquin First Nations earned \$4.1 million from logging and silvicultural operations in the Park. Since 2000, AFA has tracked payments to aboriginal forest management and logging contractors, and by 2005, the total had reached over \$16.5 million. First Nations have been very forthright in expressing a desire to increase the size and scope of their operations, to help their communities grow and prosper. A reduction in available harvest area will destroy these aspirations.*

*Forest industry, including mills and logging operations, and local communities are affected by all Park management decisions, and must be considered a major stakeholder in those decisions.*

- Report states that “particular care should be taken to minimize impacts...” referring to areas where operations may occur in proposed protection zones

*Comment:*

*Report states that any harvesting occurring in these areas should be minimal impact, i.e. selection harvesting only. Virtually all AFA operations are partial harvest systems; the “particular care” is already being taken.*

#### Wood Supply Impacts (page 10)

- The Parks Boards’ Report minimizes the socio-economic impacts of implementing the Board’s recommendations

*Comment:*

*The Wood Supply Analysis produced for the Board was produced by a team of 6 highly qualified individuals, including 4 Registered Professional Foresters. The*

*Analysis is unequivocal; implementing the recommendations of the Board “may result in shut-downs and/or layoffs at...mills.” The Analysis further states that “the available harvest volume...reduced by a range of 3% to 24% over time”, and the losses “to the most affected mills cannot be mitigated from other areas of the Park...”*

*The Boards’ Report contends that since AFA has not historically harvested all the area it is allowed to harvest, it does not need it. This is a simplistic and inaccurate position. The AFA is committed to supplying specific products and volumes; shortfalls in one area of the Park cannot necessarily be made up in another. Market conditions influence what areas can and cannot be harvested, which also affects volume recovery per hectare. When markets for low-quality material exist (which has been the case in the past several years), the recovery per hectare increases, including both low- and high-quality material, requiring less hectares to reach commitment levels. Forest product markets are generally unpredictable, which makes planning very difficult – it may take more hectares to reach product commitment levels from year to year.*

*Flexibility in area allocation allow for changes in the marketplace. Rarely are the pulpwood (low-quality) and lumber (high-quality) forest product sectors at market highs at the same time. In order to maintain employment levels, options for harvest area must exist.*

*The Boards “believes that there are opportunities to enhance harvest levels on public and private lands outside the park.” The Wood Supply Analysis clearly indicates that, on Crown lands outside the Park, this is not the case. When contacted by County of Renfrew, the Managers of both Ottawa Valley Forest and Bancroft-Minden Forest stated that their allocations were completely committed, and they could not make up for any loss in Algonquin Park wood products. Ottawa Valley Forest, the sustainable forest licensee for Crown lands in Renfrew County, has seen a reduction of 27% of their allowable harvest area since 1990. The Wood Supply Analysis goes on to say “surrounding SFLs...very limited opportunities to mitigate wood supply...”*

*Opportunities on private lands cannot be considered; there is no obligation on the part of private landowners to harvest their timber to make up for a shortfall from Algonquin Park. Further, large-scale reductions in the allowable annual harvest in Quebec have increased the pressure on Eastern Ontario, particularly in Renfrew County.*

#### Reducing the Impacts of Logging Operations (page 11, 12)

- The Parks Board Report contains a table (Table 4) indicating specific actions to reduce the impact of logging in Algonquin Park.

*Comment:*

1. Application of Forest Access Management (FAM) Zone – *AFA and MNR have been making excellent progress on FAM for several years.*
2. Integrate aggregate use, narrower roads, no hauling during wet periods – *again, AFA has been integrating aggregate use as part of the FAM for several years. Opportunities to narrow road running surfaces are being considered within the constraints of workplace safety. Reducing hauling during wet periods has been practiced for decades.*
3. More rigorous standards for aggregate pits – *AFA is governed by the rules of the Aggregate Resources Act and the Algonquin Park Plan, which contain stringent standards.*
4. Use temporary portable bridges – *AFA has been using portable and temporary bridges for some time and is recognized as a leader in the development of low-impact stream crossings. Further, AFA is obligated to meet the rigorous standards contained in the Environmental Guidelines for Access Roads (MNR) guidelines.*
5. Manage logging roads more actively - *AFA (and most logging operators, for that matter) always use old roads where possible as a cost-reducing measure, and to minimize environmental impacts.*
6. June to October period, enhance planning... - *AFA and MNR have continually minimized noise impacts during the high-use period in the Park for decades.*
7. Support ecological integrity, etc. – *Leaving more slash on the forest floor has never been an issue in Algonquin Park, as no full-tree logging systems have ever been used. However, logging contractors are being encouraged to leave more defective material on the forest floor (downed woody debris) to provide wildlife habitat and other ecological benefits. Spills are governed by a spills action plan as a component of the AFA's ISO 14001 Certification. Winter logging has always been practiced as much as possible; road costs are reduced, remote areas can be more readily accessed, and frozen ground conditions minimize physical site damage. Winter operating is limited by variables such as temperature and snow depth that cannot be controlled by AFA.*

*Independent forest audits of the Algonquin Park forest in 1992 and 1997 did not identify any problems with AFA logging operations. In fact, the audits mention “AFAs...high standard of operation...leaders in forest management”. The audits did note that MNR lacked sufficient resources to meet their obligations.*

Next Steps (page 13)

- Parks Board Report indicates that changes in zoning, etc. should be addressed through Park Planning process

*Comment:*

*By appointing an Algonquin Park-specific subcommittee to the Ontario Parks Board, the Minister would have the opportunity to thoroughly examine issues pertaining to Algonquin Park. The subcommittee should be comprised of:*

- *First Nations organizations*
- *Local community representatives*
- *Forest product industry representatives*
- *Recreational park users representatives*
- *Ontario Parks representatives*
- *Environmental protection representatives*
- *MNR/AFA representatives*

*Such a subcommittee would be able to discuss Park issues and give the Minister balanced, stakeholder-driven recommendations for Algonquin Park. Algonquin Park is a park owned by all Ontarians; all Ontarians should be represented in advisory groups.*

**Additional Comments:**

- *Subcommittee that prepared “...Ecological Footprints...” Report did not represent Algonquin Park stakeholders who would be most affected by the implementation of the recommendations.*
- *The Report is not the result of complaints or any general public displeasure with Algonquin Park logging operations.*
- *The Report fails to recognize that logging in Algonquin Park emulates natural disturbances. Because of effective forest fire control, a “natural” forest will not evolve in protected areas of Algonquin Park; the forest conditions created by logging actually mimic natural processes. Algonquin Ecowatch, a non-profit environmental protection organization dedicated to “assess, protect and sustain the Algonquin Ecosystem for the future” firmly supports logging as a means of ensuring biodiversity and ecosystem sustainability in the Park.*
- *In order to build new mills or modernize old ones, and to ensure long-term rural employment, wood processing companies must have guaranteed, long-term wood fibre supplies. Any removals from the harvestable area make investment in the forestry sector excessively risky.*
- *Special interest groups, such as the Wildlands League, use hyperbole and unsubstantiated allegations to further their agendas. It does not appear that they have to answer to any authority, and they act with impunity. Their ability to communicate with urban populations via high-speed Internet access put them at an enormous advantage over rural populations. “Push-button” letter writing campaigns to generate large numbers of “supporters” are their favoured means of pressuring politicians into making decisions which have negative consequences for rural populations. The County of Renfrew sincerely hopes that the Minister will consider reasoned, individually crafted letters to be of much higher import.*
- *The proposed reduction in harvest area seems to fly in the face of the following Ontario Government Progress Report statements:*
  - *“To strengthen the forestry sector and support jobs in the north, we’ve made \$900 million in assistance available over five years to help the industry stay competitive.”*
  - *We’re working hard to help build a stronger rural Ontario. Our five-year, \$3.3-billion plan to invest in rural infrastructure is providing funding for roads, bridges, airports, schools and hospitals, giving families and investors the tools they need to build opportunity.”*

*Jeff Muzzi  
Manager of Forestry Services  
County of Renfrew*

## SECTION 3

### Socio-Economic Issues of Algonquin Park

- In Central and Eastern Ontario, Algonquin Park is the most important source of wood supply. Approximately 45% of public land forest products in Southern Ontario come from Algonquin Provincial Park. (Healthy Forests, Healthy Business; Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources)
- Algonquin Park along with the Mazinaw-Lanark Forest, Ottawa Valley Forest, Bancroft-Minden Forest and French-Severn Forest, supports 5,000 direct full-time jobs. A further 2,300 jobs are supported in the region indirectly and another 3,200 jobs are indirectly supported throughout the rest of Ontario. (Healthy Forests, Healthy Business; Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources)
- Applying a multiplier of 1.48 (Healthy Forests, Healthy Business; Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources) to the 2006-year timber revenues from Algonquin Park yields a \$34,828,856 direct economic value to the communities immediately surrounding Algonquin Park.
- Forestry operations in Algonquin Park, by virtue of a leading edge Forest Management Plan, serves as a model for forestry operations across Ontario and around the world.
- From a global environmental perspective the wood products produced from the sustainable practices utilized in Algonquin Park are a far more environmentally responsible purchase/utilization than those wood products from other regions of the world, where sustainable forestry is not practiced.
- Ontario can continue to provide a world-leading beneficial management practices (BMP) model in Algonquin Park by supporting continual improvement of sustainable and economically viable forestry operations in Algonquin Park.
- In the small and rural municipalities surrounding Algonquin Park, forestry and related wood processing activities comprise directly an average of 15% of the labour force. Many of our municipalities are truly 'mill towns', reliant on a single wood products company. Any cutbacks in wood supply from Algonquin Park would result in mill closures and devastation in these municipalities. There is no other source of employment or tax base with which to continue to support these municipalities.
- Even with the present levels the hardwood veneer plant in Pembroke has ceased operations, one of the reasons being the shortage of available hardwood veneer from Algonquin Park. This has resulted in 120 job losses directly.

## **AFA Contributions to Algonquin Park and Area**

Stumpage: Over years 2005 and 2006 \$6,381,280 was contributed directly to Province of Ontario treasury. These are funds used at the discretion of the government for health care, education, infrastructure, etc.

Lumber sales of \$23,533,011 in 2006 and \$26,437,511 in 2005 have provided the economic backbone for all of the small, rural municipalities surrounding Algonquin Park. In the majority of these towns forestry, sawmill operations and supporting services are the mainstay of the community.

Programs at Canadian Ecology Centre for teachers to learn about forest ecology and modern forestry practices to bring back to their students: \$2,500 annually contributed by AFA to fund this highly successful teacher's workshop series.

Sustainable Forestry programs at secondary schools receive \$3,000 funding.

Scholarships: \$5,000 annually is provided to graduating high school students to support their post-secondary education.

Museums celebrating the pioneer, forestry and ecological heritage of Algonquin Park have received \$15,000.

Wolf research received \$20,000 over 2005, 2005 and 2003 for a total of \$60,000.

Wood Turtle research has received \$5,000 annually beginning in 2005.

Brook Trout research support of \$6,000.

Moose research support of \$4,500.

Pine Martin research support of \$3,500.

Hardwood and White Pine research has been funded with \$6,500.

First Nations Businesses (Pikwakanagan, Algonquins of Whitney, Algonquin Logger's Association, etc.) participate in all aspects of sustainable forestry in Algonquin Park from tree marking to planting to harvesting and transportation, with annual contracts in the range of \$4,100,000 (over \$16.5 million since 2000). This directly supports the First Nations people in a manner that connects them directly to their land- sustainable forestry- which is their key desire for the future, to retain this deep connection to the land.

First Nations communities now manage 10-12% of the forestry and related operations within Algonquin Park.

## SECTION 4

### Ontario Parks Board Algonquin Park Subcommittee – Brief Biographies

The Ontario Parks Board established a sub-committee to produce the report (page 3). The sub-committee included;

- Ric Symmes (Chair) Orillia

Ric Symmes is a Regional Director of the Nature Conservancy of Canada. Its Mission Statement:

VISION – “The Nature Conservancy of Canada will protect areas of biological diversity for their intrinsic value and for the benefit of future generations.”

MISSION – “A Nature Legacy Through Partnership”

“To accomplish this mission, the Nature Conservancy of Canada will lead, innovate and use creativity in the conservation of Canada’s natural heritage by securing ecologically significant natural areas through purchases, donations, conservation agreements, or other mechanisms, and by achieving long-term stewardship through management plans and monitoring arrangements.”

- Jennifer East Killarney

Jennifer East is the daughter of Maury and Annabelle East, who own Killarney Mountain Lodge and Outfitters located on Georgian Bay. Ms. East is director of the Lodge, and chair of Paddling Ontario, a co-operative of 23 paddling companies

- Stewart Elgie Ottawa

Stewart Elgie is a University of Ottawa associate law professor, and is also an environmental economist. He is the founding member of Sierra Legal Defense Fund, an organization that is philosophically opposed to logging in Provincial Parks.

- David Earthy Toronto

David Earthy is President and Managing Director, Woods Canada Limited. Woods produces sleeping bags, tents and other camping related equipment. In December, 2006, Woods Canada shut down its Toronto manufacturing facility and is now producing its products in Asia.

- Gerry Killan                      Toronto

Gerry Killan is President of King's College, University of Western Ontario. He is the author of several publications concerning Ontario Parks history and related environmental issues.

- Bill Calvert                      Huntsville

Bill Calvert was a Park Naturalist in Algonquin Park in the sixties, and has held a variety of government posts, including CAO of the District of Muskoka. He is currently co-chair of the Committee of External Advisors of the Algonquin land claim negotiation team.

DEVELOPMENT & PROPERTY  
DEPARTMENT



9 INTERNATIONAL DRIVE  
PEMBROKE, ON, CANADA  
K8A 6W5  
(613) 735-0091 or (613) 735-3204  
Toll Free: 1-800-273-0183  
FAX: (613) 735-2492  
www.countyofrenfrew.on.ca

The Honourable David Ramsay  
Minister of Natural Resources  
Ministry of Natural Resources  
6630-99 Wellesley Street West  
6th Floor, Whitney Block  
Toronto, ON M7A 1W3

June 11, 2007

Dear Minister Ramsay:

**Subject: “Recommendations of the Ontario Parks Board - Lightening the Ecological Footprint of Logging in Algonquin Provincial Park”**

From a tourism perspective, I’m compelled to make a few general statements in opposition to many of the recommendations from the Ontario Parks Board in their report *Lightening the Ecological Footprint of Logging in Algonquin Provincial Park*.

Firsthand, sustainable forestry operations and tourism are both important and driving economic sectors for the County of Renfrew that have created and maintained numerous jobs for our residents ranging over a span of many decades to well over one and a half centuries. Our opinion finds that both of these sectors have been well balanced in terms of complementing each other in the Ottawa Valley and in Algonquin Park. As one example, forestry plays a significant role in our heritage-based tourism, be it viewing historic implements in our many small museums or visiting a park surrounding historical log chutes. As another example, in our County and in Algonquin Park, forestry roads provide much desired access to rivers, lakes and trails for guides and guests alike.

Tourism and forestry continue to provide an economic backbone for all small, rural municipalities surrounding Algonquin Park. The majority of these towns depend on Algonquin Park as a major tourism draw that knits perfectly with other attractions, accommodations, dining and services outside Algonquin Park. The seasonal aspect of Park tourism also complements the seasonal forestry operations. Likewise, forestry, sawmill operations and supporting services are also the economic foundation of these communities.

As Manager of the Ottawa Valley Tourist Association, I have never heard one complaint from our 200+ members that forestry operations in or out of Algonquin Park have caused any detriment to their tourism-based business. Rather, forestry has enhanced their

business. Please take these comments into consideration regarding any decisions on continued sustainable forestry practices occurring in Algonquin Park.

Sincerely,

Mitchell Wilkie, MIM, SBCC, CMMIII  
Manager of Economic Development Services  
Manager of Enterprise Renfrew County  
Manager of the Ottawa Valley Tourist Association  
mwilkie@countyofrenfrew.on.ca

- c. Dorothy Shaver, District Planner  
Ministry of Natural Resources  
Parry Sound District Office  
7 Bay Street  
Parry Sound, ON P2A 1S4