

**From:** +WPG530 - Drinking Water - Environmental (CC)

**Sent:** May-12-21 4:05 PM

**To:** Porteous, Marianne (ARD)

**Subject:** RE: Request for review/comment - Louisiana Pacific 20 year Forest Management Plan and EIS - Due Friday, July 9th, 2021

No concerns.

Office of Drinking Water (ODW)

**Cory Vitt, CMMA M.Eng. P.Eng.**

Approvals Engineer

Office of Drinking Water

Department of Conservation and Climate

**From:** Armstrong, Mike (ARD)

**Sent:** May-14-21 10:09 AM

**To:** Porteous, Marianne (ARD)

**Subject:** RE: Request for review/comment - Louisiana Pacific 20 year Forest Management Plan and EIS - Due Friday, July 9th, 2021

No comments from a Crown land Management perspective. Would defer to Forestry Branch and Wildlife Branch comments.

**From:** +WPG969 - MIT Environmental Services Section (MI)

**Sent:** July-12-21 9:21 AM

**To:** Porteous, Marianne (ARD)

**Subject:** RE: Request for review/comment - Louisiana Pacific 20 year Forest Management Plan and EIS - Due Friday, July 9th, 2021

Good morning,

Please see the following comments from:

#### **MI Western Regional Operations**

The Region has reviewed the proposed Forest Management Plan, in relation to the Environment Act Licence, for Louisiana Pacific and have the following comments.

Louisiana Pacific would be required to obtain a permit from Manitoba Infrastructure for all proposed accesses off of a Provincial Road or Provincial Trunk Highway. For permit information, please contact Sheena Del Rosario [REDACTED]. Permit information and permit application forms can also be found at <https://www.gov.mb.ca/mit/hpd/permits.html>.

The Region asks the applicant, that if tree removal is required adjacent to the highway right-of-way, that a buffer of trees the width of the controlled area be left in place to obstruct the view from the work area, keep wildlife from view and reduce the distraction to the travelling public.

Please note the following statutory requirement for all PR and PTH's in the area.

#### **Statutory Requirements:**

Under the Transportation Infrastructure Act, a permit is required from Manitoba Infrastructure to construct, modify, relocate, remove or intensify the use of an access. A permit is also required from Manitoba Infrastructure to construct, modify or relocate a structure or sign, or to change or intensify the use of an existing structure (including the alteration of existing buildings) within the **38.1m** (125.0 ft) controlled area from the edge of the highway right-of-way. Along PTH 10 the controlled area is **76.2m** (250 ft).

In addition, a permit is required from the Manitoba Infrastructure for any planting placed within **15 m** (50 ft) from the edge of the right-of-way of this highway.

If you have any questions please call:

Cheri Percival  
Regional Planning Technologist  
West Central Region - Dauphin  
Manitoba Infrastructure  
[REDACTED]

#### **MI Roadside Development Section**

Please note that we do not have any records of permits for trail/road crossing and access onto PTH 10. We recommend that the proponent work with Manitoba Infrastructure to legalize all trail/road (including seasonal and all year) connections onto PTH 10.

**From:** Kelly, Jason (CC)  
**Sent:** July-07-21 3:07 PM  
**To:** Porteous, Marianne (ARD); Dagdick, Elise (CC)

**Subject:** FW: Request for review/comment - Louisiana Pacific 20 year Forest Management Plan and EIS  
- Due Friday, July 9th, 2021

Hi Marianne and Elise

Manitoba Parks has reviewed LP Canada Ltd.'s 20-year Forest Management Plan and Environmental Effects Assessment. Comments for Chapter 3 area attached. More general comments are as follows:

- The plan needs to be updated to use the appropriate language regarding land use categories and not zones.
- There are numerous table cross references that don't line up.
- Clearly state that operations are prohibited in the protected land use categories and ecological reserves
- In Chapter 8 there should be reference to how operations plan to mitigate impacts to the protected land use categories and ecological reserves from harvest and Silviculture activities as well as identify any impacts to park users and how they will be mitigated. Users are not limited to the campgrounds.

Please let me know if you have any questions – I am happy to discuss.  
Thank-you,

Jason Kelly  
Ecological Reserves and Protected Areas Specialist  
Conservation and Climate  
Government of Manitoba  
Manitoba Parks

[Manitoba Parks Comments and Track Changes in PDF Chapter 3:]

P2 Are the FMU boundaries in green? And do those boundaries overlap with FML 3? If possible, please clarify the boundaries. Are the red/orange lines roads?
P175 I believe the area is in the Metis Harvest Zone. Needs to be confirmed and if so referenced.
P175 This really needs more information. How can we be sure of any Impacts to Indigenous Rights or cultural values in the Provincial Park?
P178 Table 3.41?
P178 Could not cross reference the park and protected area numbers for FMU 10 or 11. Which parks/protected areas fall in FMU 10 and 11?
<p>P178 This whole table is confusing.</p> <p>Parts of Duck Mountain Provincial Park are protected area based on the land use category. The table is confusing as it treats provincial parks and protected areas as separate. Could change headers to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Provincial Park Area (unprotected LUCs)</li><li>• Provincial Park Area (protected LUCs)</li></ul> <p>Ecological Reserves are missing.</p>

It needs to be clearly stated whether provincial parks are being double counted as part of the provincial forest layer.

P178 Land Use Categories is the accurate and legal term - not "classes" or "zones" (p. 195). Document needs to be consistent with the park management plan and legislation.

P178 According to the Park Management Plan, RD is 8,750 ha.

P178 These objectives should be stated. It leaves the reader questioning.

P179 3.81?

P185 The figure numbers do not match for the remainder of the document.

P195 update using latest information. The park recently changed the LUC in the Line Lake area and LP was part of those discussions. Also remove language on "zones" and use the appropriate LUC.

P195 Replace with the appropriate land use categories. These are legal definitions and classifications within the park system and should be used.

P195 ~~The~~ Kettle Stones Provincial Park [Strikethrough text]

P196 ~~The~~ Springwater Provincial Park [Strikethrough text]

P196 ~~The~~ Swan River Provincial Park [Strikethrough text]

P196 ~~The~~ Cowan Bog Ecological Reserve [Strikethrough text]

**From:** Harms, Jenny (CC)

**Sent:** June-30-21 10:29 AM

**To:** Porteous, Marianne (ARD) ; Dagdick, Elise (CC)

**Cc:** Kelly, Jason (CC)

**Subject:** RE: Request for review/comment - Louisiana Pacific 20 year Forest Management Plan and EIS - Due Friday, July 9th, 2021

Hi Marianne and Elise,

I have reviewed LP Canada Ltd.'s 20-year Forest Management Plan and Environmental Effects Assessment on behalf of Protected Areas Initiative (PAI) in Legislation, Policy and Coordination Branch, and have the following chapter-specific comments followed by general plan comments to provide.:

**Specific comments** on chapters listed either below, or tracked in attached chapters/ parts of chapters:

- Ch 1 – see comments in attached
- Ch2 Pt1 – see comment p. 14 in attached
- Ch 3 Pt 1 – see comments in attached
- Ch 3 Pt 2 - Recommend the numbers assigned to figures and those referenced in brackets in text be double-checked throughout document. They do not all match up, for example - Figures 3.19-3.21
- Ch 3 Pt 6 – see comments in attached. Note that this chapter includes 3 comments previously shared by Parks Branch which I've attributed to Jason Kelly.
- Ch 4 – see comment on S4.6.2 Stakeholders Values Survey p. 63 - see comments in attached
- Ch 8 - see comments in attached. Marianne, could you please clarify what the intent of the concordance table is in Section 8.10? My comments were all regarding that table, and I think I might be missing something on its intended use.

I have no comments to provide on following chapters/parts of chapters: Ch 2 pts 2 & 3; Ch 5; Ch 6; Ch 7

**General Comments-** Recommend that the LP 20 year Plan:

1. Reference Manitoba's network of protected and conserved areas (previously known as the network of protected areas), and include definitions of the types of sites included in the network - protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs). The Plan references protected areas in multiple chapters, but they are not identified at any point in the Plan or in the appendices. In chapter 3, section 3.1 the first paragraph requires a description of protected areas be included in the plan.

The Branch recommends adding OECMs to the plan, because they may be identified within the FMLA over the course of the 20-year plan. More information on OECMs is available in the appendices in Canada's One With Nature report, available on the Conservation 2020 website: <https://www.conservation2020canada.ca/resources>. PAI staff can assist with wording if required.

Official protected area and OECM definitions - FYI:

A protected area is a clearly defined geographical space, recognized, dedicated and managed, through legal or other effective means, to achieve the long-term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values. Indigenous rights are respected in protected areas which generally remain available for hunting, trapping, fishing, and other traditional practices.

Protected areas in Manitoba include land, freshwater, or marine areas where logging, mining, hydroelectric development, oil and gas development, exploring for and harvesting peat, and other activities that significantly and adversely affect habitat are legally prohibited.

An other effective area-based conservation measure, or OECM is a geographically defined area other than a protected area, which is governed and managed in ways that achieve positive and

sustained long-term outcomes for the in situ conservation of biodiversity, with associated ecosystem functions and services and where applicable, cultural, spiritual, socio-economic, and other locally relevant values. While protected areas have biodiversity conservation as a primary objective, OECMs result in biodiversity conservation regardless of the reason for its existence.

2. Clearly state that LP cannot operate in protected areas/OECMs as part of license.
3. Include a map of protected and conserved areas in the FMLA in the Plan. Please contact Jenny Harms at \_\_\_\_\_ for the latest protected and conserved areas dataset.
4. Chapter 3 comments (note additional comments are tracked in the Chapter 3 pts 1 & 6 pdfs):

Section 3.1.3.2 Enduring Features Description:

- Much of the information in this section appears to come from an older version of the Conservation and Climate Protected Areas Initiative website. Please reference the website in the list of citations for this chapter.
- This section describes enduring features, but does not relate them to the protected and conserved areas network as required by the Draft Guidelines. The Branch has recommended wording in the PDF to help clarify. Consider referencing the final location of the protected and conserved areas definitions/requirements in this section as well.

Section 3.3.3 Crown and Private Lands

- Table 3.4.1 is confusing as presented. Please note that the Crown lands are not listed by major category, but by legal designation under various provincial Acts. Recommend language be changed to reflect that.
- Also, consider including the complete area for each designation type (provincial forest, provincial park, community pastures, wildlife management areas) and the undesignated Crown lands which is shown as Ag Crown area in the table. Please see recommended language in the attached chapter document.

Jenny Harms

Protected Areas Specialist/*Spécialiste des zones protégées*

Policy Analyst/*Analyste des politiques*

Legislation, Policy and Coordination/*Législation, politique et coordination*

Conservation & Climate/*Conservation et Climat*

[Protected Areas Initiative Comments and Track Changes in PDF Chapters:]

1.3.2. "in some cases to address values that are like those held for protected areas."	This statement is inconsistent with international guidance on protected areas provided by the IUCN, and pan-Canadian guidance on protected areas. Please remove the phrase: ". . . in some cases to address values that are like those held for protected areas". This statement is inconsistent with international guidance on protected areas provided by the IUCN, and pan-Canadian guidance on protected areas. If there is a desire to include an additional phrase, could change it as follows: "in some cases to address values that are like those held for <b>conservation</b> areas."
1.3.3 "It will also forestry related risks from climate variability and extreme events."	It appears a word is missing here.

2.3.1. “• cultural features or other protected areas”	Please note: if this is referencing protected areas included in Manitoba's protected and conserved areas network, consider putting it into it's own line. There are specific international standards that must be met for a site to be reported as a protected area. Cultural features may not necessarily meet the standards. Please note this same line is also in FMP Ch6 APP4 Forest Roads and Management Structures SOG (p.6). Because protected areas are not defined anywhere in the plan, the intent of this wording is unclear. Recommend adding definition and clarifying information.
3.1.3.2. “• Baldy Mountain – highest elevation in Manitoba”	Please note that Baldy Mountain does not technically stand out as a significant enduring feature within the ecoregion. It looks like it has been selected as significant because of its elevation - which could make it a significant landform. Consider rewriting this as a paragraph noting the first two as significant enduring features, and also noting Baldy Mtn as highest elevation in MB.
3.1.3.2. “The Protected Areas Initiative routinely conducted a gap analysis to evaluate representation with regards to protected areas planning on a regional basis. The representation map of Manitoba's enduring features gives an indication of where Manitoba's enduring features are adequately, moderately, partially, and not represented.”	Consider rewording this paragraph for clarify: "The Protected Areas Initiative routinely conducted a gap analysis to evaluate representation of <i>biodiversity in Manitoba's network of protected and conserved areas</i> , and with regard to protected areas planning on an <i>ecoregional</i> basis."
3.1.3.2. “Although there is still work to be done before the network of protected areas within Manitoba is complete, the Protected Areas Initiative has made significant progress towards the goal of representing the biodiversity across Manitoba.”	It is neither appropriate nor a requirement for the Plan to note what the past priority of government is for protected areas. Delete this paragraph.
3.1.3.2. “Note that the Duck Mountain Provincial Forest and Duck Mountain Provincial Park receive Parks Branch highest rating ‘Adequately Captured’, similar to Riding Mountain National Park. The portion of FML #3 outside the Duck Mountain is ranked as ‘Partially Captured’, ‘Not Captured’, and ‘Moderately Captured’.”	Assessing representation is not about "highest rating", but whether biodiversity is assessed as adequately represented in the network. Also note that the criteria for assessing representation may change in future, based on emerging science. Recommend simplifying this paragraph to something like this: Note that Duck Mountain Provincial Forest and Duck Mountain Provincial Park are adequately represented in the network of protected and conserved areas, while portions of FML #3 outside the Duck Mountain are moderately or partially represented, or not captured in the network.
Figure 3.79	Recommend confirming the appropriate naming convention for First Nations Lands included in Figure 3.79. Unclear whether "First Nation Pending" or "TLE-acquired Lands" areas should be included in public mapping. Also, if the process for TLE-acquired lands listed here has been completed, would they now be First Nations lands?
3.3.3. “3.3.3. Crown and Private Lands”	Consider changing this heading to reflect wording in the table - "Crown, Private, and First Nation Lands".

3.3.3	Recommend using same convention for "Crown" lands throughout document. Capitalize 'C'.
3.3.3. "FMUs 10 and 11 have a combination of Crown and private lands, with FMU 10 being primarily private land (Table 3.39). FMU 13 contains both the Duck Mountain Provincial Forest and Duck Mountain Provincial Park, and is all Crown land."	Table 3.40?
3.3.3. "The Crown lands in FMUs 10 and 11 have many different categories. Table 3.40 summarizes of the major categories in FMU's 10 and 11".	Table 3.41?
Table 3.41	Please note the areas reported in this table are not for major categories, but for undesignated Crown lands and for Crown lands legally designated under various provincial Acts. Consider renaming table as "Crown Land Designations", or something that recognizes the binding nature of management for these areas. The heading for "Ag Crown Area" column could be changed to "Undesignated Crown Land" or a note could be added explaining what Ag Crown Area is.
Table 3.41 "***Kettle Stones area is classified by the Province as both park and protected area"	<p>This triple-asterisk point is not included in any of the columns in the header row of either of the tables (3.40 or 3.41). Consider deleting as per Parks and Protected Spaces Branch comments.</p> <p>Consider including all protected area hectares in the protected areas column for each FMU. The asterisk could read something like: "Protected areas in the FMLA include ecological reserves, parts or all of some provincial parks and wildlife management areas, and some conservation trust owned lands. This area is also shown in the provincial park and WMA columns o the table."</p> <p>Conversely, the provincial parks and wildlife management area columns could say unprotected parts of provincial parks and wildlife management areas. This would eliminate the need for the Alonsa/Cayer and Kettle Stones notes.</p>
3.3.3. "In Agro-Manitoba, Crown lands have been assigned operational land use codes intended to guide the type(s) of land use and development allowed on a given parcel of Crown land."	<p>Consider rewording:</p> <p>"In Agro-Manitoba, Crown lands have been assigned operational land use codes intended to guide the type(s) of land use and development allowed on a given parcel of <i>undesignated</i> Crown land."</p>
4.6.2. "Recreation opportunities in unharvested areas can be provided by leave areas, buffers, mature and old forest purposefully left unharvested, as well as reserves set aside such as parks and protected areas."	Note: parks and protected areas are not 'reserves' or 'set asides'. Recommend alternative wording such as: ". . . left unharvested, and areas designated for other purposes including provincial parks, protected areas, and other designated Crown lands."



**Louisiana-Pacific Forest Management Plan for FML 3**  
**Comments from the Wildlife Component of the Wildlife, Fisheries and Resource Enforcement**  
**Branch**  
**July 2021**

**Summary of Comments**

- More details are required for existing bird monitoring programs within the FML that have been conducted by or supported by LP.
- More details are required for the bird indicator species assessments used in the scenario planning and rankings, and carried forward into the five-year reports.
- Additional details are still required in all sections addressing moose winter and summer habitat. Summer habitat assessments should also be included in both the scenario ranking and five-year report sections.
- Commitments to data collection and analyses are still required. All monitoring sections should contain triggers for adaptation, and details on what actions may be taken to reverse any negative projections (if/where possible).
  - o No details or commitments are made by LP regarding how moose and elk data will be collected, obtained, and provided to the consultant for the proposed RSPF project. Nor are there timelines on when during the life of this plan it will be conducted and incorporated into future assessments and reports.
  - o The plan should commit to collecting additional bird species at risk information to develop probability of occupancy models for inclusion in future assessments and reports.
  - o Road decommissioning should not only be tracked, but monitored to ensure that decommissioning is successful. If closures are not successful, then methods should be improved moving forward.

**Section Specific Comments**

**Chapter 3**

**3.1.10 Wildlife**

The Branch previously requested that a summary of Louisiana-Pacific's long-term bird monitoring program and the Ducks Unlimited Pasquia Project be included in the Ecological and Biophysical Section. This data should have been analyzed and summarized for inclusion into the Forest Management Plan to support the original program objectives and guide future operations. Statements like the following indicate the importance of this information to forest management planning: **"3.1.10.6 - We look forward to the completion of the analysis of the survey data to address knowledge gaps related to waterbirds and their habitat in the Duck Mountain, that will enable LP to assess the effectiveness of current forest management strategies related to wetlands and waterbird habitat, and ensure continued availability of wetland habitat into the future"**. We recognize that some bird data was used to model habitat for the 17 bird indicator species, however no other analysis or summary of these programs is provided.

**3.1.10.9 Golden-winged Warbler**

We appreciate that descriptions of golden-winged warbler and other focal bird species at risk were added to the document, but this section still fails to recognize that critical habitat has been defined for this species under the federal Species at Risk Act, including critical habitat squares located within FML 3. It should also mention that best management practices have also been published to assist forestry

and other industry in order to protect, maintain, and create habitat for this species. This information was previously shared with Louisiana-Pacific.

## **Chapter 5**

### **5.6.4.2 Indicator Bird Species**

#### **Table 5.10**

**&**

### **5.7.4.2 Indicator Bird Species**

#### **Table 5.13**

The Branch previously requested that details be provided on what triggers a “positive”, “negative”, “slightly positive”, etc. classification. The coefficients and p-values or other statistic used to infer significant change should be provided with the classification in these columns. We appreciate that some descriptions of what qualifies as change has been added, and modeling outputs for individual variables has been pasted into the appendices, but this still does not provide a complete summary, and explain what thresholds exist between certain classifications, e.g. between neutral, slightly positive, and positive.

A column summarizing the area (hectare or % of landscape) lost or gained within each “Probability of Habitat Occupancy” category would also be useful, similar to what is provided for moose and marten.

The Branch also pointed out the following discrepancies and requested that further explanation be provided on why negative change should be considered acceptable, which does not appear to have been added to either of these sections or section 5.8.

#### **Previous comments:**

Some of the bird maps in the appendix, and specifically the Probability of Habitat Occupancy graphs at the base of each page, differ from some of “Estimated Response” listed in the tables. A few examples where the graph and the information summarised in Tables 5.10 & 5.13 (and in the combined 5.18) do not appear to match include:

#### **Common Yellowthroat (surrogate for Olive-sided Flycatcher)**

The tables indicate that the Estimated Response for this species is slightly positive for No Harvest and Moose Emphasis and neutral for Baseline scenarios. The maps, and the accompanying graph summarising the Probability of Habitat Occupancy indicate that the Moose Emphasis and Baseline scenarios will have similar impacts on this species.

#### **Black-capped Chickadee**

The tables indicate that No Harvest and Moose Emphasis scenarios are slightly positive and Baseline is neutral. The Probability of Habitat Occupancy graphs suggest that the Baseline scenario has higher levels of high quality habitat (51-75% and 76-100% occurrence) after 40 years than the other two scenarios.

#### **Blue-headed Vireo**

There was an observation in the Blue-headed Vireo account summary in the Manitoba Breeding Bird Atlas that this species is seldom detected near roads. Although the overall estimated response for this species is “negative”, the reduction in roads the selected model could be used to temper the negative decline in habitat, if roads were not included in the probability of occupancy assessment (see comments about explaining negative change below).

#### **Brown-headed Cowbird**

Moose Emphasis and Baseline scenarios are very similar at the higher levels of habitat occupancy (>25%), only differing at no habitat and lower probability (<25%), yet Moose Emphasis is neutral and Baseline is positive.

#### Red-eyed Vireo

The values in the Probability of Occurrence graphs for all the scenarios appear very similar, yet the estimated response in No Harvest and Moose Emphasis scenarios are slightly positive and the Baseline is neutral.

#### Golden-winged Warbler (surrogate by American Redstart and Veery)

All scenarios are neutral or positive for AMRE and VEER, however true positive management to benefit GWWA would be at the operations level rather than the plan level.

There will always be concern with negative change (depending on if significant or not, as questioned above). **This report should contain an assessment of the change, and rational as to why negative change and loss of that habitat niche is acceptable (e.g. correcting to NRV, the particular habitat niche is common, covering large areas in the Ducks compared to other ecosystems).** Both harvest scenarios will have a negative impact on species associated with old growth stands (e.g. Blue-headed Vireo, Winter Wren, Boreal Chickadee, etc). Many of these species are sensitive to forest fragmentation, and in general, long-term Breeding Bird Survey trends for these species appear to be stable or positive. Despite the negative response, it is beneficial to retain some tracts of old growth forest as breeding refugia for these species, so statistics on these habitat components could be provided in the section (e.g. assurance that the FMP is not eliminating all “old” stands from FML).

#### **5.6.4.3 Winter Moose Habitat**

##### **Figure 5.33**

**&**

#### **5.7.4.3 Winter Moose Habitat**

##### **Figure 5.46**

Why were the values of 0.0 – 0.2 added back into the winter moose habitat histogram, which now negates the ability to observe change in the 0.7- 0.9 range? The Branch previously agreed with them not being shown on the original histogram due to such high areas values of 0.0 - 0.2 overwhelming the graph.

We previously requested that text or a table be added to show the area (ha) decrease in low quality habitat values to compliment the apparent conversion or increase in higher quality values that is shown across the board in the histogram. This need is further emphasized if the higher quality values can not be observed or measured in the new histograms. A similar table has been added to the monitoring chapter, but should be added to these chapters as well, with area projection of the 40 year period (opposed to only year 20 needed for the 5-year reports).

#### **5.6.6.4 Summer Moose Habitat**

#### **5.7.6.4 Summer Moose Habitat**

Similar to winter moose habitat, a table showing the hectare change within each category over time would be useful, and should be incorporated in to section 5.8 when making comparisons between the two scenarios.

#### **5.8.3 Objective Comparison by Scenario**

As previously mentioned, this section does not include a comparison for summer moose habitat. This should be included.

## **Chapter 7**

The Branch still believes that commitments to data collection and analysis are still required prior to final approval of the FMP. We recognize that a detailed moose and elk habitat modelling approach is added in the appendices, however this is only a proposal from a consultant to Louisiana-Pacific and the Province of Manitoba. No details and commitments are made regarding how data will be collected, obtained, and provided to the consultant for analysis, nor are there timelines on when during the life of this plan it will be conducted, and during which 5-year period the model will be compared to harvest and incorporated into future reports.

We reiterate that much of what is proposed for monitoring is just re-running habitat projections with updated forest harvest information. This is an important first step, however the plan still needs to acknowledge that these are projections, and the monitoring program should make an attempt to validate them. e.g.) The FMP projects that summer moose habitat will increase based on the HSM, but there is no proposed monitoring that addresses 1) the projected “ideal moose habitat” is actually being created, 2) if moose are actually using the ideal habitat, and 3) if they aren’t using the ideal habitat, then why not, and does the model need to be adapted? What are the triggers for adaptation, and what actions will be taken to reverse any negative projections (where possible)?

### **7.2.7 Road Decommissioning**

**The standards for road decommissioning data collection use either aerial imagery or ground-based GPS data collection. Road decommissioning will be reported annually when completed.**

The Branch originally requested more details on the monitoring process. The effectiveness of road decommissioning should be monitored as part of this plan. We suggest that Louisiana-Pacific assess the continued use of closed roads at the end of September each year for a period of 5 years to judge the effectiveness of road closure and decommissioning methods. If current methods are not working, then they should be adapted.

### **7.3 Five-year Report FMP Monitoring**

We reiterate that overall, the wildlife components in this section do not explain what data will be analyzed and reported. Will all focal wildlife species habitat be remodeled with the actual 5-year harvest and compared against what is projected now (which as has been noted throughout the process, could be only ~50%)? It should also contain details on how this will be conducted.

#### **7.3.3 Bird Species at Risk**

#### **7.3.4 Indicator Bird Species**

Both bird sections only explain that the models will be updated if additional information becomes available. It is acknowledged that this may happen following continued species at risk surveys, however there is no indication that the long-term bird monitoring program which collected data for the indicator species models will be continued into the future. Both sections fail to explain how bird habitat assessments and scenario projections will be assessed, validated or re-projected in the 5-year reports.

#### **7.3.6 Winter Moose**

Moose habitat units are referenced in the table and text, which appear to be actually hectares, since the values match the figures used throughout the rest of the Plan. This should be consistent throughout the document.

What does the “total habitat units” in the table represent? The projected hectare change between years within each category is appreciated, but more explanation is required on how it is being summarized, and what specific change will be evaluated in the future.

This chapter does not include a summer moose habitat section. The 5-year report should compare summer moose habitat projections vs. actual landscape change using the habitat suitability model used in the scenario planning. If the proposed quantitative summer moose habitat model is created, it can be incorporated at a later date.

#### **7.3.7 Marten Winter Cover**

We restate our comments here to help improve other wildlife sections and monitoring tables. The explanation of recalculation of habitat provided in this section should be mirrored in other species sections. This is exactly what the 5-year report should contain – projected vs. reality, followed by an amended projection.

## **7.4 Future Monitoring**

We restate that this section does not contain any timelines for LP to “**explore and pursue**” any of the future monitoring projects. It leaves us wondering, what happens if LP does not explore or implement any of these ideas?

### **7.4.1**

We appreciate the detailed moose and elk habitat modelling approach that has been added to the appendices and agree with the methods proposed by the consultant. However, this section still lacks commitments and timelines regarding how data will be collected, obtained, and provided to the consultant for analysis. It also does not explain how these models will be incorporated into the plan and 5-year reports once they are created.

### **7.4.3**

We previously expressed appreciation for Louisiana-Pacific recognizing potential bias for surveying only summer sites, limiting the ability to collect information on bird use of particular habitat types. Identifying this gap, and assessing if SAR and indicator bird models could be enhanced or adapted with additional data collection will be an important aspect of an adaptive bird monitoring program. The plan should commit to collecting this additional data, since it is referenced in section 7.3.3 that “**A habitat model could be built in the future if there are significantly more observations**” for golden-winged warbler and olive-sided flycatcher. The plan should also explain how after models are developed, what actions Louisiana-Pacific could take if a decline in habitat is observed.

## **Chapter 8**

### **8.3.3.5**

We appreciate the all new roads will be decommissioned after use, however the statement “**Nor will there be a significant change in the accessibility of the forest at a landscape level**” cannot be supported if monitoring that determines the success of road decommissioning efforts is not conducted. The Branch has requested that this type of monitoring be included in our above comments.

### **Figure 8.11**

**Reactive side of the diagram** – Moose and elk population management is Government of Manitoba’s responsibility. Mitigation barriers and controls describing population management actions (e.g. specific harvest controls) should not be prescribed by Louisiana-Pacific, and should be removed from the diagram.

### **Figure 8.16**

**Bird species at risk – habitat loss (e.g. Canada warbler) – “survey summer cut blocks for bird species at risk” and “If SAR detected avoid harvest during bird breeding season”**

Monitoring of species presence and deferral of harvest to winter is only avoiding disturbance to the nesting activities of that species, not addressing habitat loss. The quality and quantity of habitat must be monitored at the landscape level for species at risk, and it should be assured that adequate levels of habitat will remain in the future.

**Reactive side of the diagram** – Furbearer population management is Government of Manitoba’s responsibility. Mitigation barriers and controls describing population management actions (e.g. specific harvest controls) should not be prescribed by Louisiana-Pacific, and should be removed from the diagram.

## **8.6 Vegetation**

### **8.6.1 Species of Cultural Importance**

Moose should not be discussed in this section. A description of plant species of cultural importance should be added.

### **8.7.1**

These sections just list what or how many rare or endangered wildlife species exist in the province, not a description of which are known to or may occur in the FML. Nor is there an assessment of what other activities are impacting these species, and what effect forest operations may contribute.

The Branch has previously suggested that Louisiana-Pacific contact the Manitoba Conservation Data Centre to obtain Species of Conservation Concern occurrences (SOCC) to add to their current “Wildlife point” database and assist with the forest management planning process.

Date: August 4, 2021

To: Elise Dagdick  
Environment Officer  
Environmental Approvals Branch  
Manitoba Conservation & Climate

From: Forestry & Peatlands Branch  
Agriculture & Resource  
Development

Subject: **Louisiana Pacific Canada Ltd. Forest Management Plan**

---

#### 8.3.7.2 Analysis of Potential Effects

Formatting issue: The cumulative effects framework for biodiversity is shown in...\_\_\_\_\_ (the sentence continues a few pages later).

#### Section 8.4: Visual Quality

While there is mention of trying to keep roads to contour lines, there is no mention of harvest shapes trying something similar.

# Memorandum

DATE: 2021-07-09

TO: **Marianne PORTEOUS**  
Forestry and Peatlands Branch  
Production Stewardship Division  
Agriculture & Resource Development

**Elise DAGDICK**  
Environment Officer  
CC: Environmental Approvals Branch  
Manitoba Conservation and Climate

FROM: **Suyoko TSUKAMOTO**  
Sr. Impact Assessment Archaeologist

**Reid GRAHAM**  
Impact Assessment Archaeologist  
  
Archaeological Assessment Services Unit  
Historic Resources Branch

T:  
F:  
e:

SUBJECT: **Louisiana Pacific 20 Year Forest Management 2021-2041 Plan & EIS**  
**EAL 3893.10 / HRB/AASU File #: AAS-21-17004**

## Concerns.

In response to your e-mail and weblinks [1] regarding the *Louisiana Pacific Canada Ltd. – Environmental Assessment of 20 Year Forest Management Plan – File 3893.10*, the Archaeological Assessment Services Unit (AASU) of the Historic Resources Branch has reviewed the supporting documentation. The provisions addressing heritage resources are insufficient for this plan, which is intended to guide Sustainable Forestry Management (SFM) for the next 20 years.

Simple, clear, and direct reference to heritage resources in this document is required to facilitate awareness and understanding surrounding the identification, monitoring and/or mitigation of heritage resources. Referencing heritage resources in the 20-Year Plan anchors and frames the strategies and work linked to Operating Plans and Pre-Harvest Surveys. Early awareness of heritage resource management at a high-level cements the understanding and need for preventative planning measures to avoid costly work stoppages in future due to trespasses into significant and sensitive heritage resource sites.

Language changes and/or recommendations pertaining to heritage resources are provided in the table attached to this memo and are structured around:

- Draft Guidelines for Effects Assessment [2],
- Manitoba Clean Environment Commission recommendations [3], and the
- Existing environmental act licence for FML #3 [4].

[1] Public Registry 3893.10 – Louisiana-Pacific Canada Limited (LP, LP Building Products (May 10, 2021)  
<https://www.gov.mb.ca/sd/eal/registries/3893.10lp/index.html>

[2] *Draft Guidelines for the Preparation of an Effects Assessment for a Twenty Year Forest Management Plan for Forest Management Licence Area #3* (February 2018, Manitoba Sustainable Development), [https://www.gov.mb.ca/sd/eal/registries/3893.10lp/drafteisguidelines\\_feb2018.pdf](https://www.gov.mb.ca/sd/eal/registries/3893.10lp/drafteisguidelines_feb2018.pdf)

[3] Manitoba Clean Environment Commission Forest Management Approval Process (May 2020)  
[https://www.manitoba.ca/asset\\_library/en/proactive/2020\\_2021/Manitoba\\_Clean\\_Environment\\_Forest\\_Management\\_Plan.pdf](https://www.manitoba.ca/asset_library/en/proactive/2020_2021/Manitoba_Clean_Environment_Forest_Management_Plan.pdf)

[4] Environmental Act Licence No. 2191E (December 10, 1996), <https://www.gov.mb.ca/sd/eal/archive/1996/licences/2191e.pdf>



## AASU Editorial Comments and Recommendations for LP 20-Year Forestry Plan (c.2021)

Section	Title	Page	Comments [C] / Recommendations [R]
0	Title page	?	<b>R1.</b> Include a title page for this document.
0	List of regulatory pieces	?	<b>R2.</b> Include a list a provincial legislation and regulation that govern LP's forestry activities. [See MCEC 2020, pg.45]
Ch. 3 3.2	Socio-economic & Social Environment	154	<p><b>C1.</b> Explicit references to “Cultural and heritage resources, including sites or objects of archaeological, paleontological, historical or architectural value, as well as burial sites,” which are identified in 3.2 of the SD Draft Guidelines (2018) and MCEC (2020), are lacking.</p> <p><b>C2.</b> “Heritage resources” are legally defined in <i>The Heritage Resource Act</i> (1986) and this terminology should be reflected in this plan as part of general awareness and legislated protection and mitigation efforts</p> <p><b>C3.</b> Refer 3.2.10.1 and 3.2.10.3 for recommended language alterations</p>
Ch. 3 3.2.10.1	Recreation and Tourism	169	<p><b>R3.</b> Add a “Municipal and Provincially Designated Sites” section to the Recreation and Tourism Section.</p> <p>There are 35 municipally and provincially designated sites in FML#3 that hold special places in communities and are of a particular place and pride. These include historic homesteads, schools, mills, elevators, and churches. Affiliated with one of these churches is an Indian Residential school memorial.</p> <p><b>C4.</b> Additional information on municipally or provincially designated historic sites can be found here:</p> <p><a href="https://www.gov.mb.ca/chc/hrb/mun/index.html">https://www.gov.mb.ca/chc/hrb/mun/index.html</a>  <a href="https://www.gov.mb.ca/chc/hrb/prov/index.html">https://www.gov.mb.ca/chc/hrb/prov/index.html</a>  <a href="http://www.mhs.mb.ca/docs/sites/">http://www.mhs.mb.ca/docs/sites/</a>  <a href="https://www.historicplaces.ca/en/home-accueil.aspx">https://www.historicplaces.ca/en/home-accueil.aspx</a></p>
Ch. 3 3.2.10.3	Historic Values	172	<p><b>R4.</b> It could be identified in the preamble that FML #3 has a rich heritage containing approximately 20 museums and 270 known cemeteries, 35 municipally and provincially <u>designated</u> heritage sites and more than 1100 registered archaeological and paleontological sites.</p> <p><b>C5.</b> Reference to indigenous histories is lacking.</p>
Ch. 3 3.2.10.3	<i>Historic Buildings, Collections and</i>	172	<b>R5.</b> Change paragraph title from “Historic Buildings, Collections and Heritage Sites” to “Heritage Resources, including Historic Buildings, Collections, and Designated Sites” to reflect legal definitions in <i>The Heritage Resources Act</i> .

	<i>Heritage Sites paragraph</i>		<p><b>R6.</b> Add an explanatory sentence re: heritage resources, e.g., <i>Heritage resources include sites or objects of archaeological, paleontological, historical or architectural value, as well as burial sites. Thirty-five municipally and provincially designated historic sites are recorded in the FML #3 catchment area...</i></p> <p><b>C6.</b> Additional information on municipally or provincially designated historic sites can be found here:  <a href="https://www.gov.mb.ca/chc/hrb/mun/index.html">https://www.gov.mb.ca/chc/hrb/mun/index.html</a>  <a href="https://www.gov.mb.ca/chc/hrb/prov/index.html">https://www.gov.mb.ca/chc/hrb/prov/index.html</a>  <a href="http://www.mhs.mb.ca/docs/sites/">http://www.mhs.mb.ca/docs/sites/</a>  <a href="https://www.historicplaces.ca/en/home-accueil.aspx">https://www.historicplaces.ca/en/home-accueil.aspx</a></p>
Ch. 4 Table 4.4	Pine Creek FN Concerns	19	<p><b>C7.</b> RE: FMP Concern – Forest operation impacts to Artifacts and Cultural Heritage Resources and the Relevant Chapter/Solutions.</p> <p>The Archaeological Assessment Services Unit argues Heritages Resources need to be considered as a Strategic Solution as well as an Operational Solution to avoid costly work stoppages and irreparable harm to potentially significant archaeological and cultural sensitive sites. The Pre-Harvest Survey Manual does not adequately address heritage resources protection and planning.</p> <p><b>R7.</b> Pre-Harvest Survey Manual requires additional language and documentation identifying the recognition of heritage resources/objects and as well as plans for identification of heritage resources sites, mitigation and monitoring. Note that a heritage permit obtained by a qualified heritage consultant is required to conduct archeological assessments in the province of Manitoba.</p>
Ch. 6 6.2.3.1	Operational Planning Concepts	8	<p><b>R8.</b> Add to list of bullets, “Avoid significant heritage resources, which can include burial sites”</p> <p><b>C8.</b> Including heritage resources in the operational planning concepts list is consistent with provisions identified in EAL 3893, #16.v. and #16.x. and identifies heritage resources as part of the operational planning process in the strategic plan</p>
Ch 6, Appen2	Planning SOG 6.1 <i>Planning considerations</i>	13	<b>R9.</b> Please change “heritage sites” to “ <i>heritage resources</i> ” in the list of bullet points
	6.3 Heritage Resource Considerations	14	<p><b>C9.</b> Clear guidance re: where in the process heritage resources are assessed and how they are protected and mitigated need to be reflected in this guideline.</p> <p><b>R10.</b> In the first paragraph, use the legal definition of heritage resources, i.e., <i>a heritage resources is legally defined as a heritage site, heritage object, and any work or assembly of works of nature or human endeavor that is of value for its archaeological, paleontological, pre-historic, cultural, natural, scientific or aesthetic features, and may in the form of sites or objects or a combination thereof.</i></p>

	6.3 Heritage Resource Considerations <i>Cont'd...</i>	14	<p><b>R11.</b> Add a second paragraph describing how heritage resources are assessed and managed. <i>E.g.,</i> Potential impacts to heritage resources are assessed during the Government review period of Operational Plans. If there is reason to believe that heritage resources or human remains are known, or thought likely to be present, on lands that are to be impacted, then LPC is required to conduct a heritage resource impact assessment (HRIA) and mitigation, if necessary, prior to forestry operations. A qualified archaeological consultant conducts the HRIA of the proposed project location(s), in order to identify and assess any heritage resources that may be negatively impacted by forestry activities. The Archaeological Assessment Services Unit (AASU) of Manitoba Sport, Culture, and Heritage works with LPC's heritage consultant to draw up terms of reference for these assessments. Measures to protect and mitigate impacts from forestry activities will also be developed in consultation with the LPC.</p> <p><b>C10.</b> These processes are captured in EAL 3893, #28</p>
Ch.7 7.2.2.2	Pre-Harvest Surveys	11	<p><b>R12.</b> Please add "<i>heritage resources, which includes heritage sites and objects</i>" to the list of "exceptional features" that are identified in paragraph one.</p> <p><b>C11.</b> According to the Pre-Harvest Survey attached in Chapter 7, Appendix 2, "heritage sites aka heritage resources" are reported under the "Exceptional Features" option on the "Tiber Cruise Inventories." This should be reflected in the 20-Year Plan.</p>
Ch.7 Appen2	Pre-Harvest Survey Manual	10	<p><b>R13.</b> Re: 3.2 Exception Features...</p> <p>Pre-Harvest Survey Manual requires additional language and documentation identifying the recognition of heritage resources/objects. To be consistent with other illustrative material in the Pre-Harvest Survey Manual, illustrations/photographs exemplifying different classes of heritage objects (e.g., ground stone tools, projectile points, flakes; Indigenous ceramics; historic artifacts such as tin cans, machinery, glass bottles, ceramics; building foundations, earthworks, rock features, etc.) are advised. Specified flagging for heritage resources buffers should also be identified in the Pre-Harvest Survey Manual.</p>
Ch. 8 8.10.4	Mitigation	73	<p>Re: Cultural and heritage resources management plan &amp; Chapter 6 Appendix 2 Planning SOG.</p> <p><b>R14.</b> The Heritage Resource Considerations in 6.3 of this SOG are insufficient. SOG requires greater clarity for plans identifying heritage resources sites, mitigation and monitoring.</p> <p><b>C12.</b> No reference is made to management heritage resources should they be accidentally encounter during operations.</p> <p><b>R15.</b> Include stop work order and emergency contact information in Operators Manual and Pre-harvest Survey manual as part of heritage resource protection planning (HRPP). A basic template of an HRPP is provided as an example.</p> <p><b>C13.</b> Insufficient reference is made to long management of heritage resources in the FML #3</p> <p><b>R16.</b> Clearly reference the process in which operation plans are provide to AASU/HRB for review, with protective details (protected GIS layers, restricted access) on heritage resource site locations and appropriate buffers relative to operations.</p>

## Provisions Regarding Found Human Remains

**T**he discovery and recovery of human remains is a sensitive issue, but one that is governed by provincial laws and process. Therefore, it is the responsibility of any individual encountering human remains to ensure that, upon discovery, actions are undertaken consistent with provincial legislation and policy. Failure to comply may result in legal action being taken.

This information is being provided to all persons conducting fieldwork under a Manitoba Heritage Permit. It outlines the Province of Manitoba's requirements and procedures consistent with *The Heritage Resources Act* (1986) and Manitoba's "*Policy Respecting the Reporting, Exhumation and Reburial of Found Human Remains*" (1987) to be followed in the event that human remains are discovered.

References herein to *The Heritage Resources Act* (1986) are not meant to supplant the *Act*, a copy of which may be obtained online or from:

Queen's Printer, Statutory Publications  
Lower level, 200 Vaughan Street, Winnipeg, MB R3C 1T5  
In Winnipeg: (204) 945-3101 Toll free in MB: 1-800-321-1203  
Email: statpub@gov.mb.ca

### Responsibility Rests with the Historic Resources Branch

The Historic Resources Branch is responsible for the administration of *The Heritage Resources Act* (1986) and to oversee the disposition of found human remains of an archaeological nature from the moment of discovery. Accordingly, the protection, preservation and disposition of found human remains and associated heritage objects will be overseen by personnel designated by the Historic Resources Branch (*Burials Policy: Legal Provision G*).

Any human remains occurring outside recognized cemeteries may potentially be forensic in nature, that is, remains associated with past behaviors, actions or events which are a concern of other legal agencies (for example, missing persons). For this reason it is always advisable to notify the nearest police or RCMP detachment in addition to the Historic Resources Branch upon the discovery of human remains.

### Definition of Human Remains

*The Heritage Resources Act* (1986), Section 43 (1) states that "human remains" means:

"remains of human bodies that in the opinion of the minister have heritage significance and that are situated or discovered outside a recognized cemetery or burial ground in respect of which there is some manner of identifying the persons buried therein."

### Heritage Permits

Heritage Permits issued by the Historic Resources Branch are subject to prescribed terms and conditions, and unless specifically stated, do not permit the handling or disturbance or possession of human remains upon discovery:

*The Heritage Resources Act* (1986), Sections 53; 45; and 46 state:

- 53 No person shall search or excavate for heritage objects or human remains except pursuant to a heritage permit and in accordance with such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the minister and set out in or attached to the heritage permit.
- 45 The property in, and the title and right of possession to, any human remains found by any person after May 3, 1967, is and vests with the Crown.
- 46 Every person who finds an object that is or that the person believes to be a heritage object, or remains that are or that the person believes to be human remains, shall forthwith report the find to the minister and shall not handle, disturb or do anything to the object or the remains except in accordance with such requirements as the minister may prescribe.

## Manitoba's Burials Policy

In 1987, the Province of Manitoba approved the *Policy Respecting the Reporting, Exhumation and Reburial of Found Human Remains* (otherwise known as: Manitoba's "Burials Policy"). The *Burials Policy* establishes what is to be done upon discovery of found human remains in accordance with *The Heritage Resources Act* (1986). A copy of the *Burials Policy* will be provided upon request to the Historic Resources Branch.

The essentials of the *Burials Policy* constitute the best practice following discovery of human remains:

1. Unless unavoidable and necessary human remains are not to be removed from their original resting place.
2. When human remains are discovered a) all work ceases and the Historic Resources Branch is notified immediately; b) no further disturbance of the remains occurs until the arrival of personnel designated by the Historic Resources Branch.
3. Community consultation takes place before exhumation or removal of human remains or associated grave goods.
4. Personnel designated by the Historic Resources Branch shall carry out the exhumation, and as much as possible, out of the public eye.
5. Identification procedures will be undertaken only by personnel designated by the Historic Resources Branch.
6. Reburial of human remains when a First Nation is involved is arranged by the Aboriginal Liaison Officer of the Historic Resources Branch in conjunction with the community. Reburial in all other cases will be handled only by personnel designated by the Historic Resources Branch.

**Manitoba Sport, Culture, and Heritage**  
**Historic Resources Branch**  
Main Floor, 213 Notre Dame Avenue  
Winnipeg, MB R3B 1N3  
In Winnipeg : (204) 945-2118  
Emergency : (204) 792-5730  
Toll free in MB : 1-800-282-8069 ext. 2118  
Email : [hrb@gov.mb.ca](mailto:hrb@gov.mb.ca)

Website: [www.manitoba.ca/heritage](http://www.manitoba.ca/heritage)

