

COURTESY TRANSLATION

Québec, November 25, 2010

Madam Nathalie Normandeau
Minister
Ministère des Ressources naturelles et de la Faune
5700, 4^e Avenue Ouest, A 308
Québec (Québec) G1H 6R1

**Subject: 2nd modification of the 2008-2013 General Forest Management Plan
of Forest Management Unit 86-63**

Dear Madam Minister,

On September 1, 2010, the General Director of the Nord-du-Québec region from your Department submitted to the Cree-Québec Forestry Board a second modification to the general forest management plan of forest management unit (FMU) 86-63 for review.

In accordance with its mandate described in section 3.30 e) of the *Agreement Concerning a New Relationship between le Gouvernement du Québec and the Crees of Québec*, the Board reviewed the plan and the related documents submitted by the Department. The Board also reviewed the analysis report from the Nemaska and Waskaganish Joint Working Groups, submitted on October 18, 2010.

The Board notes that the modifications presented aim at assuring room to manoeuvre to the beneficiaries since several planned harvest blocks became temporarily inaccessible when a road project included in the plan was subjected by the parties to the process of environmental and social assessment (Project J).

In relation to this, we observe that the general forest management plan was modified in compliance with the provisions of the adapted forestry regime. Therefore, Board members wish to advise you that:

at the completion of the review of the documents submitted, Board members recommend the approval of the modifications presented to the 2008-2013 GFMP of FMU 86-63.

Nevertheless, the Board deems important to bring to your attention the fact that the temporarily inaccessible harvest blocks are still in the five-year plan and that the Cree

expressed some reservations about any permit emission for these blocks until the environmental and social assessment is completed.

The Board also noted in the report of the Nemaska Joint Working Group that a protected area was proposed by the Nemaska Band Council for the Lake Evans sector. This proposed area is included in FMU 86-63. A resolution of the Band Council dated September 17, 2010 was transmitted to us regarding this matter. We observe that forest management activities are planned in the projected area.

The Board therefore suggests that the authorities of your Department specify the status of the protected area proposed by the Nemaska Band Council around Lake Evans and consider a precautionary approach for forest management activities in the proposed area, if necessary.

Further to the information in this advice, we include in appendix a detailed revision sheet of the modifications presented. This document is produced for the benefit of the representatives of your Department.

Yours truly,

The Chairman of the Board,

(Original signed)

Albin Tremblay


APPENDIX

Revision sheet of modified 2008-2013 GFMP

FMU 086-63

**REVISION SHEET BY THE CQFB
MODIFIED GFMP 2008-2013: FMU 086-63**

FMU technical information

Area of the FMU	3 678 km ²	
Productive forested area of the FMU	1 764 km ²	
Concerned Cree communities	Waskaganish and Nemaska	
Beneficiary responsible for the FMU	Eacom	
Traplins included in the FMU (territories with forest planning in the GFMP underlined)		<u>N05</u> , <u>N07</u> , <u>N08</u> , <u>N08a</u> , <u>N18</u> , <u>N19</u> , <u>N20</u> , <u>N21</u> , <u>N23</u>

Analysis results of the JWG

- The Nemaska JWG recommends the approbation of the plan pending on the conformity regarding the Agreement.
- The Waskaganish JWG recommends the approval of the plan, since the concerns of the tallymen were taken into account.

Revision results of the CQFB *

The CQFB recommends that this GFMP be

<input type="checkbox"/>	Accepted
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Accepted with recommendation (s)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Refused

*Revision findings presented are the outcome of the Secretariat of the Board's analysis of the information given by the beneficiaries' representative, the MRNF and the JWGs. A detailed description of the revision methodology was sent to the Minister as an appendix to the initial advice on the review of the 2008-2013 GFMPs dated March 3, 2008.

CQFB specific recommendations

- R.1 The Board recommends the approval of the plan under the condition that the consultations for the annual plans that will follow allow the completion of the participation process started with the GFMP, in accordance with the provisions of the Agreement.

Revision timeline

Reception date of conform GFMP by the CQFB	September 1, 2010
Reception date of Nemaska JWG analysis report by the CQFB	October 18, 2010
Reception date of Waskaganish JWG analysis report by the CQFB	October 18, 2010
Production date of the GFMP revision sheet	October 20, 2010

**REVISION SHEET BY THE CQFB
MODIFIED GFMP 2008-2013: FMU 086-63**

Principle 1: GFMPs' conformity to forest allocations per FMU

Statement

- The MRNF has certified that the five-year program presented in the GFMP conforms to the forest allocations based on the annual allowable cut the Chief Forester determined in May 2008.

Comment

- None

Principle 2: Compliance with the instructions and guidelines

Statements

- The MRNF has certified that the GFMP conforms to the instructions and guidelines it defined to supervise the elaboration of the 2008-2013 GFMPs in compliance with the Agreement.

Comments

- None

Principle 3: Integration of Cree information

Statements

- The GFMP specifies that the objective of the modifications presented is to provide leeway to the agreement holder because many of the planned cut blocks became inaccessible when a road project included in the plan was subjected by the parties to the environmental and social evaluation process (project J).
- The GFMP and the participation report do not mention the use of the forest planning support maps by the agreement holder.
- The Nemaska JWG reports that the forest planning support maps were not used by the agreement holder.
- The Waskaganish JWG reports that the forest planning support maps were not used during the meetings, but the agreement holder claims he took them in consideration during the elaboration of the plan. However, the JWG members specify that they would like all these maps to be used during the meetings.
- Both JWG reports mention that the agreement holder mainly presented his planning, making some efforts to integrate Cree information, and that he postponed many requests to the annual plan.
- The participation report included in the plan mentions a correspondence with a cree outfitter in the Lake Evans area that was taken in consideration during the public consultation process that followed the tabling of the plan. The agreement holder informed said outfitter that the standards were respected rigorously. The agreement holder also invited the outfitter to register to the third-party participation for the elaboration of a next plan.

Comment

- During our 90-day analysis period, we received a copy of a resolution by the Nemaska Band Council, dated September 17, 2010, that suggests a protected area in the Lake Evans sector. We note that forest management activities are planned in the projected area .

**REVISION SHEET BY THE CQFB
MODIFIED GFMP 2008-2013: FMU 086-63**

Principle 4: Proper consultation of tallymen

Statements

- The two tallymen (N-20 and N-8 traplines) concerned by the modification to the plan were met in Val-d'Or in the first case and in Waskaganish in the second case. No new harmonization measure is added to the modified GFMP.
- The modified GFMP identifies no conflicting issues in this FMU, even though some of the tallymen's requests were not answered (road categorization (winter or summer), requests for jobs or contracts, road improvements, culvert installation and windrows removal after harvesting).
- The participation report shows that the participation meetings were led by a consultant who acted as a delegate for planning. However, it specifies that a representative from Eacom attended the meetings.
- The Nemaska JWG states that the main conflicting issues revolved around road repairs, job or contract attribution and on the negative effects of drainage. The Waskaganish JWG adds ploughing of access roads during winter. Further discussions on these subjects are scheduled during the annual plans.

Comments

- There still remain many unresolved issues that need to be addressed in the annual plan.