January 11th, 2010

Honourable Bill Blaikie
Minister of Conservation and Climate Change
Room 330 Manitoba Legislative Building
450 Broadway
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 0V8

Ms. Tracy Braun,
Director, Environmental Assessment and Licensing Branch
Manitoba Conservation
123 Main St. Suite 160
Winnipeg, Manitoba,
R3C 1A5
Email: tracy-braun@gov.mb.ca

Dear Minister Blaikie, Ms. Braun:


Manitoba Wildlands is providing comments on *Tembec 2009-2028 Forest Stewardship Plan and Environmental Impact Statement* as filed with an Environment Act Proposal, file # 4572. We expect these comments, and attachments to be filed in the public registry for Tembec proposed Forest Stewardship Plan and Environmental Impact Statement, and added to Tembec materials posted on the Manitoba Conservation web site. ([http://www.gov.mb.ca/conservation/forestry/forest-practices/fpp-contents.html](http://www.gov.mb.ca/conservation/forestry/forest-practices/fpp-contents.html])

**Economic Viability**

It is common to generate business plans and economic projections when creating long term business and operations plans. Currently, there are no business plans or economic projections included in the 2009-2028 Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP). In addition, there are no timelines or set dates for re-evaluation for projects and management strategies. We understand the environmental license may be for ten years but there is no indication of any clear intent for public review, assessment etc at that time. In order for there to be a clear, transparent plan for Forest Management License 01 (FML 01), these planning aspects must be included in the 2009-2028 FSP. It is feasible to do this without releasing proprietary information, and doing so would fulfill certain of Manitoba’s Sustainable Development principles.

Many economic questions stand out at this junction: Are there sufficient customers for newsprint from this mill? What are the ongoing ramifications of lost recycled paper sources for this mill? Is loss of the recycled paper sources an ingredient in the mill closing? Is this mill viable in the current North American economy? What fibre sources will replace the recycled content over this twenty year period?
Why is information about sources for the rest of the fiber needed absent from the Plan? Why is the information about the various other permits Tembec holds missing? Has Manitoba Conservation decided to change how we hold a public review of a forest management plan in Manitoba? These sources of information have been part of past filings and public reviews of forest management plans in Manitoba. Our identification of the need for a clear business plan reflects the current situation, and lack of content in the Plan itself. These lacks then in turn affect the contents of the EIS. It may be worth reminding Manitoba Conservation that the current Environment Act licence for the Tembec mill was issued with no EIS, no public review, no hearings, and no business plan or environmental assessment.

The 2009-2028 FSP assumes continued use of the Pine Falls Mill in manufacturing of newspaper. No other potential buyers are listed for the timber in forest management land (FML) 01. As of December 8th, 2009, Tembec put the Pine Falls TMP Mill up for sale, effectively leaving FML 01 without a mill for processing fibre. Manitoba Wildlands urges Manitoba Conservation put a hold on this review of the Tembec 2009-2028 Forest Stewardship Plan and EIS until status of the Pine Falls Mill is determined, and a clear business plan is in place.

Relationship between Pine Falls Mill and FML 01
Currently, there is full reliance on the Pine Fall Paper Mill in the 2009-2028 FSP and EIS for use of fibre from this FSP. There have been a number of instabilities regarding the Pine Falls Mill, including lockout of employees and as of December 8th 2009, Tembec announced it will sell the mill. Given the current instabilities of Tembec’s Pine Falls Mill, and the deficiencies in the Guidelines, Plan, and EIS Manitoba Wildlands recommends that Manitoba Conservation undertake a complete economic viability, and cumulative environmental assessment of both the woodlands and mill operations. (We note that the Manitoba Labour Board has ruled the lockout an unfair practice.)

Questions regarding the viability of this mill and whether paper and newsprint should be manufactured from intact Boreal forest need examination. Also, there is effectively no proponent at this time, there is a vacuum for licensing proceedings which include federal review/ public hearings etc. In our discussion Tembec has consistently acknowledged they expect an environmental hearing process.

Access to Information/ Public Registry
Currently, the operating plans for the FML woodlands operation (basis for this FSP) are not in the public registry, neither are the timber permits for FML 01. In addition, neither the current or previous legal agreements between Tembec and the Province of Manitoba regarding the FML 01, nor associated orders in council with schedules are in the public registry OR included in the filing from the company. In order to allow for a transparent, fair review of this long term plan, current and previous licenses, permits and legal agreements must be made available to the public.

It is important to highlight that all documents in relation to the operation and licensing of FML 01 should be filed in the public registry. Simply posting these documents on a website does not constitute filing documentation under a public registry. To date there is no complete public registry file.
It should also be noted that this is the first time in 20, perhaps 30 years, that the company filing a proposal for a long term forest management plan and environmental EIS in Manitoba did not include the legal agreement(s) in the filing.

The Manitoba Government paid Tolko and Tembec 3.1 million dollars compensation for not logging in provincial parks in Manitoba. Since then, Tembec has ceased operations at the Pine Falls Mill. What has happened to the money paid to Tembec in compensation for no logging in these areas? What conditions were put on those funds, and given it is apparent the conditions will not be met, what steps is Manitoba Conservation taking? Manitoba Wildlands recommends that Manitoba Conservation make public the conditions for those funds and whether Tembec has complied.

**Responsibilities under Legal Agreement**

From a public interest point of view a transparent public review to support appropriate decision making and licensing is not feasible without the legal agreement(s). As these have been available in previous long term forest management plan reviews, Manitoba Conservation needs to provide clear policy and procedures for forestry plans and licensing.

Communities affected by this legal agreement deserve access to the legal agreement(s). It is also feasible that civil servants, and those responsible for making sure the company’s operations are appropriate do not have sufficient information.

Manitoba Wildlands recommends that Manitoba Conservation resume the usual policy of making legal agreements with forestry companies, and any orders in council, etc public. These can be held in the ongoing public registry file, and included at any significant junction in review, licensing etc.

**Regulatory/Policy Compliance with Manitoba Standards**

Manitoba Wildlands has learned The Pine Falls Paper Company (purchased by Tembec) applied for a federal Navigable Waters permit in 1998, which was never approved. As outlined in the 2009-2028 FSP Guidelines, all applicable acts, regulations and guidelines must be included in an appendix within the FSP. As a result, navigable waters permits should be included in Appendix 9 of the 2009-2028 FSP. In particular if the company is in breach of the federal act now, Manitoba Conservation needs to review the situation.

When the Pine Falls Paper Company (precursor to Tembec) was found to be in contravention of the Navigable Waters Act during the 1990s there were 18 missing permits. Manitoba Conservation staff would be expected to have been vigilant given the history of missing permits.

Manitoba Conservation public review period for its *New Forest Management Guidelines for Terrestrial Buffers* ended November 16th, 2009. This document replaces *Consolidated Buffer Management Guidelines*. Table 1 of *New Forest Management Guidelines for Terrestrial Buffers* also replaces portions of the *Forest Management Guidelines for Wildlife in Manitoba* (1989). Manitoba Conservation and the company will have known about this new Guideline was available with a close on review period in advance of the review of the Plan and EIS. The filings are silent on this Guideline—
so we have another omission in contents filed. As a result of these new guidelines, a number of areas need to be revised within the 2009-2028 FSP. These revisions (for both the FSP and the EIS) include, but are not limited to:

- Portions of Section 4.1 of the FSP which do not conform to the new guidelines. These conflicts need to be updated.
- Buffers must be implemented around large mammal dens, snake hibernacula, bat caves and native grassy meadows. These new guidelines must be reflected in 2009-2028 FSP and the EIS.
- The Integrated Resource Management Team has more work to do regarding buffers around cultural heritage sites and parks and protected areas.

Manitoba Wildlands staff has past experience with Environment Act reviews has included audits of the public policy, guidelines, and regulatory requirements for both plans and EIS documents. Public policy has consistently been part of the requirements. These have routinely included both provincial and federal policies, especially those the government of Manitoba has signed on to.

**Manitoba’s Submission Guidelines for Twenty Year Forest Management Plans States:**

"List in an appendix all applicable acts, regulations, and guidelines that must be followed that are relevant to forest management planning."

Section 3.0 (Intent and Scope of the Environmental Assessment) of the Guidelines for the Preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement for the Tembec 2009-2028 Forest Stewardship Plan states:

An Environmental Impact Statement would incorporate, consider and directly reflect, where applicable, the Principles of Sustainable Development as contained in the “Sustainable Development Strategy for Manitoba” (1994), and the policies which have been developed or are emerging under the “Land and Water Strategy”, such as “Applying Manitoba’s Water Policies” (1994), “Applying Manitoba’s Forest Policies” (1994), and “Applying Manitoba’s Natural Lands and Special Places Policies” (1995). The EIS should also show how the policies and/or principles encompassed in the following documents will be addressed:

- “Manitoba’s Forest Plan ... Towards Ecosystems Based Management” (KPMG, 1996);
- “Defining Sustainable Forest Management in Canada: Criteria and Indicators” (CCFM, 2003);
- “The Canada Forest Accord”;
- “National Forest Strategy (2003-2008), A Sustainable Forest: The Canadian Commitment” (2003);
- “Timber Harvesting Practices for Forestry Operations in Manitoba” (MNR, 1996);
- “Consolidated Buffer Management Guidelines” (MNR, 1996);
- “Canadian Biodiversity Strategy” (DOE, 1995);
- “A Wildlife Policy for Canada (CWS, 1990)”;
- “Forest Management Guidelines for Wildlife in Manitoba” (MNR, 1989);
"North American Waterfowl Management Plan";
- "Policy for the Management of Fish Habitat" (DFO, 1991);
- "Forest Management Guidelines for Riparian Management Areas" (Manitoba Conservation and Manitoba Water Stewardship, 2008);
- "Manitoba Stream Crossing Guidelines for the Protection of Fish and Fish Habitat" (DFO & MNR, 1996);
- "Kyoto and Beyond" (Province of Manitoba Climate Change Action Plan, 2002);
- "Manitoba and Climate Change - Investing in our future" (Manitoba Climate Change Task Force, 2001); and

Other Manitoba Guidelines:
- "Forestry Road Management" (Manitoba Conservation, 2005);
- "Brush Disposal Guidebook" (Manitoba Conservation, 2005);
- "Pre-Harvest Surveys" (Manitoba Conservation and Manitoba Water Stewardship, 2008); and
- "Protection of Softwood Understorey in Mixedwood and Hardwood Forests" (Manitoba Conservation, 2003).

The list above from the EIS Guidelines for this Plan and EIS is dated, inaccurate, and misleading. It does not provide an acceptable basis for the company’s materials. Many more up to date or revised policies and Guidelines are missing. It is well known that Tembec has been writing, providing for review and asking about the ability to provide a long term plan and EIS to the department at various times over the last decade. This list may be from drafts provided by the company 8 or 10 years ago. Both company and Manitoba Conservation staff are knowledgeable about new policies, especially in relation to forestry operations, so it may be necessary to determine how this happened. The BOLD titles above have been replaced some time ago. Others in the list have also been replaced with updated and changed public policies, forest management policies, etc. We have attached to this letter our listing of Lands and Water policies for the Manitoba government from 1999 - 2009, as an aid. (Available on DVD with file folders and electronic format documents)

One example: Climate Change policies, province wide plan, and new Act are all as of 2008. Or: Manitoba has had a new Water Strategy since 2007. It is routine in EIS Guidelines that both the principles and guidelines for Sustainable Development in Manitoba are included.

Manitoba Wildlands advises Manitoba Conservation at this time that the public policy basis for this FSP and EIS is wrong, and requests that Manitoba Conservation pause the review process, and have the public policy requirements updated, so that the proponent can adjust the Plan and EIS.

No Logging in Parks Act
The Economic Viability section above notes that significant funds were provided to Tembec when they agreed to stop logging in Atikaki South, Nopeming, and Whiteshell parks (and any future protected areas.) The so called "No Logging In Parks Act" which is actually corresponding amendments to the Parks Act, and The Forests Act, fails to ban logging in protected areas - under any Act they are
designated under. More seriously the amendments also fail to remove the resource management land use classification for those zones that used to be logged. All of these zones in parks remain in a development zone.

The Plan and EIS fail to include analysis regarding the zones where logging is now prohibited and the effect on its long term forest management plan. The loss of recycled content for newsprint and the corresponding impact on the Plan and EIS is also omitted. Lack of information as to the source of the fiber to replace fiber from zones where logging is now prohibited means we have a significant deficiency in the Guidelines, Plan, and EIS.

Manitoba Wildlands recommends that Manitoba Conservation and Tembec together provide an addendum that reports on how these two significant changes in fiber access in the FML have affected and will affect over the next twenty years, the Plan, and EIS. This analysis and report should include impact on economic viability.

Crown Lands and Existing Designations/Protected Areas
Currently, there are no buffers for forestry activities around protected areas and provincial parks included in this FSP. These include Atikaki Provincial Park, Manigotagan River Provincial Park and Observation Point Wildlife Management Area. Under guidelines, New Forest Management Guidelines for Terrestrial Buffers, the Integrated Resource Management Team needs to direct establishment of buffers around cultural heritage sites and provincial parks. These areas are protected so any disturbance caused by forestry activity must be buffered to protect for instance, habitat for ecologically sensitive species, such as woodland caribou.

We assume that these steps are underway, and will be added to the FSP and EIS, with filing in the public registry. If not this is another deficiency in the EIS.

Table 1.2.1 of the 2009-2010 Operating and Renewal Plan outlines use of both East and West Integrated Wood Supply Area (IWSA) for access to wood quotas. However, there is very little mention of the IWSAs with in the twenty year plan. The IWSA are crown land designations from the 1970s.

Section V. (ii)(a) of the Legal Agreement between the Provence of Manitoba and Tembec (transferred from Pine Falls Paper Company, and then Abitibi-Price) states:
Within the area referred to in Schedule ‘B’ (hereinafter called the ‘Integrated Wood Supply Area or I.W.A. Area’) in order to meet the total wood requirements of the Existing Plant when each requirements are not fulfilled by timber derived from the F.M.L. area, the right to harvest additional timber and a First Right of Refusal (as defined in Schedual ‘C’) respecting all timber suitable for the Existing Plant except those volumes and/or areas which are at present allocated to Third Parties under the quota system within the I.W.S. Area. In the event that a Third Party makes application for timber cutting rights within the I.W.S Area, Manitoba shall advise the Company in writing of the application and the First Right of Refusal is to be exercised in writing by the Company within ten days of Manitoba giving such advice. In the event that a Third party obtains cutting authority within the I.W.S Area it shall, first offer for sale to the
Company the timber harvested by it, and the Company may thereafter exercise its First Right to Refusal in respect of such timber subject to the provisions of this cause.

The Company acknowledges that the First Right to Refusal cannot apply to timber which is surplus to the total requirements of the Existing Plant.

Section V. (ii)(b)

Within the I.W.S. Area the Company shall carry out its cutting operations in the same manner, and subject to the same requirements, as Third Parties operating within the I.W.S. Area.

Section V. (iii)

In allocating timber under Clause V (i)(b), priority shall be given to local communities. In exercising the First Right to Refusal under Clause V (ii)(b), the Company shall give due consideration to the needs of local communities. Notwithstanding, any other provisions contained herein, timber located on the F.M.I. Area and I.W.S. Area be made available to local residents for personal domestic use.

Our review of the Guidelines, Plan, and EIS all clearly show the IWSAs need to be included in the filings by the company. As this has been part of the filings in the past, and there is IWSA content in these filings it is important for Manitoba Conservation to indicate how it will make information about the forestry operations in the two IWSA public.

We have been informed that Manitoba Conservation Forest Branch does the planning for the two IWSAs. Those operational plans, which sound like they are on a five year cycle, need to be accessible when reviewing the long term plan for any company that assumes fibre access to the IWSAs in their filed FSP and EIS, and fiber use projection.

Given the legal responsibilities Tembec holds with regards to both IWSAs, this is essential. The long time lag since there was anything more than a 1 – 3 year plan for this woodlands operation, and the lack of cumulative impact assessment for forestry plans and environmental licences in Manitoba make it all the more important to make IWSA information available. We presume that the Forestry Branch holds the data for past logging for the IWSAs. Given there are no contents in this FSP and EIS regarding the patterns and impacts of past logging Forestry Branch planning, and outcomes for the IWSAs, should be available at this time.

So this means there is a further deficiency in Tembec’s FSP and EIS. We would also assume that information as to Tembec’s quota holder permits in the IWSAs, their renewal dates, pattern in terms of amount of fibre etc would be available. See reminder above as to the requirements of the other forestry companies in the province, when they obtained their long term licences.
Stumpage fees information is not found in 20 year plan. See comments above. Has Manitoba Conservation made specific policy changes? Will quota holders information now be secret, when it has been included in all past long term forest management plans?

We recommend that Manitoba Conservation compare these filings, guidelines etc with what other forestry companies have provided when applying for long term forest management plans. The public interest and the minimum compliance requirements for public information have been decreased or avoided, leaving significant forest management information secret.

First Nations
Section 2.4 of 20 year plan states there are three communities, Sagkeeng, Little Black River, and Hollow Water in FML 01 that have intimated publicly are currently land claim disputes with the Manitoba government. What is the Manitoba government and Manitoba Conservation, as the Crown, doing in this regard, and what are the expected impacts on the long term use of lands in the FML?

It should be noted that land claims disputes as they are termed in these filings are a matter of the federal Crown first. They then become provincial due to the transfer of open crown lands responsibilities to the province. Treaties are with Canada, the federal crown.

We would recommend that the public registry contain the consultation standards being used, and any notification documents etc. These steps would add certainty to the Crown being transparent, including so that any other First Nation potentially affected, or members of those mentioned can access this information. Without these steps First Nations and First Nation individuals access could be blocked. Such steps can be taken without breaching confidential aspects of consultations. Manitoba Conservation’s process for assessing for any potential impact on Aboriginal rights, if undertaken, should be a matter of record also.

We have provided the text in Section 2.4 below. It should be noted that Treaty Land Entitlements are not land claims. It is common knowledge that Sagkeeng First Nation has a current legal undertaking with respect to lands and waters in the FML. A reference to 1978, but not to present specifics is spurious at best. The text below may be required content, if so it needs to be up to date. Otherwise why is it here? And what mitigation for the potential lands selection inside the FML have been identified? Is this another deficiency in the Plan and EIS?

Section 2.4 of 2009-2028 FSP (First Nation and Stakeholder Involvement)

*Treaty Land Entitlements (TLE):* At this time, only one FN in Manitoba has a validated treaty land entitlement claim in ER90. St. Theresa Point FN has selected approximately 2000 acres on the north side of Warrington Lake to fulfill their claim. The lands are within their traditional land use area. At least three other ER90 FN’s (Sagkeeng, Little Black River, and Hollow Water) have intimated publicly that future TLE’s may yet arise within ER90.
Memorandum of Intent: A brief memorandum was signed on 28 October 1986 between Hollow Water FN and Manitoba DNR. The intent agreed to between the parties, subject to their respective positions, is as follows: DNR committed to work with the Hollow Water FN towards cooperative big game management, with the goals of communication, education and conservation. Hollow Water FN committed to work with DNR on cooperative big game conservation in its traditional hunting area, with the objective of securing the sustainability of wildlife resources for its FN members and all Manitobans.

Potential Land Claim: Sagkeeng FN submitted a land claim in 1978 that was not validated by the Federal Government at that time. The current status of the land claim is not known.

Potential Land Claim: Approximately 200 individuals, formerly Northern Affairs residents of Manigotagan, have had their Registered Indian Status re-instated. While formally having been included on the Hollow Water FN Band Registry, that FN cannot support such an expansion of its membership with the increased number of new Registered Indians on its limited land and funding base. As part of a plan to create and implement the Chill-Wee Indian Band as an independent FN, the Band membership has applied to obtain a land base for the Chill-Wee Indian Reserve. The lands would be used as a land base for economic development and as a reserve for the current and future population of the Chill-Wee Indian Band. The current status of the land claim application is not known.

Manitoba Conservation Forest Resource Inventory
Section 4 – 9 of the Tembec twenty year forest management plan states:
Since the last inventory, several new resource management issues have been identified, including woodland caribou, protected areas initiative, parklands re-configuration and rezoning, treaty land entitlement selections and expanded watercourse reserves as well as changing operating standards and practices to name a few. These changes and the pressure they bring to bare on the land base are significant and require careful consideration in determining the forest’s ability to supply the forest industry with the required forest products on a sustainable and environmentally sensitive basis.

Given Manitoba Conservation Forest Resource Inventory (FRI) data for the twenty year plan was collected in 1998, and the twenty year plan itself states that many issues have been brought to light since the last inventory occurred, Manitoba Wildlands suggests Tembec’s 2009-2028 FSP should base harvest projections and twenty year plan/operations on current data which takes these issues into consideration. The lands planning initiative via the WNO, and the World Heritage Site initiative are not included, and both have relevant inside the FML.

Although methodology for creation and monitoring of permanent sampling plots is laid out in the 2009-2028 FSP EIS, there is no mention within either the twenty year plan or EIS of how many permanent sampling plots will be created in FML 01 or how often these plots will be surveyed. There
is also no reference to sample plots standards including types, sizes and frequency of monitoring. This information are key to understanding how FML 01 will be monitored and should be included in the EIS. **Manitoba Wildlands recommends that the Plan and EIS be updated to include information about permanent sample plots, and temporary (if there have been programs where temporary plots were used.)** The requirements for operations in the FML, including new and updated public policy requirements, should include monitoring standards that reflect public policy. An example of such updating would be climate change indicators, being monitored regularly in permanent sample plots.

There are also no references to harvest plan or timeline within the twenty year plan or EIS. Again, this is key information which should be included in a twenty year forest management plan. At the very least an explanation as to how annual operating plans will provide this information – and public access to this information during the long term plan and licence – is needed in these filings. It may be worth reminding Manitoba Conservation staff that Tolko (and its precursor Repap) were required to take this step throughout its long period of annual plans and one year licences.

The lack of a Manitoba planning and assessment standard for forestry operations so that long term sustainable yield can be applied to decisions about forestry operations means Manitoba Conservation needs to use all the tools it has. This would include more rigorous and public review of the annual operating plans – not just open houses. This also would include supporting demonstration projects inside the FML and IWSA to assess the cumulative impacts of forestry operations. This FML has the longest history in the province of logging operations. Therefore it is long overdue that for the company, quota holders, and Manitoba Conservation to initiate monitoring and assessment programs for the next 20 years.

**Annual Allowable Cut and Yield**

Manitoba has no public data in order to compare: annual allowable cut, yield and inventory data, and actual cut (yield). This situation makes it difficult for there to be a clear connection between the Plan and the EIS. Comparison also can be difficult, and faulty.

Essentially the situation is that there is no public: road data, logging data, cumulative assessment, operating plans / assessments or alterations to operating plans, sample plot or monitoring reports, verification of inventory data. Policy continues to return forest lands to the inventory too soon after a fire. **We recommend that the Manitoba government put in place a province wide assessment and public reporting on where logging has taken place.** In combination with information as to where cutting will take place, decision making and the health of our forests would both benefit. This will be used for forest management planning, and environmental impacts assessment.

All calculations as to regeneration would then be based on fact, rather than theoretical calculations. It is time also to identify anywhere in the province where there has been a successful second or multiple cuts, so that analysis can be made as to indicators for and against timelines for regeneration projections.
The tables referenced below are examples of why the information regarding actual cut (which also used to be required in Manitoba long term forest management plans) are essential for any technical/public review. We found these charts to be deficient in comparison to other forestry company products. Table 5.1 of Section 5 (Development Program): Harvest Area History on FML 01 (pg. 9/119) Table 5.2 of Section 5 (Development Program): Harvest Volume History on FML 01 (pg. 10/119) Projected Annual Allowable Cuts: Table 4.1 of Section 4 (Wood Supply Analysis)

Climate Change
While Tembec has included Table 6; Impact Implications on Global Ecological Cycles in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the twenty year forest management plan, Tembec has not included the green house gas (GHG) inventory required through the Guidelines for the Preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement for the Tembec 2009-2028 Forest Stewardship Plan. These numbers must be available for transparency and accountability of the 2009-2028 FSP and EIS.

In order to provide the missing GHG inventory Tembec should be required to provide a carbon inventory for the FML, then a budget for its operations through the 20 year period – which would be housed with its GHG inventory. We would suggest that a no net loss of carbon policy is overdue for our development in our forest regions, whether for a forestry operation or other significant developments.

There are better mechanism and tools to rely on than Canada’s GHG inventory. Between the UN citing Canada for the problems with its inventory and reporting and the obviously dated thresholds required, Manitoba Conservation would assist all its clients by putting standards in place that more closely reflect for instance the Western Climate Initiative emissions thresholds. Manitoba is party to or signatory to more up to date and relevant climate change tools.

Manitoba Wildlands recommends that Manitoba Conservation, Forestry Branch, be directed to updated and put in place for all quote holders, licence holders, and forest based mills in Manitoba expectations for carbon inventory, GHG operations budgets, and emissions reporting that reflect the regulatory and policy direction of the government of a whole.

Manitoba Wildlands recommends that the deficiencies in the Plan and EIS regarding climate change be immediately corrected and filed publicly. This would include the regulatory and public policy omissions being corrected and Tembec responding to these.

In addition, neither the 2009-2028 FSP nor the EIS reference the Manitoba Climate Act or Province of Manitoba Climate Change Action Plan 2008 when reviewing potential impacts regarding climate change. These documents are a vital part of environmental planning in Manitoba and must be considered when conducting long term planning. The deficiencies also include: no information as to emissions per year in relation to the projected fiber access, and road building; lack of mitigation actions, including with regard to regeneration.
Environmental Impact Statement – Other Deficiencies

Guidelines for the Preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement for the Tembec 2009-2028 Forest Stewardship Plan for FML 01 are a guiding document for planning activities for 20 years. Section 3.0 of EIS Guidelines states “The EIS should also show how the policies and/or principles encompassed in the following documents will be addressed”. As commented on above, a number of policy and regulatory matters in the 2009-2028 FSP EIS need to be fulfilled. In our review, we are not able to find:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item to be addressed through Guidelines for the Preparation of EIS for 2009-2028 Tembec FSP</th>
<th>Result of search</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 3.0: Need and justification for the proposal.</td>
<td>Not found in EIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.2.3: States implications and green house gas inventory calculated according to guidelines developed by Environment Canada and the United Nations be included.</td>
<td>Not found in EIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.5: Time frames for impacts of activities should be outlined in the EIA.</td>
<td>Not found in EIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.5: When applicable, worse case scenarios regarding impact be outlined in EIS</td>
<td>Not found in EIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policies and guidelines listed but not addressed in the 2009-2028 FSP EIS:

- Sustainable Development Strategy for Manitoba (1994),
- The Canada Forest Accord
- Manitoba Water Strategy
- Canadian Biodiversity Strategy (DOE, 1995)
- A Wildlife Policy for Canada (CWS, 1990)
- Forest Management Guidelines for Wildlife in Manitoba (MNR, 1989)
- North American Waterfowl Management Plan
- Policy for the Management of Fish Habitat” (DFO, 1991)
- Forest Management Guidelines for Riparian Management Areas” (Manitoba Conservation and Manitoba Water Stewardship, 2008)
- Kyoto and Beyond” (Province of Manitoba Climate Change Action Plan, 2002)
- Manitoba and Climate Change - Investing in our future” (Manitoba Climate Change Task Force, 2001)

It is important that Tembec comply with the Guidelines for the Preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement for the Tembec 2009-2028 Forest Stewardship Plan and include these requests and documents in the long term planning of FML 01. Manitoba Wildlands recommends that Tembec fulfill the requirements of the Guidelines. (Please see earlier content as to the deficiencies in this listing.)
We would note at this time there are various information requests to Manitoba Conservation placed to assist in our review of the Tembec Plan and EIS. While some information requests were answered, several are outstanding.

We have attached here:
Manitoba Wildlands March 2008 comments letter regarding the Draft Guidelines for this EIS. Few of our comments were acted on.

Our office and staff are available to respond to questions or assist in actions to fulfill recommendations in this review comments letter.

Yours truly

Gaile Whelan Enns,
Director
Manitoba Wildlands.
March 15, 2008

Honourable Stan Struthers
Minister of Conservation
Room 330 Legislative Building
450 Broadway
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 0V8

Ms. Tracy Braun
Director, Environmental Assessment and Licensing Branch
Manitoba Conservation
123 Main St Suite 160
Winnipeg MB R3C 1A5
E-Mail: tracey.braun@gov.mb.ca

Dear Minister Struthers, Ms. Braun;

Re: Draft Guidelines for the Preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement for the Tembec 2009-2028 Forest Stewardship Plan – Public Registry File # 4572.00

Manitoba Wildlands is pleased to provide comments on the Draft Guidelines for the Preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement for the Tembec 2009-2028 Forest Stewardship Plan. We are filing these comments based on the approval by branch staff of an extension in the deadline. Please include our comments in the public registry file for Tembec’s proposed Forest Stewardship Plan. Please also note that our comments on the Guidelines are not exhaustive and do not constitute a complete review of the draft EIS Guidelines. The absence of comments on any given section of the draft EIS Guidelines should not be construed as a confirmation of its comprehensiveness.

Context – EIS Guidelines and Overall Environmental Assessment
Our first concern regarding these draft EIS Guidelines and the overall environmental assessment (EA) process relates to the context for Tembec’s forest management activities. Despite its importance in Tembec’s forest management activities, the legal agreement between Tembec and the Province of Manitoba is not referenced in the draft Guidelines. The draft EIS Guidelines should acknowledge that the proposed 2009-2028 FSP is governed by the legal agreement. The proponent should also be required to discuss the inter-relationship between the legal agreement, the EIS Guidelines, the EIS and the proposed FSP.

Tembec’s legal agreement is set to expire at the end of 2008. As part of the discussion and description regarding the status of the legal agreement, the intended steps to be taken prior to the end of 2008 and

Manitoba Wildlands continues the work of WWF Canada and Nature Canada for new Manitoba Protected Areas.
the implications for the proposed 2009-2028 FSP should be included by the proponent as part of the EIS. We would remind the Minister and department staff that information about the legal agreement is public, and has always been available during the stages of public review prior to the issuing of any new forestry license and environmental license in Manitoba.

According to the draft Guidelines, Tembec's proposed FSP and this EA process apply to FML-01 only. However, there are additional areas throughout southern Manitoba from which fibre is harvested for use in the mill (IWSA for example) and lands aside from those within FML-01 are currently referenced in Tembec's legal agreement. These fibre sources are also part of the context for this assessment and licensing process. Some acknowledgement or clarification should be made to indicate that other areas provide fibre for Tembec's mill, despite not being included as part of this EA process. This is essential information given the assumptions about fibre access upon which the FSP will be based.

We have in the past pointed out that the usual and better procedure at the start of such an EA and licensing process under Manitoba Conservation and its predecessor is for a schedule of the steps intended for the Environment Act process to be posted / released as the first step. That has not yet occurred for the Tembec EIS, of an FSP.

Increased Fibre Needs – Elimination of Recycled Content
Manitoba Wildlands assumes that these EIS Guidelines apply to the FMP – the twenty-year plan that Tembec wishes to file – and therefore apply to the public reviews, new EA and new environmental license for the long-term plan.

On that basis, it is essential for the company and Manitoba Conservation to clarify how the 20% potential increased cut due to the company ceasing its recycling program will be included in the EIS Guidelines, the AAC, the FMP, and public reviews. We note that the specifics of the AAC, and statistics as to the actual cut within FML-01 are another example of public information essential to be able to respond to the start of the environmental licensing process for Tembec's long-term forest management plan. As such, AAC information should be posted to the public registry immediately.

The relationship between the EIS Guidelines, the AAC, the assumed cut, and the FMP, and licensing process is unavoidable given the announcement by the company that it will no longer use recycled materials in the mill. While that license is a separate license, the operation of the mill is based on also holding the FMLA with Manitoba, the environmental license to proceed with the FMP held by Tembec, etc. Manitoba Conservation must now make full information available before any further steps are taken with reference to Tembec and FML-01.

Climate Change
EIS Guidelines for Manitoba Environment Act proposals now include climate change considerations. That is to say that both the effect of climate change on the operation or development, AND the contribution to climate (change) / greenhouse gas emissions by the operation, Environment Act
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proposal, or development. To that end, and based on commitments by the Manitoba government to make sure that all renewed or new forestry licenses include climate change as a factor in decision making, the EIS Guidelines for Tembec’s proposed 20-year FMP must include climate change considerations.

The draft EIS Guidelines currently contain a single reference to ‘climate’ — in section 1.1 (Description of the) Biophysical Environment and a reference to ‘global warming’ in section 2. Environmental Impact Assessment. This is simply not acceptable.

At a minimum, the following sections of the draft EIS Guidelines should be amended to include climate change requirements:

- the listing of policies and/or principles to be addressed by the proponent listed in the section ‘Intent and Scope of the Environmental Assessment’ should include climate change policy documents such as the Manitoba Climate Change Task Force report: *Manitoba and Climate Change: Investing in Our Future* (September 2001), and the Manitoba Government Climate Change Action Plan, *Kyoto and Beyond - A Plan of Action to Meet and Exceed Manitoba's Kyoto Targets* (October 2002)

- Section 1.1 Biophysical Environment should indicate not only the inclusion of a description of the “general climate conditions”, but also a description of current climate change impacts. This would better ensure that impacts of climate change on the project and the implications of the project in terms of its contribution to climate change and its GHG emissions are carried through and assessed as part of section 2. Environmental Impact Assessment, section 4. Mitigation, section 5. Residual Impacts and section 6. Monitoring and Research. The current direction in section 2. to, “consider whether other environmental stresses such as global warming, ozone depletion and air borne pollutants may affect the degree of any impacts from forestry activities” is incomplete and lacking in specifics.

**Linear Disturbance**

Although roads (access, construction, management) feature prominently in the draft EIS Guidelines, there is no explicit requirement for analysis of the cumulative (past, present, future) impacts of the proposed forestry operations in terms of linear disturbances within the geographic scope of the initiative (in this case FML-01). This is a significant omission that could be addressed by making an explicit reference to consideration of the cumulative effects of linear disturbances on the landscape within the section, ‘Intent and Scope of the Environmental Assessment’ and in section 1.3 Existing and Past Forest Management Activities. This would ensure that linear disturbance is part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (section 2.), as it states, “The environmental impacts should be related to, and assessed with respect to the Biophysical Environment, Socioeconomic and Land Use Status, and Existing and Past Forest Management Activities”.

Manitoba Wildlands continues the work of WWF Canada and Nature Canada for new Manitoba Protected Areas.
Protected Areas

Recent decisions taken to intersect the enduring features along Lake Winnipeg with additional road building – both to Bloodvein River First Nation, and from Poplar River to Norway House – mean that enduring features assumed to be protected and represented north of FML-01 are no longer adequately represented. The delay in making decisions for permanent protection of the Poplar/Nanowin Rivers Park Reserve also means that representation of these enduring features in the same natural region is not permanent, and must be considered to be at risk. The EIS Guidelines must therefore include protected areas objectives for the region, especially for enduring features located in FMP that are not permanent, or adequately represented in the region.

Elements to be Addressed in the Final EIS Guidelines – Special Places and New Protected Areas

Within the list of information and assessment requirements, there is a detailed description of elements to be described by the proponent as part of the Forest Management Area Description (in this case these draft guidelines have been provided for public comments and pertain to FML-01). These elements are to be carried through the EIS and addressed as part of the sections regarding the Environmental Impact Assessment, the Sustainability Assessment, Mitigation, Residual Impacts, Monitoring and Research, etc. We feel there are some important elements that should be added and included in the final EIS Guidelines.

The boundaries of the proposed World Heritage Site (WHS) located on Manitoba’s east side connect/overlap to a certain extent with the boundaries of FML-01. This is the first time since the WHS was first proposed and supported by the Manitoba government that a forestry licensing process has been initiated. Given the international significance of this boreal forest area, some specific discussion is warranted. The proponent should be directed to specifically describe the WHS and explicitly include it in the overall assessment of the proposed 2009-2028 FSP. The company needs to be clear in a public manner about its assumptions regarding the future World Heritage Site.

The Bloodvein River is a Canadian Heritage River and it flows through FML-01. Special attention is paid to heritage river management and monitoring of Heritage Rivers and there is a priority placed on maintaining the natural, heritage and recreational values of Heritage Rivers. Forestry activities can compromise these values and for this reason, the Bloodvein Heritage River warrants specific reference and detailed discussion and assessment within the EIS. The final EIS Guidelines should include specific requirements to discuss how Tembec will safeguard these values within the riparian and areas adjacent to the Bloodvein Heritage River. The same specifics in the EIS Guidelines are needed for the Manigotagan River Provincial Park. This designation is new since the last EIS, and long term forest plan and FMP from the forest company that owns the mill in Pine Falls. The same specific treatment and details must be included in the EIS for each new protected area within the FML-01.

Draft EIS Listing of Public Policies to be Addressed, Reflected in the FMP
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We commend Manitoba Conservation for its detail in the section of the draft EIS Guidelines that describes ‘Intent and Scope of the Environmental Assessment’, however we feel it could be strengthened and that certain essential policy areas are not adequately reflected in the listing.

Although forestry guidelines regarding (for example) stream crossings and riparian areas are included in the list, there are additional water policies that should be included in this list – such as ‘Manitoba’s Water Strategy’, ‘Manitoba Water Quality Standards, Objectives and Guidelines’ and the CCME’s ‘Canada-Wide Framework for Water Quality Monitoring’ and ‘Water Quality Index’.

The policy document, ‘An Action Plan for Manitoba’s Network of Protected Areas’ contains key definitions and principles related to protected areas in Manitoba and should be added to this list.

Management plans or regulations for any crown land designation inside the FML should be indicated as applicable. The proponent should be required to discuss and address any existing plans or regulations regarding crown lands within the geographic scope of the study area.

Two final general comments on this list of policies and principles – all should be dated to ensure that the proponent addresses the most recent version. Any policies, regulations, documents not available electronically on the Government of Manitoba website should be filed in the public registry file to ensure the public has adequate access.

**The December 2007 Submission Guidelines for Twenty Year Forest Management Plans**

We congratulate Manitoba Conservation for its initiative to update the submission guidelines for forest management plans. As the public was not provided with the opportunity to review and comment on a draft version of this policy document, and as this is the first forestry licensing process to make use of the new guideline, we trust that our comments will be afforded thoughtful and thorough consideration. We would remind the Government of Manitoba that the 1999 Guidelines for Long Term Forest Management Plans were written specifically for Tembec in summer 1999 – in advance of a truncated review process for a forest management plan from Tembec. Tembec’s CEO and legal counsel withdrew their new forest management plan by asking for an extension of the improbable deadline for comments. There has been no filing of a long term plan from the company since then.

Our concerns below could be addressed in the short term through adjustments to the draft EIS Guidelines, and if necessary written response from Tembec. We urge Manitoba Conservation to also convene a formal public review process that would allow for public input with the objective of strengthening and improving the 2007 Submission Guidelines for Twenty Year Forest Management Plans.

**Ecosystem Based Management vs. Ecosystem Management**

Although the language is generally similar in the text description, the fact that one of the guiding
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principles of the 2007 FMP Guidelines (Section 1.1 in both FMP Guidelines) has shifted from being ‘Ecosystem Based Management’ to being ‘Ecosystem Management’ is significant, given that Ecosystem Based Management entails defined management techniques while ‘ecosystem management’ is generic and vague. Ecosystem based management is a primary strategic theme of Canada’s National Forest Strategy and Accord (http://nfsc.forest.ca/strategies-strategy5.html). Further, page 2 of the draft EIS Guidelines in the section entitled ‘Intent and Scope of the Environmental Assessment’ states, “The Environmental Impact Statement for the proposal will: . . . to the extent possible, apply an ecosystem-based approach to forest management at the landscape level, and employ adaptive management strategies” (emphasis added) and the listing of policies and/or principles to be addressed in the EIS refers to the policy document, “Manitoba’s Forest Plan ... Towards Ecosystems Based Management” (emphasis added). It is clear that ecosystem-based management is Manitoba public policy, so it is unclear why the shift in language has occurred in the re-writing of the FMP Guideline. We would request that the 2007 FMP Guideline be amended and the guiding principle of ‘Ecosystem Based Management’ be restored.

In terms of the EIS Guidelines, we request that Manitoba Conservation specifically clarify in the EIS Guidelines the policies and guidelines that are paramount and indicate that the proponent must demonstrate compliance with said policies.

Species
The loss of prescriptive language in the shift from the 1999 to the 2007 FMP Guideline concerning current forest condition and management objectives – specifically in relation to including content regarding species (wildlife species, threatened and endangered species, indicator species) – is worrisome and leaves too much to the discretion of the proponent (please refer to sections 4.3.4 and 4.5.1 of the 1999 FMP Guidelines for examples of language that has been dropped from the 2007 FMP Guideline). This is slightly balanced by the fact that in the new 2007 FMP Guideline the proponent is now required to “Include a discussion on how the FMP is addressing the integration of recovery plans for provincial and federal species at risk that occur within the license area.” However, this does not negate the need for explicit requirements for considerations of species’ habitat and range needs and other impacts resulting from forestry activities to be an integral part of every aspect of the FMP. The forestry company should be required to provide its measures to manage and safeguard any species that is listed.

An explanation as to why Manitoba Conservation Data Centre ranked species appear not to be included in requirements for the forest management plan should be provided by Manitoba Conservation.

Section 4.3.4.3 of the 1999 FMP Guidelines and section 5.7.2 of the 2007 FMP Guidelines reference wildlife habitat. It is disappointing that the 2007 FMP Guidelines no longer refer to proponent requirements to address habitat needs, and instead use weaker language that is also confusing, indicating the proponent will “discuss the relative amount of habitat for a minimum of five selected
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wildlife species and the relative abundance of habitat for the selected species over time”. ‘Discussing’ is not the same as ‘addressing’ and it is unclear as to what is meant by ‘relative abundance of habitat’. The language regarding wildlife habitat from the 1999 FMP Guideline should be restored.

Also 5 species is simply insufficient – even as a stated minimum. We suggest that department staff review previous FMP documents, and the standards regarding species habitat, number of species, and specifics as to the company’s responses so as to improve this section of the EIS Guidelines. A five species minimum is also too conservative given the Model Forest which overlays the FML has extensive information regarding species and their habitat from its technical programs – and Tembec has actively participated in much of this study.

An absence of ecological thinking is appears to be evident in this aspect of the 2007 FMP Guidelines. Species do not live separately. Woodland caribou, as an example, have as many as 80 symbiotic species. The 2007 FMP Guidelines should clearly state that specific species, their habitat, and relationship to other species in that habitat must be included in the FMP. This should also be a stated requirement of the EIS Guidelines.

The new requirement in section 5.6.1 of the 2007 FMP Guidelines to “Include a discussion on how the FMP is addressing the integration of recovery plans for provincial and federal species at risk that occur within the license area” is a welcome addition. However, this requirement could still in theory result in no Manitoba species listed under the Endangered Species Act being designated as indicator species for the purposes of the FMP and the EA (i.e. if the proponent doesn’t include them as indicator species and Manitoba Conservation accepts the proponent’s list). The 2007 FMP Guidelines should contain a clear requirement for indicator species to include species found within the study area that are listed under either Manitoba or federal species at risk legislation and species that require significant habitat areas. There is also an argument to be made here that the proponent’s suggested list of indicator species should also be made publicly available for review and input. Whether either level of government has a recovery plan in place as yet is unacceptable as a basis for decision as to inclusion in the EIS. That opens the door for avoidance of recovery plans in parts of Manitoba where there are forest licenses.

It is also disappointing to see that section 4.5.1 from the 1999 FMP Guideline requiring FMP management objectives to address threatened, endangered species, and indicator species has been omitted from the 2007 FMP Guideline. Overall, the prescriptive language from the 1999 FMP Guidelines concerning management objectives should be reinstated.

The 2007 FMP Guideline could also be strengthened by reviewing the 1999 FMP for additional references to species and wildlife and restoring these references to the 2007 FMP Guidelines. For instance, the section on the Current Forest Condition (4.3.4 in the 1999 FMP Guideline) included “3. Description of the habitat for selected wildlife species” in the list of required information for the discussion of the current condition of the forest. No concurrent reference is found in the 2007 FMP Guideline. Requirements as part of the historic forest description are also now very general in the 2007
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FMP Guideline and the proponent is no longer specifically required to provide “information on biodiversity, forest productivity and wildlife habitat and populations ... with respect to historic trends and range of variability”.

Many of these omissions are in open contradiction to the Forest Management Indicators derived from Canada’s Forest Accord and Forest Strategy, which are endorsed in the draft EIS Guidelines and which the government of Manitoba has signed. We are fairly certain Tembec has the ability to provide these kinds of information.

Finally, the Glossary for the 1999 FMP Guidelines contains definitions for ‘vulnerable species’, ‘threatened species’ and ‘endangered species’; no Glossary items in the 2007 FMP Guideline relate to species. The Glossary should have been expanded and edited as part of the re-writing process; terms related to species should have been carried through and included in the 2007 FMP Guidelines. There are several other terms that should be defined in the Glossary – ecological integrity, ecological services are two such examples of terms that are currently not in the Glossary.

Section 6.0 FMP Amendment (2007 FMP Guideline)

Section 6.0. of the 2007 FMP Guideline regarding the amendment process and triggers for amendment of an FMP is new; there is no corresponding section in the 1999 FMP Guideline. This is a welcome addition, however, we feel this section could be strengthened by a more detailed description of the amendment process. Will all the different FMP EIS Guideline amendment triggers require the same scale and review by Forestry Branch and the Environmental Assessment and Licensing Branch? Will the amendment process be a public process? If not, please explain.

This section is also missing a reference to ‘protected areas’ as part of the list of factors that may result in a significant change to the operating area. Although there is a reference to ‘parks’ in this list, in Manitoba parks are not the only legal designation tool for protected areas (ecological reserves, protected forests, protected wildlife management areas and park reserves are not parks).

Requirements for Current and Historic Descriptions of the Forest

Section 5.4.3 Historical Forest Description (2007 FMP Guidelines) is less complete than its corresponding 1999 FMP Guideline section (4.3.3), and contains fewer details as to requirements concerning past forestry operations and history of human-cased and natural forest processes.

Section 5.4.4 Current Forest Description (2007 FMP Guidelines) is also less complete than its corresponding 1999 FMP Guideline section (4.3.4), omitting 1999 requirements to provide the following information as part of the description of current condition of the forest:

- Description of the habitat for selected wildlife species; and
- Discussion on forest productivity.
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In both instances, the more detailed and requirements of the 1999 FMP Guidelines should be reinstated. The revision of the FMP Guideline should result in more clarity and guidance for the proponent; additional discretion and latitude for proponents is not in the public interest, especially when it concerns safeguarding ecosystem structure and function. This is especially true in relation to a 20-year FMP. In the case of Tembec, the FML concerned is an intensely inhabited, populated, transected, and impacted area.

We trust that our above comments on both the draft EIS Guidelines for Tembec’s proposed 2009-2028 Forest Stewardship Plan and on the December 2007 Submission Guidelines for Twenty Year Forest Management Plans will receive careful consideration. We look forward to information from Manitoba Conservation as to how our comments will be addressed and reflected in the final EIS Guidelines.

Yours truly,

Gaile Whelan Enns
Director, Manitoba Wildlands

cc:
Ms. Elise Dagdick, Environment Officer, Environmental Assessment and Licensing Branch
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This listing includes Government of Manitoba public policy statements, strategies, standards, and discussion papers regarding lands and waters:

- authored or released by government departments and agencies
- endorsed or adopted by the government
- released by a board, committee or body appointed by the government, or where a Ministerial reference or mandate has been issued.
- included in basis for tenure or other decision making

NOTE:

✓ indicates policy that may pre-date present government, where policy has been confirmed as current

✓ indicates document is not available online

†† indicates link leads to HTML text only page

See listing of undated policies at end of this listing.

For a DVD collection of these policy materials or to advise regarding others to add contact info@manitobawildlands.org

Prior to 1999

- ✓ Whiteshell Provincial Natural Park Master Plan, Department of Natural Resources (August 1983) http://www.gov.mb.ca/conservation/parks/management_plans/whiteshell/whiteshell_master_plan.pdf

- ✓ Grass River Provincial Park Management Plan, Parks Branch, Department of Natural Resources (December 1984) http://www.gov.mb.ca/conservation/parks/management_plans/grass_river/grass_river_management_plan.pdf

- ✓ Turtle Mountain Provincial Park Management Plan, Parks Branch, Department of Natural Resources (September 1985) http://www.gov.mb.ca/conservation/parks/management_plans/turtle_mountain/turtle_mountain_management_plan.pdf

• ✔ Forest Management Guidelines for Wildlife in Manitoba, Manitoba Natural Resources (1989)

• ✔ Applying Manitoba’s Water Policies, Manitoba Natural Resources (1989)

• ✔ Sustainable Development Strategy for Manitoba, Manitoba Natural Resources (1994)


• ✔ Applying Manitoba’s Capital Region Policies, Sustainable Development Coordination Unit (March 1996)

• ✔ Planning and Submission Guidelines for Annual Operating Plans, Manitoba Natural Resources (1996)
  http://www.gov.mb.ca/conservation/forestry/forest-practices/pdfs/aop_plan&submit_requirements.pdf

• ✔ Timber Harvesting Practices for Forestry Operations in Manitoba, Manitoba Natural Resources (1996)


• ✔ Manitoba Stream Crossing Guidelines for the Protection of Fish and Fish Habitat, Manitoba Natural Resources (1996)

• ✔ A System Plan for Manitoba’s Provincial Parks, Parks and Natural Areas Branch, Manitoba Conservation (March 1997)

• ✔ Winkler Aquifer Management Plan, Winkler Aquifer Management Plan Round Table (March 1997)

• ✔ Guideline for the Designation of Contaminated Sites in Manitoba, Manitoba Environment (March 1997)

http://www.gov.mb.ca/conservation/annual-reports/soe-reports/soe97/soe97.dir.html


An Action Plan for Manitoba’s Network of Protected Areas 1998-2000, Manitoba Natural Resources

Report of the Consultation On Sustainable Development Implementation (COSDI), June 1999

Ten Year Forest Management Plan Submission Guidelines, Manitoba Natural Resources (August 1999)

First Nation Protected Areas Memorandum of Understanding (FN PA MOU), Manitoba Natural Resources (1998; confirmed Fall 1999)
http://www.gov.mb.ca/conservation/pai/mou_complete1.html


Oak Lake Aquifer Management Plan, Oak Lake Aquifer Management Plan Round Table (March 2000)

Manitoba Minerals Guideline, Manitoba Energy and Mines (March 2000)

• Development of a Nutrient Management Strategy for Surface Waters in Southern Manitoba, Manitoba Conservation (April 2000)  

• An Action Plan for Manitoba's Network of Protected Areas 2000-2003,  
  Manitoba Conservation (Spring 2000)  
  http://www.gov.mb.ca/conservation/pai/actionplan.html

• Woodland Caribou (Rangifer tarandus caribou) Conservation Strategy for Manitoba, Manitoba Conservation (May 2000)  
  http://manitobawildlands.org/web_docs/Woodland_Caribou_Final_Repo.htm

• Implementing Sustainable Development For Future Generations: Manitoba's Sustainable Development Strategy, Manitoba Conservation (June 2000)  

• East Side of Lake Winnipeg All-Weather Road Scoping and Justification Study — Executive Summary, prepared by H.N. Westdal and Associates and Dillon Consulting for Manitoba Highways and Government Services (August 2000)  
  http://www.gov.mb.ca/mit/tspd/completed.html#east


• Drinking Water Advisory Committee Report, Office of the Chief Medical Officer of Health (November 2000)  

• Sustainable Livestock Development in Manitoba — Finding Common Ground,  
  Livestock Stewardship Initiative Panel (December 2000)  

• Manitoba's Sustainable Development Procurement Guidelines, Manitoba Conservation (December 2000)  

2001

• Planning Manitoba's Capital Region: Next Steps, Manitoba Intergovernmental Affairs (January 2001)  

• East Side Lake Winnipeg Broad Area Planning Initiative Phase 1 Preliminary Discussions Draft Report, East Side Planning Initiative Round Table (Spring 2001)

• Manitoba's Provincial Sustainable Development Code of Practice, Manitoba Conservation (July 2001)  
• Manitoba’s Provincial Sustainable Development Financial Management Guidelines, Manitoba Conservation (July 2001)

• Pukatawagan Economic Assessment Study for an All-Weather Road, prepared by H.N. Westdal and Associates and Dillon Consulting for Transportation and Government Services (August 2001)
  http://www.gov.mb.ca/mit/tspd/completed.html#pukatawagan

• Manitoba and Climate Change: Investing in Our Future, Manitoba Climate Change Task Force (September 2001)

• Discussion Paper - Building a Sustainable Future - Proposed Changes to Manitoba’s Environment Act, Manitoba Conservation (?) (September 2001)

• Water: A Proposed Strategic Plan for Manitoba, Manitoba Conservation (October 2001)

• All-Weather Road Servicing Options for Ilford - Public Consultation Study, prepared by Dillon Consulting for Transportation and Government Services (December 2001) http://www.gov.mb.ca/mit/tspd/completed.html#ilford

• All-Weather Road Servicing Options for Pikwitonei - Public Consultation Study, prepared by Dillon Consulting for Transportation and Government Services (December 2001)
  http://www.gov.mb.ca/mit/tspd/completed.html#pikwitonei

• All-Weather Road Servicing Options for Shamattawa - Public Consultation Study, prepared by Dillon Consulting for Transportation and Government Services (December 2001)
  http://www.gov.mb.ca/mit/tspd/completed.html#shamattawa

• All-Weather Road Servicing Options for Thicket Portage - Public Consultation Study, prepared by Dillon Consulting for Transportation and Government Services (December 2001)
  http://www.gov.mb.ca/mit/tspd/completed.html#thicketportage

• All-Weather Road Servicing Options for York Landing - Public Consultation Study, prepared by Dillon Consulting for Transportation and Government Services (December 2001)
  http://www.gov.mb.ca/mit/tspd/completed.html#yorklanding

• East Side Lake Winnipeg Broad Area Planning Initiative Phase 1 Preliminary Discussions “Summary of Comments and Recommendations from Phase 1 Discussions” Draft Report, East Side Planning Initiative (November 6, 2001)

• Provincial Sustainability Indicators – What You Told Us, Manitoba Conservation (2001)
• Forest Renewal Standards, Forestry Branch, Manitoba Conservation (2001)
• Manitoba and Climate Change: A Primer, Manitoba Clean Environment
  Commission and the International Institute for Sustainable Development

2002

• Final Report from the Chair - Environment Act Amendment Core Group, 2002
  Proposed Amendments-Draft, Manitoba Conservation (Feb. 15, 2002)
• Next Steps – Priorities for Sustaining Manitoba’s Forests, Manitoba
  Conservation (March 5, 2002)
• East Side Lake Winnipeg Broad Area Planning Initiative Phase 1 Preliminary
  Discussions Final Report, East Side Planning Initiative Round Table (Spring
• Strengthening Manitoba’s Capital Region: General Principles and Policy
  Directions – A Public Discussion Paper, Regional Planning Advisory
  Committee For Manitoba’s Capital Region, Manitoba Intergovernmental
  Affairs (April 2002)
• Final Report of the Chair - Core Group on the Amendments to the
  Environment Act 2002, Manitoba Conservation - Prepared by RAS Consulting
  (April 13/02)
• Grand Beach Provincial Park Management Plan, Parks and Natural Areas
  branch, Manitoba Conservation (May 2002)
• Kyoto and Beyond: Meeting and Exceeding Our Kyoto Targets, Government
  of Manitoba (June 2002)
• Kyoto and Beyond: A plan of action to meet and exceed Manitoba's Kyoto
  targets, Manitoba Department of Energy, Science and Technology (October
• Manitoba Water Quality Standards, Objectives and Guidelines - Final Draft -
  For Additional Review and Comment, Manitoba Conservation (November 22,
  2002)
• Ethanol Panel Advisory Report – Ethanol: Made in Manitoba, Manitoba
  Department of Energy, Science and Technology (December 2002)


2003


2004


2005


• MOU Between Ducks Unlimited Canada and the Province of Manitoba for the Conservation of Biological Diversity and the Protection of Natural Ecosystems (December 2005)

• Declaration of the Federated States and Regional Governments on Climate Change, Climate Leaders Summit (Government of Manitoba signatory) (December 2005)

• Provincial Land Use Policies Regulation Amendment, Manitoba Intergovernmental Affairs (2005)

• Manitoba’s Conservation and Recovery Strategy for Boreal Woodland Caribou (2005)

2006


• Green and Growing – Building a Green and Prosperous Future for Manitoba Families, Manitoba Energy, Science and Technology (January 2006)

• Recommendations for Regulating Phosphorus from Livestock Operations in Manitoba (January 2006)

• Issues and Options Arising from Initial Consultations on Water Quality Management Zones for Nutrients (February 2006)


• General Overview of Wind Power Development in Manitoba, Manitoba Energy, Science and Technology (November 2006)


**2007**


• Energy Security and Climate Stewardship Platform for the Midwest (November 2007) http://www.wisgov.state.wi.us/docview.asp?docid=12495


2008


• Atikaki Provincial Park and Bloodvein Canadian Heritage River Management Plan, Parks Branch, Manitoba Conservation (April 2008)

• Seine River Integrated Watershed Management Plan Final Draft, Seine-Rat River Conservation District (April 2008)
  http://www.srrcd.ca/specialprojects/documents/Sections1to4April1.pdf and
  http://www.srrcd.ca/specialprojects/documents/Section5toEndApril1.pdf

• Licensing / Permitting Requirements for Outfitters, Manitoba Conservation (June 2008)

• Conservation Districts Program Framework for the Future Discussion Document – What You Told Us (DRAFT), Manitoba Water Stewardship (June 2008)

  http://www.gov.mb.ca/agriculture/soilwater/ecological/pdf/egis01s01.pdf

• Protecting Manitoba’s Outstanding Landscapes: Manitoba’s Protect (sic) Areas Initiative, Manitoba Conservation (2008)

• Manitoba Protected Areas Initiative Update 2008, Manitoba Conservation (2008)

• Beyond Kyoto: Manitoba’s Green Future, Government of Manitoba (2008)
  http://www.gov.mb.ca/beyond_kyoto/index.html
    o Top 10 Actions You Can Take
    o Executive Summary: Meeting Our Commitments -- Reducing Emissions in Manitoba and Beyond
    o Overview: What Climate Change Means to Manitoba
    o Energy: Expanding Clean Energy and Energy Efficiency -- Manitoba Helping the World
    o Transportation: Greening Our Transportation Sector
- Agriculture: Climate Friendly Farms
- Municipalities: Creating Sustainable Cities and Communities
- Business Opportunities: Low-Carbon Profits
- Government: Greening Our Operations
- Adapting To Climate Change: Preparing for the Future
- What You Can Do
- Glossary


2009

- Information Bulletin – Environmental Assessment and Licensing under The Environment Act, Environmental Assessment and Licensing Branch, Manitoba Conservation (January 2009)
- Environmental Assessment and Licensing Process, Environmental Assessment and Licensing Branch, Manitoba Conservation (January 2009)
• Provincial Land Use Policies Rationale and Highlights: For Consultation Purposes, Manitoba Intergovernmental Affairs (March 2009)

• Provincial Land Use Policies Draft For Consultation, Manitoba Intergovernmental Affairs (March 2009)

• Provincial Land Use Policies – What You Told Us Workshop Feedback, Manitoba Intergovernmental Affairs (April/May 2009)

• Provincial Land Use Policies – What You Told Us Stakeholder and Written Feedback, Manitoba Intergovernmental Affairs (April/May 2009)

• Stumpage Based Auction – Information Sheet, Forestry Branch, Manitoba Conservation (April 2009)


• Conservation Districts Program Framework for the Future, Conservation District Framework Committee (May 2009)

• La Salle River Watershed Draft Plan, La Salle Redboine Conservation District (May 2009)

No Date

• ✔ Manitoba’s Forest Plan...Towards Ecosystems Based Management – Report to Manitoba Natural Resources 1995, Manitoba Natural Resources

• ✔ Structure and Mandate of Proposed Working Groups – Round Table & First Nations Council, East Side Planning Initiative Work Guide

• ✔ Forest Renewal Standards, Forestry Branch, Manitoba Conservation
  (see also http://www.gov.mb.ca/conservation/forestry/forest-renewal/fr2-standards.html#sfgc)


• ✔ Manitoba’s Water Protection Handbook, Manitoba Water Stewardship

• ✔ Integrated Watershed Management Planning (IWMP) Brochure, Manitoba Water Stewardship

• ✔ Manitoba Wind Farm Q & A, Manitoba Energy, Science, Technology and Mines

• ✔ Manitoba’s Ethanol Program, Manitoba Energy, Science, Technology and Mines

• ✔ Manitoba Permitting and Regulations - Wind Farm Development, Manitoba Energy, Science, Technology and Mines

• ✔ Crown Land Policy and Wind Farms, Manitoba Energy, Science, Technology and Mines

• ✔ Manitoba Wind Farm Development Process, Manitoba Energy, Science, Technology and Mines

• ✔ Manitoba’s Protected Areas Initiative – Mining Sector Consultation Process, Manitoba Energy, Science, Technology and Mines
  http://www.gov.mb.ca/stem/mrd/geo/exp-sup/min-pai.html

• ✔ Procedures for Crown Consultation with Aboriginal Communities on Mine Development Projects, Mineral Resources Division, Manitoba Science, Technology, Energy and Mines

• ✔ Procedures for Crown Consultation with Aboriginal Communities on Mineral Exploration, Mineral Resources Division, Manitoba Science, Technology, Energy and Mines

• ✔ Land Use Planning Guide - A Guideline for [First Nation] Councils to prepare Community Development By-law and Community Zoning By-law, Manitoba Aboriginal and Northern Affairs


For additional policy documents and studies (many of which pre-date 1999), please visit the following websites:


Manitoba’s Clean Environment Commission website (http://www.cecm.anitoba.ca/index.cfm?pageID=9) also contains reports to government on environmental decisions.