

The Professional Forester

March 2009

Number 193

The official publication of the Ontario Professional Foresters Association



Tenure, Pricing and Ownership in the Future Forest of Ontario

Also Inside: AGM Agenda The Science Side

What's Inside...

every issue

Business Cards	14
Member News	15
Coming Events	16

this issue

Forest Tenure	3
Forest Tenure Systems - Past, Present, and Where Do We Go From Here?	4
Tenure, Pricing and Ownership in the Future Forests of Ontario: An Academic Perspective	5
Tenure Reform	6
AGM Agenda	7
The Science Side	8
Finding the Next Generation of Foresters	9
Getting Your Professional Licence in Ontario: The Experiences of International and Canadian Applicants	9
New Initiatives: Participation Opportunities	10
Call for Nominations	11
Competency Support Committee	12
Notice of Meeting	13

want to place an ad?

Located under *Classifieds* on the OPFA website and in *The Professional Forester* you can find postings of available employment opportunities. You may also post your resume for potential employers to view on the website.

WEBSITE RATES:

Employment Opportunities	\$60
Personal Resume	\$60

NEWSLETTER RATES:

For a schedule of rates please contact the OPFA office at opfa@opfa.ca.

www.opfa.ca opfa@opfa.ca

Ontario Professional Foresters Association
5 Wesleyan St., #201, Box 91523,
Georgetown, ON L7G 2E2
905-877-3679 or opfa@opfa.ca

EDITOR

Caroline Mach, R.P.F.
newsletter@opfa.ca

EDITORIAL BOARD

Matt Benson, R.P.F., Chair
Ken Armson, R.P.F., Caroline Mach, R.P.F.,
Jim McCready, R.P.F., Craig Robinson, R.P.F.,
Mike Rosen, R.P.F., Eric Thompson, R.P.F.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Tony Jennings, R.P.F.

The Professional Forester is published quarterly by and for members of the Association, as well as those interested in the profession of forestry in Ontario.

Unless specifically stated, views and opinions expressed do not necessarily represent those of the Association, its Council or the employers of members.

Printed in Ontario, Canada

REPRINT PERMISSION

Requests to use material published in *The Professional Forester* should be directed to the OPFA at opfa@opfa.ca or 905-877-3679.

Forest Tenure

Jeremy Williams



Tenure is a prominent part of the institutional architecture of the forest sector, and while the current travails of the sector reflect many cross-currents and influences, it is fair to say that Canadian forest tenure arrangements have not been supportive of the sector in recent decades. To me, the most telling evidence of this is that the national conifer harvest rate was flat during the 1990's and has since declined, once the extensive salvage cutting of mountain pine beetle (MPB) kill is removed from the equation. The hardwood harvest increased throughout the 1990's, and essentially reached a plateau in 2000. Excluding the impacts of MPB salvage cutting, the total Crown land harvest peaked in 2000. Even including the MPB salvage cut, the total harvest in 2007 (most recent year with available data) was estimated to be 19% below the 2000 level. It does not seem possible to me that we can maintain what is left of our international market position when the industry is facing declining harvests, and the assumption that underlies this article is that it is in our national interest to restore our forest industry to a position of global leadership.

Current tenure arrangements on Crown land have not encouraged companies to bolster their wood supply by intensifying their silvicultural practices; and provincial policy direction everywhere has eroded industrial wood supply. While Canada needs to manage its forests in an ecologically sound and sustainable manner (and probably does this better than any other country), the industry has borne most of the costs of this transition and has no incentive to spend money to increase yields. Ontario provides a good example of this – Ontario's Living Legacy, which was based on the triad approach; set aside a significant amount of area in parks and reserves, while providing licensees with the opportunity to designate enhanced management areas (EMAs) for a range of purposes that included intensive forest management. Yet, as far as I can determine, no intensive management EMAs have been designated.

Why might this be? One reason is that it is difficult to justify an investment in intensive silviculture when the overriding policy trend is to erode the allowable harvest and increase the cost of harvesting. Even if the provincial

government pledged not to withdraw or re-allocate the intensively managed stands, continued introduction of measures that have the effect of reducing the wood supply negate the benefits of intensive management and represent de facto increases in wood cost. The resultant static or declining harvest level makes it difficult to justify significant investments in plants and equipment.

Current tenure arrangements do not provide a suitable level of security – in all provinces except Alberta, governments own the trees on Crown land. Few licence types offer compensation for the loss of timber or allowable harvest due to land withdrawals or policy changes.

There is presently a tension between the desire to manage forests in a manner that sustains their biodiversity, which is leading us in Canada to try to create "natural" forests, and allowing forest managers to grow the kinds of forests that will support a healthy industry. Finding a tenure mechanism that provides an appropriate balance is critical to resolving this tension and improving the institutional platform of the forest industry.

I would suggest that the provincial governments need to revise their forest legislation so that forest licensees have ownership of the trees. I do not think that this necessarily involves lengthening the licence terms, but it would imply that the licensees would be compensated for provincial measures that withdrew land and/or reduced wood supply. The emergence of carbon and biofuels as new products, and the anticipated future development of wood-based chemical production, creates a need for new licensing and tenure arrangements – providing licensees with ownership of these products would consolidate and integrate their management. As things currently stand, most provincial governments are retaining ownership of carbon credits generated on Crown land, which will guarantee that practically no carbon offset credits are generated from forest management on Crown land. To balance these changes, measures should also be put in place to ensure that licensees do not unnecessarily shut out other participants, such as prospective pellet manufacturers for example. The provinces might also consider measures that would reward the good performance of licensees, and be ready to deal more severely with those very few licensees that

are poor forest managers.

The proposal to compensate licensees for reductions in wood supply or increases in harvesting costs in order to provide enhanced ecological services and values will likely concern many people. An approach that offers the potential for an elegant solution is to look at mechanisms to pay or otherwise compensate licensees for the provision of ecological services. Such measures are increasingly being examined, and are in place in the form of property tax reductions to private landowners who retain ecologically important sites and enhance the ecological benefits provided by their land.

With the Canadian forest sector in crisis, the value of forests and ecological services increasing each year, and the emergence of new products from the forest, including chemicals, biofibre and carbon, this is an excellent opportunity to overhaul the tenure arrangements in provincial forests.

Forest Tenure Systems - Past, Present and Where Do We Go From Here?

Tony Rotherham, R.P.F. (Ontario and BC)

Some observations based on experience.



In Canada the majority (163 million ha or 87%) of actively managed forest land is publicly owned.

On this land we have made a choice between a 'state enterprise' approach, where the government handles all

aspects of management, harvest and wood transport and a private enterprise approach. Getting the allocation of responsibility and accountability right to ensure delivery of good management has not been easy.

The provinces have set policy, allocated some of the forest resources to private enterprise and experimented with the division of responsibility and accountability for management. Trial and error have resulted in the slow development of forest tenure systems that deliver forest management in a cost-effective way.

Public policy and socio-economic conditions change. So must tenure.

Forest Management Paradigms Over the Past 40 Years

1960 - 1975 Multiple Use Management - the needs of the public for recreation had to be considered.

1975 - 1995 Integrated Forest Resource Management - a real effort was made to plan the management of resources - wood, wildlife for hunting and fur trapping, fish habitat for recreational fishing and camping.

1995 - the present - Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) where the big difference is that the values and functions of the forest ecosystems are recognized, managed, and conserved.

In response to changes in forest management paradigms and society over the last 40-50 years we have used variations on systems based on area and volume allocation. Readers may be surprised to know that tenures are almost evenly divided between the two systems.

The main difference within these two forms of tenure used across Canada has been the trial, error and improvement in the allocation of responsibilities to carry out and pay for various aspects of management. Post-harvest regeneration is the most important of these. This has bounced back and forth between the Crown and the tenure holder depending on the size of the company, the economy and the political philosophy of the day. The general trend has been to allocate more responsibility and accountability to the tenure holder. The lines of responsibility and accountability have become shorter and straighter. With this has come additional scope for the application of professional judgement and experience by R.P.F.s.

Management licenses are increasingly allocated to large wood users with the smaller industries having rights to wood secured through the allocation of secondary licenses. The trick with the secondary licensee approach is to ensure that both the letter and the spirit of the wood supply agreement is honoured. The trick has not always been successfully accomplished.

There is usually a hard link (appurtenance) between tenures and consuming mills. In many cases these are mills operating in one-industry towns. The tenure, mill and community are linked. Good socio-economic idea, but it creates real difficulties in the essential rationalization of the industry as technology and economics change.

What drives tenure system design?

Political philosophy; real or perceived public opinion; social values; forest management paradigms, capital cost and lifespan of mills; wood volumes needed; the capacity of companies to manage; forest land ownership patterns; the availability of experienced ethical professionals; and occasionally the successful application of hard-nosed analysis of experience with different forms of tenure.

In Canada there is always a 'third rail' question that dare not be asked. Should we privatize the public forest? We don't have to sell all of it and we can attach conditions. New Zealand examined the case for selling

publicly owned forest land stocked with high production plantations. A big concern was who the buyers might be. There was little public support for massive land sales to foreign interests. Sale of the standing trees and a long-term leasehold contract that included the right to grow two rotations of fast-growing plantations was adopted as an acceptable compromise.

In 1990 about 30 senior forest managers, academics and scientists spent a fascinating day discussing the ideal 'next generation' forest tenure system for Canada. At the end of the day they agreed that a leasehold system held much promise. The form would be an emphyteutic lease, requiring a duty of care and stewardship along with the right to enjoy the benefits of productivity. The lease would be for a period of approximately 50 years with a clear statement of the condition of the forest and all capital improvements upon expiry of the lease. There would have to be periodic opportunities to review the lease if and as major socio-economic conditions changed. Forest products companies or community forest management organizations would bid on the present Annual Allowable Cut (AAC) with the bid to be paid as an annual fee. The fee would be linked to inflation and the price of commodity products. Increases in AAC due to good management would be a bonus to the manager. Annual harvest levels would respond to market opportunities. Given Canadian growth rates, management directed at achieving the end-of-lease forest conditions would have to begin in the first year of the lease.

What factors drive successful forest management tenure arrangements and systems?

- Long-term security of supply for mills that require large investments and for the families that depend on the mills for employment and community stability.
- Some AAC must be available to new entrants in the marketplace.
- Policy stability and clear, agreed

(Continued on page 5)

Tenure, Pricing and Ownership in the Future Forests of Ontario: An Academic Perspective

Chander Shahi, Assistant
Professor and Reino Pulkki,
Professor and Dean

Faculty of Forestry and the Forest
Environment, Lakehead
University, Thunder Bay, Ontario



There are increasing concerns that the traditional Crown forest tenure system applied previously to almost 100% of Ontario's Crown forests has been a major contributor to the current forest sector crisis and no longer offers the

economic and social benefits that it was designed to provide (Minister's Council on Forest Sector Competitiveness 2005). The regulations and guidelines under the tenure arrangements have significantly increased the total cost of production of timber by increasing the responsibilities of tenure holders for exercising their rights and complicating the forest management planning process. The efficiency and competitiveness of the forest industry in the province has been further hampered due to the constraints imposed on the transfer of forest tenures. The traditional wood allocation system, under which forest lands are held, has also failed to boost secondary value added manufacturing, possibly due to lack of access to reliable fibre supply to this sector. Until recently the long term tenures of 20 years that represent a large percentage of the annual allowable cut have been held mainly by large companies, whereas the short term tenures of 1-5 years, which contribute to a small percentage of the annual allowable cut, have been held by small companies and communities. While the Canadian forest policies have incorporated social concerns, the provincial tenure systems do not seem to promote sustainable community development (Haley and Nelson 2007).

A major aspect of Ontario's current tenure systems and the stumpage system linked to

these is that the Crown charge portion of the stumpage rate is based on end product values, i.e., the type of mill the wood ends up at. Since low end use value maintains low stumpage fees, the tenure holders are least motivated to look for value-added options. Therefore, the stumpage system has actually failed to promote the manufacturing of value added forest products in the present day context and has been sending wrong price signals to the private sector (Luckert 2008). Some economists have advocated the use of stumpage systems based on competitive timber auctions to remove such inefficiencies. However, competitive timber auctions may not promote efficiency and equity under the prevailing imperfect market conditions and may inadvertently drive stumpage rates too low or too high. Under increasing global competition, the private sector plays a major role, and the tenure and pricing system has to be more responsive for wood allocation to the needs of new value-adding participants. Moreover, with the development of the bioeconomy sector, the tenure system should support all communities in different parts of the province. Without true decision-making power in forest management, the communities' development and true sustainability will continue to remain an elusive concept.

Privatization has been suggested by some economist as the solution to create market driven incentives for increasing efficiency in timber production and sustaining the forest industries. Countries like New Zealand, Australia, Germany and Sweden have benefitted from privatization to some extent (Haley and Nelson 2007). Such a policy may not be politically acceptable in Canada, given the pattern of ownership of our forest

land is mostly public. However, decentralization of the authority, while retaining the public ownership of forest land, could help in establishing more competitive regional markets. A shift towards community based forest management would be a significant step towards regional economic development. Such a reform does not mean that the past tenure systems were not well formulated. It also does not mean that only one tenure system is applicable. There needs to be varying forms of tenure across the province that meet each particular area's community and industrial needs. These reforms only signify that the institutional arrangements need to change with time to meet changing social demands, while retaining the competitiveness of our forest industry in the international markets, and allowing new players to enter the scene. The tenure system and forest management need to be geared to growing value in our forests and our forests becoming profit centers. A general land rent can be charged by the Crown, however, any additional revenues derived through additional volumes and values generated through forest management need to remain with the entity/company responsible for managing the area.

Haley, D. and H. Nelson. 2007. Has the time come to rethink Canada's Crown forest tenure systems? *The Forestry Chronicle* 83(5):630-641.

Luckert, M.K. 2008. How can tenure systems help us get more timber value from Canada's forests? *The Forestry Chronicle* 84(2): 148-149.

(Continued from page 4)

management objectives.

- Lines of responsibility and accountability must be short and straight.
- Management units large enough for economies of scale.
- No un-funded responsibilities.

Demanding too much economic return will result in forest management failures. There is only so much meat on the rabbit.

- Allocation of the bundle of property rights must result in a fair balance between management responsibilities, costs and benefits.
- A system to quickly **enforce** fair treatment for smaller players.
- Recognition that one system will not fit all conditions - flexibility, trials and learning must continue.

Options:

- Division of management units into three

categories of land based on the triad approach.

- Evaluation of the northern limits of practical economic sustainable management (forest conditions, distance to markets and provision of services to remote communities).
- Co-operation in learning at the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers (CCFM) level would be useful. All provinces are in the same boat.

Tenure Reform

Alan Thorne, R.P.F., P.Eng



There are few topics in forestry that generate as much debate as Tenure Reform. This is true not only in Ontario, but in the rest of Canada as well, where over 90% of the land is owned by the public.

Tenure essentially identifies the rights that companies have to the forests they have licenses on. For example, the tenure may guarantee a certain volume of a tree species each year.

There exist many forms of tenure today. From small tenures such as community forests on a few thousand hectares in British Columbia to proposed Cooperative Sustainable Forest Licenses (SFLs) of 4 million ha in Ontario. There are area based tenures as well as volume based tenures. Tenures on private land as well as combined tenures on both public and private land such as Tree Farm Licenses.

In Ontario today, the tenure system has evolved from largely Crown managed tenure to the current Sustainable Forest License (SFL) approach, which is led by the forest industry. The Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) still retains substantial control of forest management activities through the *Crown Forest Sustainability Act*, and its associated regulations, policies and guidelines. Essentially, all of the commercial forest in Ontario today (outside of biomass) has been committed to one company or another. Furthermore, the SFLs are either led by single companies or by cooperatives that all consist of businesses who access fibre from the forest.

Despite this evolution over time, there is a substantial demand from many people in Ontario for change. The demand for change is coming from many different groups including smaller communities, First Nations, local governments and municipalities, and even some forest companies. In a never ending quest to establish an effective tenure system, the MNR is remaining open minded to new ideas even though there is no formal process today to initiate change.

So what is the best proposal for new tenure in Ontario to satisfy the many interests across the province? I have personally worked within

ten different forms of tenure, each with different advantages and objectives. Based on this experience, I would suggest that before deciding on a new tenure approach, it is important to clearly identify the objectives and problems to be solved. Secondly, I would suggest that perhaps we may have to consider more than one tenure system as issues are not the same across all areas of the province.

Some of the typical concerns I have heard include the following. In some areas, local communities would like a direct say in how forest management is done to ensure local control and benefits remain in the local community. Also, there are concerns with environmental stewardship and a belief that the current approaches do not adequately address these issues.

First Nations share these same issues as well. In addition, First Nations also believe that because of their inherent rights to the land and current status of treaties, they are more than just a stakeholder and have a connection to the land not defined by simple tenure. Indeed, current legal case law requires the government of Ontario to consult with local First Nations on land use in their traditional territories.

The people of Ontario, much like Canadians everywhere, value the vast areas of Crown forest that exist today. Most other countries do not have this unique situation as private, fee simple land dominates the landscape. As a result, Canadians tend to want to have a balance of environmental and socio-economic values from their forests. They want us to ensure long term environmental health is not compromised by short term economics. That said, Canadians clearly want a healthy economy that is respectful of communities, workers, and local First Nations. They want us to achieve all of this.

Then there is the industry. In this volatile economy, the industry is facing unprecedented challenges. Low cost structures are needed as well as quality wood supplies that are stable and predictable over a long period of time. In addition, the industry requires a clear set of rules that do not change too frequently, and a resolution to the land claim and treaty issues of First Nations that does not shift excessive cost burdens to the industry. No longer can Ontario forest

companies remain comfortable with the historic market in the United States. Reduced wood demand and increased supplies from other countries have fundamentally changed this primary market.

Based on all of this, I would like to offer the following recommendations:

- When seeking input across Ontario, ensure the analysis of the input is summarized locally as well as provincially. This may identify unique local opportunities that may not apply everywhere.
- Learn from other jurisdictions such as New Zealand or Australia where there are still substantial components of Crown land and the forest industry is relatively successful.
- Explore a zoning concept within forests to minimize land use conflicts of conservation vs expanding wood supplies.
- Have an open discussion on whether or not directing all the commercial volumes is the best approach. Directed volumes offer stability for industry but may restrict innovation from new players and may not guarantee the most efficient businesses thrive in the future. In short, should some of the wood be available through some sort of a competitive bid process?
- Government should take a direct role in offering more benefits to local First Nations and not just rely on the industry to solve socio-economic opportunities.
- Consider small pilots for new tenure to test viability once all the issues have been clearly identified.

In summary, the most important recommendation for tenure reform is to take the time to listen first to the issues before rushing into a new tenure system that may not work. If done correctly, we can address the many demands on our forest to ensure long term environmental health and socio-economic opportunities that are desirable for industry, local communities and First Nations.

52nd Annual Conference
April 22-24, 2009 Sudbury, Ontario
Whose Forest is it Anyway?
The Role of Tenure, Pricing and Ownership
in the Future of Ontario's Forests

Wednesday, April 22, 2009

9:00 am - Registration at Holiday Inn (all day)

12:00 pm - Field Tour from Holiday Inn

Tour A - Restoration Efforts in the Sudbury Basin

Tour B - White and Red Pine Management in the Killarney Area

7:30 - 9:00 pm **Andrea Mandel-Campbell** "**Competing in the Global Marketplace - Why Mexicans Don't Drink Molsons**"

9:00 - 11:00 pm - Icebreaker at Holiday Inn

Tradeshow all evening

Thursday, April 23, 2009

Moderator: Markus Schwabe, CBC Radio Sudbury

Tradeshow all day

7:00 - 8:15 am - Registration

8:20 - 8:30 am - **Mayor John Rodriguez** - City of Greater Sudbury

8:30 am - **Dr. Shashi Kant**, University of Toronto "**Lessons From Abroad**"

9:30 am - **Dr. Harry Nelson**, University of British Columbia "**Alternative Tenure Approaches to Achieve Sustainable Forest Management**"

10:15 am - Break

10:30 am - **Dr. Mark Kuhlberg**, Laurentian University "**History of Forest Tenure in Ontario**"

11:15 am - **Dr. Marty Luckert**, University of Alberta "**The Role of Privatization in Forestry**"

12:00 pm - Lunch - **Hon. Donna Cansfield**, Minister of Natural Resources (to be confirmed)

1:00 - 3:30 pm - Afternoon Speakers Panel "**Tenure Approaches in Four Canadian Provinces**" (Moderator: Tat Smith, University of Toronto - to be confirmed)

Bill Thornton, ADM Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources

Gilles Desaulniers, ADM Quebec Ministry of Natural Resources

Paul Orser, ADM New Brunswick Department of Natural Resources

Bob Freisen, ADM British Columbia - to be confirmed

3:45 pm - Ontario Professional Foresters Business Meeting - All Welcome

6:30 pm - Banquet

OPFA Awards and Presentations

Ken Armson - "**Forest History Society of Ontario**"

Local Entertainment (to be confirmed)

Friday, April 24, 2009

Moderator: Phil Hearn, The Working Forest

7:30 am - CIF Breakfast

9:00 am - **Harry Bombay**, National Aboriginal Forestry Association "**Aboriginal Forest Tenure**"

9:45 am - **Carl Corbett**, Algonquin Forest Authority "**The AFA as a Tenure Model**"

10:30 am - Break

10:45 am - **Bob Fleet**, Grant Forest Products "**Report Card on Ontario's Tenure System - A Home-Grown International Viewpoint**"

11:30 am - **Dr. Dave Robinson**, Laurentian University "**Community Forestry as a Tenure Model**"

The Science Side

Steve D'Eon, R.P.F.



Editor's Note: Steve D'Eon, R.P.F. has generously offered to author this feature that summarizes scientific articles of significance related to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Forest. If you would like to submit, on an occasional or

regular basis, similar summaries related to Boreal, Carolinian, or Urban forests please contact the Editor at newsletter@opfa.ca.

Predicting tree survival in Ontario sugar maple forests based on crown condition

Tominaga et al. Canadian Journal of Forest Research 38:1730-1741.

Decline in sugar maple in the 1980s spawned several large field based research networks provincially, regionally, and internationally with over 30,000 trees monitored and tested from the mid 1980s to the late 1990s when most programs began to wrap up once crown conditions of sugar maple improved. A definitive answer to the causal agent(s) for the decline never emerged from these networks with suggested reasons being defoliation, drought, acid rain, nutrient deficiencies, winter thaw-freeze events, and combinations of the above. Tominaga et al. used data from the 102 plots and 7,000+ trees of the Ontario Forest Biomonitoring Network (OFBN) to test whether crown conditions for dominant and co-dominant sugar maples as measured can indicate future mortality.

They found the annual mortality rate for the 18 year period to be 1.5% which is comparable to the results reported from the other networks (NAMF-Ontario natural stands 0.4% for 1989-1997, CFS-Ontario 1.2% for 1998-2002, southeastern Quebec 0.8% for 1984-1993 but ~4% 1984-85 then improving). Within OFBN the Algoma region had higher mortality rates and this higher rate was not attributed to poorer crown conditions at the start of the study but to the general less favourable growing conditions. The authors found Algoma maple less likely to survive the same initial poor crown conditions as maple in the St. Lawrence region with the Georgian Bay and Huron regions intermediate. Very poor crown condition for two consecutive years predicted low survival for all four regions similar to results from Quebec. Mortality predictions were not valid

for short term as tree death appears to take more time than the expression of stress via crown condition.

These results may be of interest to those managing sugar maple stands suggesting crown condition may predict future mortality.

Consumer-grade Global Positioning Systems (GPS) receiver performance

M. Wing. Journal of Forestry 106(4):185-190.

Hand-held GPS receivers are a common tool used by foresters throughout the world and the accuracy of their measurements is sometimes important both under open sky conditions and under the forest canopy. M. Wing tested six consumer-grade GPS receivers in the northwestern U.S. under open sky conditions, under a young forest canopy of moderately dense conifers 10-20 years old, and under a closed conifer canopy 40-50 years old. Wing placed the receivers at breast height (1.2m) collecting single point data, the average of 30 points, or the average of 60 points and calculated the error in horizontal position from surveyed benchmarks. The list price of the receivers ranged from \$200 to \$400 USD.

All receivers performed better under open sky conditions, as expected, with accuracy ranging from 1.0 to 6.6 m. Standard deviations were around 50% of the reported accuracy indicating an expected range for users. Accuracy under the closed canopy ranged from 6.6 to 12.1 m and the results for the young canopy test were intermediate between the open sky and closed canopy. The author reported the GPSmap 60CS as significantly more accurate than the others. One model (GPS Map 76cx) had a larger degrade of accuracy under closed canopy than the other five models which had a gradual degrade in accuracy. Averaging 30 or 60 data points generally improved accuracy for two of the six models (Atlas MNS and eTrex Legend). Averaging 30 points produced slightly less accurate readings under all three canopy conditions for the other four models (Earthmate GPS PN-20, GPSmap 60CS, GPSmap 76Cx, and iFinder Explorer).

These results might assist users in knowing the limitations of their receivers and how they

utilize spatial data collected with this grade of receiver.

The widespread threat of Calcium decline in fresh waters

Jeziorski et al. Science 322:1374-1377.

Jeziorski et al. identify an important recent decline in lake water calcium (Ca) using direct and indirect measurements with the record extended back to the 1800s for lakes in Central Ontario. The authors also tracked pH and presence of *Daphnia* species, an important but Ca sensitive crustacean zooplankton. The authors attributed the decline to a reduction in the exchangeable Ca concentration in catchment soils and referenced acid rain and forest harvesting as accelerating the problem. Some press reports on release of the paper focused on forest harvesting as a prominent cause whereas the paper described acid rain as a more causal factor.

The authors did not directly study forest harvesting effects on Ca and referenced a southeastern U.S. study and a modeling study from the Dorset area of Ontario. The Dorset modeling study noted estimates of base cation removals resulting from forest harvesting do not exist for the region and used proxy data to conclude long-term soil depletions of Ca, especially from whole tree harvesting, could have ecosystem wide impacts. The cited U.S. study concluded a potential broad regional pattern of Ca depletion in forest ecosystems could exist. Preliminary results from a study on sandy soils at Petawawa indicated that while whole tree harvesting yielded 35% more biomass it also increased Ca removal by 66%, mostly in the smaller diameter material containing a higher proportion of nutrient rich bark. The potential for calcium deficiency is more likely for hardwoods than conifers.

Future enhanced biomass removals for energy generation could have long-term sustainability impacts and these issues need to be addressed as part of provincial policies on forest biomass harvesting. A 1992 provincial tech note listed season of harvest, rotation age, and controlling crown size through spacing as potential mitigation measures (www.mnr.gov.on.ca/MNR_E005393.pdf).

Finding the Next Generation of Foresters

Carla Grant
Executive Director
Ontario Forestry Association



The Ontario Forestry Association (OFA) has been educating and encouraging young people to consider careers in forestry for 60 years. In 2008, the OFA built on this commitment by participating in many relevant

forestry initiatives, while continuing to offer our valuable core programs in education, awareness and stewardship.

Thousands of educators, students and members of the public visit the exhibits and shows that the OFA attends each year. Our primary goal at each event is to leave teachers and young people with a better understanding of our forests, as well as the exciting and rewarding careers available in forestry-related fields.

For the past seven years the OFA has attended the Environmental Career day at the University of Toronto. Students at this event have always been eager to learn about forestry opportunities and how they can get involved.

The OFA also participated in the Green Living Show, from April 25 – 27, which attracted thousands of members of the public who were keen to learn about trees. The exhibit was an excellent opportunity to tell people about promising careers in the forestry sector. At the OFA booth, visitors were presented with a tree identification exercise to show them what forestry

professionals do on the job.

During the summer, the OFA was on hand at the Bark Lake Leadership Centre, which provides outdoor educational programs for high school teachers who are interested in learning about the environment. Teachers at the 2008 program were keen to learn more about career options in forestry, and the OFA provided them with materials to pass along to their students.

In the fall, the OFA attended three highly successful events: the International Plowing Match in Teeswater, Ontario; the Woodstock Outdoor Farm Show; and, for the first time, the 11-day Royal Winter Fair, held at the Direct Energy Centre in Toronto. At all of the events, the OFA booth featured an “increment borer demonstration” so that students could have some hands on experience with tools that are used in the forestry industry. Each event offered us many excellent opportunities to interact with students and teachers and to discuss career options in forestry.

The fall was also a busy time for education-related events and shows, including the Ontario Association of Geography and Environmental Educators (OAGEE) and the Science Teacher’s Association of Ontario (STAO). In both cases educators were thrilled to have resources that they could use in the classroom, such as OFA teaching kits and lesson plans.

The OFA’s premier education event is the

Ontario Envirothon, which reaches over 10,000 students throughout Ontario each year. Registered teams participate in local workshops across Ontario to receive hands on experience and knowledge about Envirothon topics, and one of the program’s core topics is forestry.

Envirothon is an excellent mentoring opportunity for students, where they can talk directly with forestry professionals and ask them questions about their careers in the forestry sector. It allows students to step right into the shoes of a forester and learn how to use a clinometer, prism, and increment borer, and also learn specific skills such as tree identification methods or how to assess the basal area of a forest.

Past Envirothon participants have provided us with great feedback about these opportunities, often saying that the program positively affected their career choices and helped them achieve academic success in their post secondary studies.

The OFA looks forward to building on this success in 2009 and beyond, and will continue to encourage Canada’s youth toward career opportunities in the forestry sector.

Getting Your Professional Licence in Ontario: The Experiences of International and Canadian Applicants

Are you interested in sharing your story about getting licensed? The Office of the Fairness Commissioner wants to hear from you.

It has commissioned a research firm to gather first-hand information—from the applicant’s point of view—about registration and licensing in Ontario’s regulated professions. The study includes an online survey at www.fairnesscommissioner.ca/survey and focus groups.

“The study will provide solid research about a topic where existing information is often anecdotal,” said Hon. Jean Augustine, PC, Fairness Commissioner. “I encourage applicants and members to get involved in this project.” The Office of the Fairness Commissioner is an arm’s-length agency of the Ontario government. Its mandate is to ensure that certain regulated professions have registration practices that are transparent, objective, impartial and fair. The office believes that everyone, whether educated here, in another province, or elsewhere around the world, deserves fair treatment when applying to become a member of one of Ontario’s regulated professions.

New Initiatives: Participation Opportunities

Tony Jennings, R.P.F.
Executive Director and Registrar



Now into the second quarter of OPFA's 2008/09 year, some Members are balancing the challenges of the downturns in the forest industry and the economy with the more positive experiences with new OPFA initiatives.

While a number of sponsors are again supporting the conference, the support of the Minister and the Ministry of Natural Resources in the above regards has been critical.

Competency Support:

The new Standing Committee is underway as recognized elsewhere.

Forestry Committees:

As previously reported, the Urban Forestry Committee has been joined by a Crown Lands Forestry Committee and a Private Lands Forestry Committee. These three "Forestry Committees" will provide resources for work on behalf of Council and Members and efforts have begun.

After a period of quiet, the Urban Forestry Committee, under the Chairmanship of Anne Koven, one of our Public Councillors, met recently and committed to focus early efforts on a paper to outline urban forestry and its importance. Characterized by an overlap with the practice of Certified Arborists, this aspect of forestry is perceived as not well understood even by our own Members.

The Crown Lands Forestry Committee under the Chairmanship of Laird Van Damme devoted most of its first meeting to consideration of the current revisions to the Forest Management Planning Manual and called a second meeting for two weeks later to allow Members to review the draft. At the time of this writing, it seems likely that Council will be presented with a formal reaction to put forward.

The Private Lands Forestry Committee, under the Chairmanship of Bob Burgar, was represented by him at a Southern Region workshop on "good forestry practices" on southern Ontario private lands. While the workshop focus is southern Ontario, as many

of you suggested in the fall seminar discussions, the committee membership is not limited to the south. Setting another precedent, Council has agreed to extend invitations to specific non-members to represent OFA (Ontario Forestry Association) and OWA (Ontario Woodlot Association) on the Committee.

These Committees will have lots of potential projects and are authorized to reach out to those interested in their area. **Let me remind you that the new personal information format allows you to indicate one or more areas of interest.** This is one route to more active involvement in our efforts.

Website:

Not everything goes smoothly. Despite testing and review, some aspects of our new website ran into difficulty. Between mid-December (when our changes went live) and mid-February, when we realized what was happening, CE records and some new personal information entered was not retained and some information chosen from drop down boxes was changed. Twice now we thought we caught and fixed all the changes, but even as I am writing we are apologizing for incorrect notices of unreported CE credits. APOLOGIES! Please check your records (again) and let us know about any gaps or errors.

Conference:

The upcoming 2009 Annual Conference will provide a neutral but concerned forum for discussing the widest range of approaches to the future of our Crown forests and their effect on communities and individual livelihood. Tenure, pricing and ownership can be seen as their own three legged stool, (i.e. three interconnected elements that must operate together for us all to have an effective outcome) just like the other stool: balancing environmental, social and economic values. Our concern as a profession is in ensuring a thorough review that ideally will result in needed resources to manage forests for that wide range of values and in respect of professional judgement and accountability.

The Annual Conference will also see two background papers for participants. The Sustainable Forest Management Network has agreed to our use of Harry Nelson's paper (*Alternative Tenure Approaches to Achieve Sustainable Forest Management: Lessons for Canada*) and Shashi Kant has agreed to undertake an international literature review on the conference theme. Dr. Kant will complete his paper after hearing the discussion in April; however, a draft will be available for our use before the conference.

The Provincial Forest Policy Committee is meeting in conjunction with the conference and many of its members will attend the full conference.

Your Theme Ideas Wanted!

Since *The Professional Forester* switched to a theme-based format several years ago, the Editorial Board has worked hard to bring you interesting, timely, and sometimes controversial themes. Now, we are asking for your help. Is there a current issue that you are dying to learn more about? A current issue that you would be willing to write about to get the ball rolling? Please send any and all ideas to the Editor at newsletter@opfa.ca.

Upcoming themes include: how forestry is addressed in non-forestry legislation (e.g. Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act), forests to manage carbon, and First Nations forestry.

Call for Nominations

OPFA Council December 1, 2009 to November 30, 2010

Nominations by OPFA Members for vacancies on next year's Council would be welcomed by the Nominating Committee. Nominations should be: for a specific position, in writing (email will suffice), and made by one or more Members other than the Nominee.

Positions for which Nominations may be submitted this year are:

Officers:

President	1 year term	(Currently Carl Corbett, R.P.F.)	Huntsville	#1253)
Vice-Pres.	1 year term	(Currently Alan Foley, R.P.F.)	Englehart	#1403)

Councillors: Currently completing 2nd term:

South West	2-year term	(Currently Caroline Mach, R.P.F.)	Rosemont	#1754)
Central East	2-year term	(Currently James McCready, R.P.F.)	Carlton Place	#889)

Councillors: Currently completing 1st term:

At Large	1 year term	(Currently Laird Nelson, Associate	Codrington	#1924)
-----------------	-------------	------------------------------------	------------	--------

Send written nomination(s) to Executive Director Tony Jennings, before Monday, May 31, 2008.

For Information:

- All Members in good standing except Students and Provisional Members are eligible to be candidates and may vote.
- **OPFA past practice has been that Members of Council may serve for a second term.**
 - President Carl Corbett, Vice-President Alan Foley and Councillor-at-large Laird Nelson are prepared to serve a second term.
 - Two Section Councillors will have completed two terms at the end of this year.
- **Past President** (currently David Milton, R.P.F.) is ex-officio and is not elected.
- The Nominating Committee will ensure at least a full slate of candidates.
- Section Councillors would be voted in by the Members in that section.
- Council has asked the Nominating Committee to have at least one Associate Member as part of the slate offered, using the "At Large" position if needed.

The following Councillors will be continuing in the second year of their term:

North East	Year 2 of 1 st term	Jeffrey Barton, R.P.F.	New Liskeard	#1681
South East	Year 2 of 2 nd term	Debra MacEwen, R.P.F.	Peterborough	#1663
Central West	Year 2 of 2 nd term	Greg Pawson, R.P.F.	Sault Ste.Marie	#1465
North West	Year 2 of 2 nd term	Frank Miklas, R.P.F.	Thunder Bay	#1613

There are currently five Public Members of Council, named by the Ontario government:

Anne Koven	(1 st Term ends May 2008)
Bob Duncanson	(1 st Term ends April 2010)
Henry Lickers	(1 st Term ends April 2010)
Brian Kurikka	(1 st Term ends July 2011)
Michael Barker	(1 st Term ends Sept. 2011)

Competency Support Committee

Bob Elliott, R.P.F.

One of the expectations of a licensed profession is that it has a quality assurance program in place that is focused on helping its members maintain their professional competency. Our Act describes that requirement. It is a goal of the OPFA to adequately ensure that each Registered Professional Forester is maintaining relevant professional competencies to protect the public interest. The intended outcome of a competency support program in the OPFA is that the Public has the assurance that:

- The practice of professional forestry is being carried out at a consistently high standard.
- The OPFA is carrying out its responsibilities in ensuring that each active member is competent to practice their scope of professional forestry.

In April 2007, the Competency Maintenance Working Group, a predecessor of the Competency Support Committee, presented a report to Members entitled *Sustaining Professional Competency and Growth*. This document was further refined based on Member input at the 2007 Fall Seminars and a resolution was passed at the 2008 Annual General Meeting to move towards documentation of member's Personal Practice Focus rather than institute a Continuing Education (CE) audit. The resolution specifically stated that action to improve Member information about CE opportunities would be given early attention. Council decided that the formation of a Competency Support Committee was the way to implement this Resolution.

In late fall 2008, the Competency Support Committee, a standing committee of OPFA Council, was struck to make recommendations to Council regarding a program for sustaining professional competence and growth.

Terms of Reference

Mandate:

To recommend to Council by-laws and program elements in support of Council's authority regarding Quality Assurance and Continuing Education [Act 53 (1) 22 & 24] and for implementing for all practicing members of the OPFA (Full, Associate and

Non Resident) a member friendly program and working tool to:

- support their individual responsibility for maintaining professional competency;
- encourage excellence; and
- adequately meet the Association's due diligence in these regards.

Tasks:

Guided by the report *Sustaining Professional Competence and Growth* and the approval of a first step in this regard:

- To develop a document that may be used to describe one's Personal Practice Focus.
- To develop an additional plan to supplement the Personal Practice Focus to facilitate their planning for CE and to plan for, if necessary, changes in their Personal Practice Focus.
- To define adjustments and improvements to the current requirements of CE.
- To provide recording and reporting mechanism(s) for members.
- To provide guidelines and examples of record keeping.
- To establish a time frame(s) for each member to act and report.
- To consult with the Registration Committee regarding Provisional Members with respect to their participation in Quality Assurance and CE.
- To identify and/or facilitate Continuing Education opportunities for members to maintain professional competency.

Notes:

- The Committee will meet electronically as much as possible.
- The Committee will provide notices and minutes of all meetings to the OPFA Executive

Director and/or designee.

- The Committee will seek input from the membership in the development of the Quality Assurance tools.
- The Committee may initiate work as appropriate, but shall keep Council advised through the office.
- OPFA submissions, public positions, positions regarding dealings with other bodies, documents for members, etc. shall be released by Council (or approved by Council before release). If matters are urgent this may be by email between meetings and/or by the Executive Committee on behalf of Council.

Reporting To: OPFA Council

Life Span: Continuing, subject to annual confirmation by Council.

Members: The majority of committee members will be Registered Professional Foresters who practice or work in the Province of Ontario and will so far as possible be drawn from all six sections. Membership will include a **minimum** of one councilor. The Chair will be approved or selected by Council for a term of one year at which time the position may be renewed.

The members of this committee are:

- Herb Bax, R.P.F.
- Nancy Luckai, R.P.F.
- Kevin Ride, R.P.F.
- Lauren Quist, R.P.F.
- Jeff Barton, R.P.F.
- Bob Elliott, R.P.F.
- Tom Croswell, R.P.F.
- Richard MacNaughton, R.P.F.
- Dean Johnson, R.P.F.
- Steve D'Eon, R.P.F.
- Trevor Longpre, R.P.F.
- Ivan Listar, R.P.F.

(Continued on page 13)

Notice of Meeting

While the formal notice and proxy form will be sent by Email together with the link to the 2008 Annual Report, the following is offered for those who have not provided a working Email address or asked for paper mailings:

NOTICE OF THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF MEMBERS

Notice is hereby given of the Annual Meeting of Members of the Ontario Professional Foresters Association to be held in the Holiday Inn, Sudbury, Ontario, Thursday, April 23, 2009 for the purpose of conducting the affairs of the Association including:

1. Receiving and considering reports of the President, Executive Director, Auditor and Committee Chairs for the year December 1, 2007 to November 30, 2008.
2. Considering Bylaws, Rules and Fee Schedule for 2009-2010.
3. Appointment of the Auditor.
4. Confirming and approving the acts and procedures of Officers and Councilors.
5. Considering and if desirable, approving resolutions.
6. Transacting such further business that may properly come before the meeting.

(Continued from page 12)

Judy Biggar and Tony Jennings, R.P.F. are providing support.

Initial meetings took place in late January and early February. The Committee is committed to:

- openly communicating and interacting with

Members;

- testing of concepts/programs on a voluntary basis with some Members prior to implementation; and

- meeting the needs of the Association, its Members, and Public the Interest in a cost effective and efficient manner.

Our initial tasks are to define a work plan

that will achieve the requirements of the Terms of Reference and to develop a communications methodology that will provide Members with regular updates of progress and issues and will encourage interactive participation by the Members. We are working on these things now. You will see and hear more at our 2009 AGM.



Mark Your Calendars!

The Role of Tenure, Pricing and Ownership in the Future Forests of Ontario

Business Cards

Your Business Card Here!

Advertise your company or services here.

Members \$25 per single issue
 \$80 per year (four issues)

Non Members \$40 per single issue
 \$140 per year (four issues)

If you would like to be included in the Business Card section please email opfa@opfa.ca.



Canadian Institute of Forestry
Voice of Forest Practitioners since 1908

The Forestry Chronicle
the national journal for forest practitioners

Our membership includes foresters, forest technicians and technologists, educators, scientists and others with a professional interest in forestry.

Reduced membership fees for OPFA members

www.cif-ifc.org



The benefits of being a member! The OPFA has arranged a Corporate Class Business Rental Program agreement with Enterprise Rent-a-Car. To receive your special rate you can do one of three things:

1. Book online at www.enterprise.com
2. Call 1-800-736-8222
3. Contact your local branch

You will be asked to provide your Corporate Class ID number which has been mailed to all members. Your Corporate Class Business Rental Program offers special pricing anytime, any day with unlimited mileage. And you can rent anywhere in North America – even for the family trip! If you have any questions, call the OPFA office at 905-877-3679.



OPFA Group Benefits Plan



Coverage designed for individuals, couples, families, & single parents.

Customized features available to meet your financial & insurance needs.

Features include extended health care, dental, life insurance, AD&D, short & long-term disability, and members assistance plan.

For More Information Contact

Mary Armstrong 416-644-7704
MARYA@LMS.CA

Jessica Sheehan 416-644-7730
JESSICAS@LMS.CA

1-800-663-6628 WWW.LMS.CA/OPFA

Putting the pieces together for you

Errors and Omissions Insurance: Do you have yours yet?

The Ontario Professional Foresters Association (OPFA) offers a group Errors and Omissions insurance policy to its members through LMS PROLINK Insurance Group and a master insurance policy underwritten by Lombard. This covers liability for suits initiated in Canada for alleged claims of professional malpractice occurring in Canada. For more information or an application form, call the OPFA office at 905-877-3679 or email opfa@opfa.ca

Member News

New Members

Full

Tracey Bradley
Chris Clowater
David Etheridge
Robert Hunt

Associate

Rob Arnup
Earl Dertinger
Tim Payne
Rod Seabrook
Joe Watson

Provisional

Dragos Burs
Randall Van Wagner

Non-Resident

Mark Nazer

Reinstatement From Non-Resident

Murray Smith

Transfers Out

Craig Parsons

Deceased Members

Jim Quirt

Resignations

Thomas Ballantyne
Dave Barker
Avery Dorland
Mike Guitard
Bruce Hopper
Paul Jewiss
Richard Krygier
James McBride
Wally McNiece
Robert "Roj" Miller
George Stanclik
David Stringer
Geoff Sykes
David West
Peter Yates

Lost Member

(If you know the whereabouts of any of these members, please ask them to contact the OPFA office.)

Douglas True

The Professional Forester is now delivered electronically except for those who have requested a paper copy. A copy is also available on the website (www.opfa.ca). To make sure that you receive all important member information, **please check that your email address and other personal information are accurate on the website. Thank you.**

Despite the introduction of the late payment charge, we still have members who owe for past years membership fees. Please check your records and contact our office.

For Your Information...

For those of you who regularly correspond with colleagues and friends in the provincial government, please be aware that their e-mail accounts are set to not accept attachments over 5MB in size. Keep that in mind when deciding whether or not to send that video clip of Saturday night's party.

Reminder: James S. Miller Memorial Scholarship Fund

The first anniversary of Jim Miller's passing was in August 2008. As a tribute to the truly humanistic person Jim was, a Scholarship Fund to commemorate him has been established. In this way Jim's legacy can live on, assisting a Northern Ontario student in pursuit of a post secondary education in a natural resources discipline.

The goal is to be able to award the first scholarship on April 25, 2009. Support is being counted on!

If you are interested in donating to this worthwhile cause, please make cheques payable to: Ontario Forestry Association and mail to:

James S Miller Memorial Scholarship Fund
c/o Ontario Forestry Association
701-200 Consumers Road
Toronto, Ontario M2J 4R4

Credit card payments will be accepted by phone at 1-800-387-0790 or by filling out the downloadable form on the OFA website at www.oforest.on.ca. The form can be mailed to the address above or faxed to 416-493-4608. Include your contact information with correspondence as charitable receipts will be issued for all donations.

More details about the scholarship fund are on page 18 of the June, 2008 issue of *The Professional Forester*.



The Professional Forester

Publications Mail Agreement Number

40026838

Undeliverable copies can be sent to:

5 Wesleyan St., #201, Box 91523
Georgetown, ON L7G 2E2

Coming Events

EVENT	DATE	LOCATION	CONTACT
Ontario Woodlot Association Annual General Meeting and Conference	March 28	Acton, ON	info@ont-woodlot-assoc.org
Today's Forests - Tomorrow's Uses: Joint SAF-CIF Spring 2009 Meeting and Conference	March 31 - April 1	Sault Ste. Marie, MI	Maria Janowiak 905-482-6303 x 29 Tom Noland 705-946-7421
Third Annual Wildland Fire Litigation Conference	April 17-19	Reno, NV	www.wildlandfirelitigation.com
Envisioning Tomorrow's Forests: Knowledge Networking for Sustainability	April 21-23	Gatineau, PQ	www.sfmnetwork.ca
MNR Tree Marker Training Course	May 4-8	Huntsville, ON	scott.r.reid@ontario.ca
PricewaterhouseCoopers 22nd Annual Global Forest and Paper Industry Conference	May 14	Vancouver, BC	www.pwc.com/forestconf09
Canadian Forest Communities Conference: Trends and Opportunities	May 20 - 23	Nanaimo, BC	www.fcc-ccf.ca
2009 CIF Conference - Stewardship: Energizing Forestry Through New Strategies and Partnerships	Sept. 21 - 23	Nanaimo, BC	www.cif-ifc.org
XIII World Forestry Congress	October 18-25	Buenos Aires, Argentina	www.wfc2009.org

If you know about an event that should be listed here, please send the information to the editor at newsletter@opfa.ca.

OPFA Dates

EVENT	DATE
<i>The Role of Tenure, Pricing and Ownership in the Future Forests of Ontario: 2009 AGM and Conference</i>	April 22-24, 2009 Sudbury, Ontario

Submissions

Submissions are welcome; please send them to:

Caroline Mach, R.P.F., Editor
newsletter@opfa.ca

Deadline for the next issue: May 1, 2009

