

FFP North Bay Workshop, 2008 11 04 - Results of Scenario Discussions

Forest Futures Project of the Sustainable Forest Management Network

Transcribed from flipchart notes and workshop recorder files by Kyle McKenzie, Project Research Associate

Scenario A - Goods from the Woods

Important messages

- Climate change - gentle impacts
- Materialistic - commodity- based
 - Industrial (big business)
- Control in hands of few large companies
- High demand for all products
- European - very intensive management (smaller foot print)
- Water quality improved despite increased industry
- Value added + technological diversity + improvements
- Utilitarian (based on known risks)
- Exploitation
- Bio energy taken off
- Commodities → economics / \$
- Corporate benefits → where are we going?
- Capitalistic
- Industrialism
- Regulation vs. voluntary
- \$ out of green behaviour?
- Zoning of forest (use)
- Private ownership increases
- Ecosystem services decreases
 - Resources not valued in first day (no model)
- Carbon
 - Monetary value (minimal)
- Land use conflicts fester
 - Legislation??? (Does it works?)
- Increase privatization and legislative regulation, both local and corporate ownership (more)
- Regulation beefed up (increases)

How people feel

- Not a cozy feeling

Implications for northeastern Ontario

- Opportunity for North East Ontario
- Products, production, innovation
- Increased tourism (corporate); multi-use land

- Foresters better off (stable jobs)
- Community is weaken – less influence
 - Very individualistic
- Using full annual allowable cut, companies more integrated powering communities, increased utilization
- North more isolated (gas price) – more local use of products; infrastructure changes for shipping
- Larger cities, more public transit
- Increased plantations (some privatized)
- North serves South
- Sustainability decreases – trade off (capital and trade)
 - Governance of private land? Develop stronger regulations
- Farmland in north-east Ontario - convert to bioenergy plantations/ forests
- Northern rural communities moving south (food/gas)
- Increased agroforestry – food + trees; lignin in corn stalk for fuel
- Big companies taking over family-owned business
 - Stronger service industry, contractors
 - Increase recruitment for forestry and technicians
 - Increased softwood market
 - Plantations - wildlife impacts in intensive zones
 - Long term impacts... unknown
 - Food chain
 - More roads
 - Soil depletion
 - Fertilizers
 - Beneficial - stability
 - Fine woody debris
 - Biodiversity (need regulation to keep maintained)
 - Diversion of wood supply
- Annual allowable cut not currently being marketed
- Competition for wood supply
 - good for north-eastern Ontario
- Forest products would need to change
- Fire decreases
 - Bio energy / bio pulping increase
 - (Board mix – high technology)
- Market driven scenario

How people will react, policy shifts needed

- Interest group driven?
- Opposition to privatization
- North vs. South
- Jobs / workforce, is it there?

- Application of technology (bio energy / pulping)
- Population increases in North Eastern Ontario
- Retraining / quality of jobs
- Some policies already shifting this way
 - Mergers, tenure changes
- Stronger regulation but decreased community involvement (local citizens committee, non-governmental organizations)
- Housing investment in North Bay area- Disney Forest
- Bio energy policy, secretariat
- Policy will be economically- driven
- Rather than reduction in energy-use, shift to other fuels - need new technology to ensure sustainability
- Need more flexibility on transporting goods
- More improved roads (materials?) or rail? Water?
- Smaller mills in communities, more specialized value-added; some more on-site processing
- Revenue - sharing policies, land management schemes + land use policies
- Environmentally sensitive areas - more emphasis on recovery, re-introduction
 - Change import policies and transport
- Social issues – widened urban- rural gap
- Not talking full advantage of Canada's forests (more than just products)
- Drastic effects on standard of living, social status
- Less economic diversity - lack of flexibility
- Soil nutrients
- Opportunities for science
- Facilitates/complexes to produce
- Transition
- Zoning – rational vs. agro forestry
- Reconnect the public to the forest
- Management of whole area even when zoned
- Public relations / Education (awareness)
- Apathy – most of the population

Scenario B - Peace in the Woods

Important messages

- 'Warm and Fuzzy' scenario
- 'Teddy Bear' Scenario
- Collaboration and cooperation is a good thing
- Good that city people are now concerned about forest communities; not just forests
- Positive governance model
- Smaller communities don't have capacity (population) to take over management

- Government and Aboriginal empowerment can't be separated
- Some examples now of Aboriginal communities co-managing forests
- Loss of traditional forest employment is a negative

Implications for northeastern Ontario

- Areas with shallow soils (e.g. north-west Ontario) can't afford loss of nutrients to bioenergy
- Emphasis on value added wood products
- Like government and societal values of this one
- Need lots of public participation for these to work
- Much more land is currently private than will work in this scenario
- Major impacts on communities like Capus casing, Chapleau, Cochrane, north-west Québec
- Concern that bioenergy hasn't flourished, so no economic balance for communities
- Not all timber in this part of the world is suited for value-added products
- Recreation and water taking up slack is a plus, but not enough jobs
- Not everywhere here is interesting enough for tourism; growing along Lake Superior
- Bigger footprint on land from more tourists
- Lower paying, seasonal jobs
- Greater fire risks from tourists
- Need more education on forest values, for guides and tourists
- More regulation of access
- More fire from climate change
- More ignition in spring and fall
- Benefits are more seasonal; need to make them year- round
- Lots of cheap fuel for snow mobiles
- Would have to be local ownership to maximize benefits
- Getting to this scenario will be difficult
- Look at model forests for guidance
- Change needs to be supported by financial institutions and governments
- Need to decide which towns survive and which don't
- Don't prop up dieing towns
- Increase in Aboriginal empowerment may compound pressure on non Aboriginal communities
- Will value be added locally or in cities?
- 'Value added' needs to be redefined to make this work because we won't have enough primary production to add value to
- Need transportation plan to move products out and tourists in
- Need to stop exporting raw logs
- How does private sector/land fit in this scenario?
- Non-monetary incentives for private land owners (Fundy Model forest, Trees Ontario)

- Might private landowners band together to form cooperatives?
- Encourage land owners today to plant
- Examples of co-ops and incentives in Quebec
- We do have plans and models out there to achieve scenario B
- Need regulations over private land (and societal change)
- Requires slower processes (e.g. consensus)
- Heavy regulations may be needed, but not necessarily a good thing (can stifle innovation)
- Volunteers need to feel they're having an effect to stay engaged
- Keep issues at a level all can understand

How people will react, policy shifts needed

- Private land forestry
- Culture of innovation in North
- More opportunities for communities, less single resource towns
- Remove restrictions to wood supply for innovative firms
- Allocation of wood changed to bidding
- Making tenant the landlord with some rights
- Change from area to volume based (or vice versa)
- Volume per area
- Best security of supply is private land base
- How to move from a politically based industry is a leap...
- Industry too sensitive to government changes
- More like U.S. model with much greater private ownership
- First Nation in Cochrane has right to collect wood, but there's no lawyer
- This scenario is a compromise between environmentalists and capitalists (the Canadian way)
- We need to be flexible or we're not going anywhere

Scenario C - Turbulence in the Woods

Important messages

- Nasty, nasty, very nasty
- General comment: NGOs should be a driver
- Evolution of forest management
 - Exploitation
 - Regulation
 - Ecosystem management
 - Social forestry
- If we do nothing, this scenario is likely to happen
- We're still acting like cowboys
- We don't want to go through all the stages Europe did, we need to find our own path
- Something has failed to get us here (what?)

- If this started to happen, surely someone will have to step in and do something
- The Armageddon scenario

Implications for northeastern Ontario

- More urban means more disconnection from forests
- What would this more urban attitude mean to small forest communities? (Back to being frontier-towns)
- More education and money to universities in small cities, like Sudbury
- Wrestle political influence over forests from urban people
- Travel restrictions on roads through forests
- Small woodlots consolidate under the barons

How people will react, policy shifts needed

- Can current regulations deal with natural disasters
- Current economic model can't handle this scenario
- Need to introduce to society the idea that the forest isn't just for products, but is also for services
- Harvest crews could become like fire crews
- Does harvested wood get shipped around the province?
- Concentrate on reforestation between responding to disasters
- Help things move; give them pathways
- Employ fire smart techniques
- Engage government to be a facilitator with groups so that this scenario doesn't happen
- Barons have operated well on public lands
- Bioenergy would be better in this scenario than lumber
- Theme in this quadrant is chaos (we need to get smart)
- Can we compare this scenario to current situation in Eastern Europe or Central America?
- Will it take a generation to get out of this scenario?
- Therefore we need to start with this generation to avoid this scenario
- Can't change climate, but can control the societal aspect
- Governments have failed us
- Northern Ontario will have to separate from south
- Have we learned from mountain pine beetle?
- Need to focus on societal values
- Urban population is happy with all this
- No plan in B.C. for mountain pine beetle; we need a plan
- Force forest users to use downed wood first
- May have to rationalize resources to respond
- Risk management / assessment
- Political fallout in places like North Bay would be tremendous
- Service communities will be greatly affected

- How do we prevent this if urban people don't care?
- Support community forests so they don't fail and turn into baronisms
- Decentralizing government authority would make this worse, giving barons more power
- Educate urban people about value of forests so they can see this coming

Scenario D - Restoration in the Woods

Important messages

- Strong social values at the express of economic and environment
- Focused on consumption
- Forest products staying mostly in local markets
- Movement away from traditional products - more emphasis on research and technology
- Increase non-wood products
- More active, happy communities
- Drastic switch in Canadian economy from traditional forestry
- Accepted to use what is needed- not in excess (more in terms of spirituality than conservation)
- Increase pollution, consumption, overall environment degradation, happier, working together (defeatist acceptance)
- Sustainability not the focus
- Economic use (consumption) decreases – social acceptance increases
- Climate change driven
- Not preserve / adapt / respond
- Move north
- National system / federal
- Result of not being sustainable
- Provincial – communities (ownership)
- Investment is different (local)
- Aboriginal political power is up, economic power is down
- Society's will to work together
- Restoration (health & value) = adaptive as well
- Log time increases (to move)

How people feel

- Feel good society - willing to accept lower standard of living; work together as communities (not individualistic)
- Guilt

Implications for northeastern Ontario

- North Eastern Ontario will be Carolinian – not Great Lakes St. Lawrence
- Drastic wildlife changes/migration

- Much higher population - reduction in habitable land, more cramped
- NGOs changing to economic development
- Opportunity to re-introduce species at risk in new large Carolinian forest
- Forest degraded, sector diminished
- Much fewer forest professionals - more arborists and urban foresters
- More ecotourism
- More shipping through Arctic - Moosonee
 - New routes up Abitibi (canal system/ rail)
- More mines
- North Bay could prosper but not in terms of forest
- Increase in invasive species
- Mennonite furniture will take over
- Society shift (increase immigration); different values/culture
- Population up in north-eastern Ontario
- Resource distance / transportation
- Boreal decline
- Bio technology – genetics, tree modification
- Population increases (economic driven)
- North-eastern - claybelt (agriculture)
 - Ontario to Québec
- Water quality decreases – concerns quantity
- Fire control / silver tool
- The invasives of today are the indigenous of tomorrow (JP)
- Science and management regimes have to change
- Still ups and downs – climate (affects establishment of new species)
- Seed zones change; science-based; adapt
- Understanding of natural state
- Difficult to change
- Habitat change
- Bio diversity implications

How people will react, policy shifts needed

- More focus on research - medicines from forest?
- More municipal / community policies
- Social pressure for restoration, eco-tourism
- Less regulatory policies - allow flexibility
- Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources would work to restore status quo for wildlife, industry, invasive species
 - No public pressure would help sway policy
- Focus on regeneration of Carolinian species – less focus on commercial end-use
- Woodlands improvement act-like system
- Reactionary to climate disasters
- Maintain forest ‘traditional’ species

- Wildlife and fish implications
- Fundamental change (Degradation/guilt) - affecting societal attitudes
- Co-management? Realistic? (local citizens committees → important → management process)
- Tenure reform → community-based
 - How forest management unit is redrawn?
 - Thru integrated planning management
 - Forests
 - Mining
 - Agriculture
 - Parks
 - Recreation
- Control of all use
- Personal responsibility
- Regulation on impact of recreation (big ecotourism) - consumptive use
- Urban people visiting rural areas
- Escaping Toronto sweat box
- Marketing
- International travel
- Extended seasons