

Tables de réflexion sur l'avenir de la forêt

SUMMARY REPORT ON
THE PARTICIPATORY APPROACH



Note to Readers

The remarks and proposals contained in this report are a synthesis of the comments made by the participants and do not commit the Ministère des Ressources naturelles et des Forêts (MRNF). This summary does not claim to reflect the entirety of what was said orally or in writing by the participants, as the MRNF has extracted the essence of the comments and proposals.

Furthermore, the MRNF has not undertaken any verification or validation as to their accuracy. Therefore, it is important not to consider the information presented in this document as being supported or confirmed by the MRNF.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all of the citizens and organizations who took part in the Tables de réflexion sur l'avenir de la forêt. The high level of participation and the quality of the discussions and proposals testify to the importance that Québec society attaches to forests and the forest sector.

Produced by

Ministère des Ressources naturelles et des Forêts (Department of Natural Resources and Forestry)
Forestry sector
5700, 4^e Avenue Ouest
Québec (Québec) G1H 6R1

© Gouvernement du Québec
Ministère des Ressources naturelles et des Forêts
Legal deposit – Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec, 2024

ISBN: 978-2-550-98023-0 (PDF)

Towards a simplified forest regime adapted to the regions of Québec



After a year that saw an unprecedented number of forest fires in 2023, maintaining the status quo was no longer an option. A comprehensive review of the development and management of Québec's forests became a necessity. The challenges posed by climate change further underscored the need to adapt our practices to ensure the sustainability and resilience of this resource, which is crucial to the decarbonization of our economy and the economic vitality of our forestry communities.

Launched in February 2024 and deployed in 12 regions of Québec, the Tables de réflexion sur l'avenir de la forêt aimed to develop a vision for the future of Québec's forests so that they continue to provide environmental, social, and economic benefits.

I want to acknowledge the valuable participation of my governmental assistant, Daniel Bernard, member for Rouyn-Noranda-Témiscamingue, who met with stakeholders in all regions of Québec. This major exercise would not have been as successful without his contribution!

The interest generated by this broad consultation shows how important the use of the forest is to Quebecers. In just a few months, more than 1,000 people participated through questionnaires and briefs submitted by citizens, Indigenous communities, and various organizations, as well as regional tables, working sessions with First Nations, and the national meeting. This synthesis report presents the key findings gathered as part of this process, which will inform our thinking in the coming weeks and months.

We are collectively reimagining Québec's forest management for present and future generations, with the goal of increasing its contribution to the economic benefits, decarbonation and energy transition of Québec and its regions. We aim for simplified, competitive, agile and regionally tailored management. This must be done by ensuring greater predictability and better harmonization of forest land uses, particularly with Indigenous and forestry communities.

Achieving these ambitious objectives will require a modernization of the current forest regime. To do so, we must continue the work begun during the Tables de réflexion sur l'avenir de la forêt and remain committed to this desire for change.

I want to express my sincere gratitude to all those who participated in this historic exercise. Your contributions have been invaluable, and I look forward to our continued collaboration as we work to ensure the sustainability of Québec's forests!

Maïté Blanchette Vézina

Minister of Natural Resources and Forests

Contents

Introduction	1
Forest management context in Québec	1
Executive Summary	2
Approach and participation	4
Table 1. Description of the participation components of the Tables de réflexion sur l'avenir de la forêt approach	4
Table 2. Participation in regional panels	5
Comments made and solutions put forward	7
Highlights of the regional panels	7
Online questionnaires and briefs	11
Theme 1. Sustainable Management and Forest Productivity	12
Sub-theme 1. Sustainable Forest Management Approach in Québec	12
Sub-theme 2. Forest Productivity	17
Sub-theme 3. Access to Public Forest Land	21
Theme 2. Wood Supply	28
Sub-theme 1. Forest planning	28
Sub-theme 2. Contribution of Private Forests	31
Sub-theme 3. Open Market Timber	37
Sub-theme 4. Granted Forest Rights	40
Theme 3. Conciliation of Land Uses	44
Theme 4. Economic Development and Regional Benefits	48
Sub-theme 1. Forest Contribution to Economic Development and Decarbonization	48
Sub-theme 2. Forest Sector Innovation and Diversification	52
Sub-theme 3. Regionalization of Management	56
Other themes	59
Theme 5. Indigenous Partners	60
Sub-theme 1. Participation in Decision-making Processes and Consultation and Accommodation	60
Sub-theme 2. Relationship between the Department, Indigenous Communities and the Forest Industry	61
Sub-theme 3. Participation in Socio-Economic Development	62
Sub-theme 4. Skills and Capacity Development	63
Other themes	64
Conclusion	66

Appendices.....	67
Appendix 1. List of Abbreviations and Acronyms	67
Appendix 2. List of organizations invited to regional tables, by region	68
Appendix 3. List of First Nations and organizations invited to the Tables de réflexion sur l'avenir de la forêt.....	83
Annexe 4. List of participants present at the Rencontre nationale de réflexion sur l'avenir de la forêt (National Meeting for Tables de réflexion sur l'avenir de la forêt) (April 11, 2024)...	85

Introduction

On the sidelines of the "Feux de forêt 2023 - Bilan et constats" event, held on November 17, 2023 in Québec, Maïté Blanchette Vézina, Minister of Natural Resources and Forests, announced that the Tables de réflexion sur l'avenir de la forêt approach would take place in the winter of 2024.

This was a concrete response to the challenges facing the forestry sector. Climate change, among other factors, is pushing us to rethink forest management and act so that the forest can continue to generate the expected environmental, social and economic benefits for present and future generations. The approach also responded to the recommendation of the Chief Forester who, in a document published in September 2023, called for a global reflection on forest development.

Thus, from February 13 to April 12, 2024, a major participatory approach was deployed, through an online public consultation, as well as in the various regions of Québec, within the framework of meetings, in order to develop a collective vision and determine future solutions to optimize the management of Québec's forests.

The Tables de réflexion sur l'avenir de la forêt process focused on the following four themes:

- Sustainable Management and Forest Productivity;
- Wood Supply;
- Conciliation of Land Uses;
- Economic Development and Regional Benefits.

In addition, the First Nations and Inuit representatives were asked to express their views on an additional component dealing with Indigenous partnerships.

FOREST MANAGEMENT CONTEXT IN QUÉBEC

The *Sustainable Forest Development Act* (SFDA), in effect since April 1, 2013, confirms the Government's commitments in terms of sustainable forest development and sets out the provisions on which forest management in Québec on public and private land is based. The Act also provides for the development of the Sustainable Forest Management Strategy (SFMS), which sets out the vision, orientations and objectives for sustainable forest development. The *Regulation Respecting the Sustainable Development of Forests in the Domain of the State* (RSDF) regulates forest development activities on public lands.

On November 6, 2020, the government announced 26 concrete administrative measures to improve the business environment and competitiveness of companies in the forestry sector. The measures presented in this targeted revision of the forestry regime were divided into the following three components:

- Review of timber marketing mechanisms;
- Optimization of forestry planning processes
- Improving the forest industry's business environment.

Under section 224 of the SFDA, the Minister must produce and table in the National Assembly a report on sustainable forest development in the form of a five-year report. A first assessment of the current forestry regime, covering the period 2013-2018, was published in 2020. The second review, covering the period 2018-2023, is due to be published in the autumn of 2024.

Executive Summary

The Tables de réflexion sur l'avenir de la forêt process, which ran from February 13 to April 12, 2024, gathered comments and proposals from a number of stakeholders interested in the management and development of Québec's forests. In all, some 500 people were met by teams from the Ministère des Ressources naturelles et des Forêts (MRNF), in person or virtually, at regional meetings, Indigenous community consultations and the national partners' meeting. More than 500 online questionnaires were completed by citizens or partners, and 175 briefs were also submitted as part of the process.

The five proposed themes were all the subject of numerous and varied comments, representing the different perspectives on the forest, while sometimes bringing to light certain major trends. Here is a summary of the main comments made and the solutions proposed by the stakeholders.

In the theme of **sustainable forest development and productivity**, the forest fires that struck Québec in the summer of 2023 left their mark on several stakeholders. To this end, the importance of ensuring the sustainability and resilience of forest ecosystems was emphasized. To this end, a proposal was made to adopt a strategy for adapting forests to climate change and to update the ecosystem-based development approach. Although not unanimous, a large number of stakeholders were in favour of intensifying forestry production, albeit under certain conditions. However, many are aware of the social acceptability issues involved. Moreover, there is no consensus on the role of forest development in decarbonizing the economy. Finally, with regard to access to public forest land, several participants consider that the "user pays" principle is not really being applied, but that it should be. Others are concerned about the environmental impact of the current network of forest roads, particularly on watercourses and biodiversity. A number of stakeholders proposed solutions to optimize the management of the road network.

On the subject of **wood supply**, a number of points emerge, but above all, there is a desire to see greater involvement from private forests. More investment is needed to optimize the potential contribution of these forests. Several stakeholders mentioned that the current legal and regulatory framework governing private forests is complex and lacks coherence. Secondly, with regard to forestry planning, many stakeholders are calling for greater predictability, upstream consultation and a review of roles and responsibilities, notably by entrusting certain aspects to regional bodies. Opinions are also polarized on the open market for timber. Many stakeholders are positive about the introduction of an open market to obtain fair market value for timber in Québec. However, other participants questioned the need to maintain it and deplored the regional consequences of the open market, notably on forestry planning, harmonization of uses in public forests, predictability for the forest industry and conditions for forest workers. Finally, with regard to granted forest rights, some stakeholders raise the need to take into account the optimal use of resources and land in the process of granting rights.

On the subject of the **conciliation of land uses**, a majority of participants felt that all uses in public forests should be subject to harmonization processes. In addition, local integrated resource and land management panels would be appreciated by several stakeholders, although some deplore the fact that they do not have real decision-making power. Indeed, planners have little leeway to take into account concerns raised at the level of the local integrated resource and land management panels.

On the theme of **economic development and regional benefits**, several stakeholders felt that the context of the energy transition presents opportunities for the forestry sector, which can offer products with a low carbon footprint, including forest biomass. In a context where the timber supply could become more difficult, the need to diversify not only wood products, but all economic activities that depend on the forest, was expressed. The theme of regionalization, raised several times by participants, comes to the fore here. Although not unanimous, many participants would welcome greater regionalization of forest management in order to better develop regional potential and adapt management objectives to regional contexts.

On the theme of **Indigenous partnerships**, many Indigenous communities want the Gouvernement du Québec to recognize their leading role in forest management, and to commit to finding solutions based on a nation-to-nation vision. In particular, the importance for Québec of concluding treaties and agreements with Indigenous Peoples to normalize relations and create a predictable and structuring economic environment was mentioned. The First Nations believe it is essential for them to be actively involved, as far upstream as possible, in all decision-making processes concerning forest development and management. Regarding the relationship between the Department, Indigenous Communities and the forest industry, Indigenous stakeholders believe that a better understanding on both sides would improve collaboration in forest development activities. Moreover, the First Nations generally insist on the importance for their communities and members of having access to the economic benefits of forest land development. Finally, the First Nations point out that the Indigenous workforce is available and located close to the resource, as well as to regional timber processing hubs.

Approach and participation

The Tables de réflexion sur l’avenir de la forêt approach was rolled out simultaneously, from February 13 to April 12, 2024, in several participatory phases.

Table 1. Description of the participation components of the Tables de réflexion sur l’avenir de la forêt approach

Component	Target clientele	Activity	Date	Participation
Regional panels	National representative of forestry partners, including the First Nations and Inuit	In-person panels	February to April 2024	12 meetings 333 participants
Online consultation	Citizens Representatives of: • organizations • associations • groupings • companies • Indigenous communities	Online questionnaires Deposit of briefs	February 13 to April 12, 2024	425 questionnaires — citizens 116 questionnaires — partners 175 briefs
Participation of Indigenous communities	First Nations and Inuit representatives	Hybrid (face-to-face and virtual) meeting to launch the consultation with Indigenous communities Special meetings at the request of communities	February 15, 2024 February to April 2024	About 100 participants
National meeting of partners	National representative of forestry partners, including the First Nations and Inuit	In-person meeting in Québec	April 11, 2024	36 national groups (66 people)

Regional panels

Twelve in-person regional panels were held across Québec. Regional partners were invited to comment on the proposed themes, taking into account the different regional contexts. A total of 333 people had the opportunity to express their views during this regional tour.

The discussions were structured in thematic blocks and moderated by Morin Relations publiques. The moderators supervised the exchanges to ensure a fair sharing of speaking rights between the participants and to cover all of the themes linked to the approach.

The list of organizations invited to each of these meetings can be found in Appendix 2.

Table 2. Participation in regional panels

Date	Region(s) concerned	City	Nb. of participants
February 13, 2024	Bas-Saint-Laurent	Rimouski	28
February 20, 2024	Côte-Nord	Baie-Comeau	27
February 22, 2024	Gaspésie–Îles-de-la-Madeleine	Gaspé	20
February 27, 2024	Saguenay–Lac-Saint-Jean	Alma	43
February 29, 2024	Capitale-Nationale and Chaudière-Appalaches	Lévis	31
March 12, 2024	Mauricie	Trois-Rivières	31
March 13, 2024	Centre-du-Québec and Estrie	Sherbrooke	23
March 19, 2024	Outaouais	Gatineau	24
March 21, 2024	Laval, Lanaudière and Laurentides	Saint-Donat	29
March 26, 2024	Abitibi-Témiscamingue	Rouyn-Noranda	35
March 28, 2024	Nord-du-Québec	Chibougamau	17
April 3, 2024	Montréal and Montérégie	Saint-Hyacinthe	21

Online consultation

All Québec citizens and forestry partners were able to take part in the online process, either by completing a questionnaire on the proposed themes or by submitting a brief. Participants could fill in the questionnaire or submit a brief directly on the Consultation Québec platform.

The online questionnaire covered four main themes and included a total of 27 open-ended questions, giving participants ample opportunity to express their comments in relation to the proposed themes. For the consultation with Indigenous communities, there was an additional theme on Indigenous partnerships, comprising four sub-themes and nine open-ended questions.

A total of 425 questionnaires were completed by citizens and 116 by organizations on the Consultation Québec platform. In addition, 175 briefs were submitted by citizens or organizations.

Participation of Indigenous communities

A meeting with representatives of Indigenous communities was held in Québec on February 15, 2024, to which representatives of all Indigenous nations and communities in Québec were invited. Special meetings with certain communities were also held, at their request, during the consultation period. The themes addressed during these meetings considered the specific realities of Indigenous communities and their concerns as expressed in the past. In all, some one hundred participants from Indigenous communities were met. This report presents a summary of the comments and possible solutions put forward by the relevant Indigenous communities or organizations, from February 13 to May 16, 2024.

National meeting of partners

Finally, a meeting bringing together representatives of national organizations concerned with forest development and development was held in person in Québec on April 11, 2024. A total of 66 people, representing 36 national groups, took part in the meeting.

As with the regional panels, discussions were structured into thematic blocks and moderated by Morin Relations publiques.

Comments made and solutions put forward

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE REGIONAL PANELS

Bas-Saint-Laurent

The meeting on February 13, 2024 was an opportunity to note that the Bas-Saint-Laurent is an example of effective regional cooperation and reconciliation of forest land uses. Elected municipal officials are calling for greater delegation of forest development and land-use planning powers, as well as the sharing of royalties collected in State-owned forests with regional county municipalities (RCMs).

The active role of the private forest, the region's diversified industrial structure and the consensus in favour of intensified forest development are elements that set the region apart. Several stakeholders are also involved in improving conditions for forestry workers.

Issues concerning the development of maple syrup production potential, the financing of silvicultural work, timber auctions and the protection of forests against the spruce budworm epidemic were raised.

Côte-Nord

The February 20, 2024 meeting highlighted the importance of forest development jobs in the region, but also the challenges associated with workforce recruitment. The Côte-Nord region is distinguished by the size of its public forests, but this represents a challenge due to the fact that work is spread out over the territory, as well as the associated supply and road maintenance costs.

Concerns were raised about potential reductions in allowable cuts related to the protection of woodland caribou habitat and future protected areas. Moreover, stakeholders stressed the need for incentives to maximize the use of wood left in the forest following natural disturbances. The implementation of cogeneration plants to promote the use of forest biomass was proposed.

Most stakeholders are in favour of intensifying forest development, if this is done in a concerted regional fashion and with the allocation of substantial silvicultural budgets.

Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine

The Gaspésie meeting was notable for the commitment of forestry stakeholders to sustainable forestry that reconciles the various uses of forest land, notably conservation, recreational tourism and forest development. The majority want regionalized, adaptive management.

The February 22, 2024 meeting highlighted the challenges associated with protecting the habitat of the mountain caribou, a vulnerable species, and the effects on forest development. Issues included the abundance of forest roads, the lack of funding for their upkeep, and the consequences of neglected roads on river water quality. Greater predictability in forestry planning would provide for a longer-term view of the road network.

The stakeholders raise the need for increased forest protection against the spruce budworm epidemic that is plaguing the region. To this end, there is a desire to see greater local use of wood from degraded stands.

Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean

Participants at the February 27, 2024 meeting stressed the importance of regionalizing forest management so as to enable greater involvement of local elected representatives. To achieve this, they would like to see a review of the governance and its provisions, to ensure that management is adapted to regional realities as well as greater accountability for local forestry professionals.

The significant repercussions of the 2023 forest fires were highlighted, as was the need to invest in the regeneration of burnt areas. Adaptation of the development approach is also targeted to manage the risks associated with natural disturbances and climate change.

Finally, concerns were expressed about the potential reduction in allowable cuts associated with the protection of woodland caribou habitat and the creation of protected areas, as well as the associated socio-economic benefits.

Capitale-Nationale and Chaudière-Appalaches

The February 29, 2024 meeting highlighted the importance of private forests in the Chaudière-Appalaches region's timber supply. Issues related to the recruitment and financial support of new forest producers, the complexity of the regulatory environment and invasive alien species in these forests were raised.

Maple syrup production also makes an important contribution to the regional economy. To this end, it is hoped that the forest development of these areas will be adapted to ensure their long-term survival.

The public forest land in the Capitale-Nationale region is coveted by many users due to its proximity to the urban environment, thereby complicating the harmonization of uses. Moreover, the proximity to research and development organizations helps stimulate innovation in the region's forestry sector.

Mauricie

The Mauricie region boasts a vast public forest that is used extensively by the forest industry, vacationers, wildlife managers, maple syrup producers and Indigenous communities. People live in the forest, which complicates the harmonization of uses on the territory and increases the need to maintain multi-purpose roads in order to ensure their safety. The forest industry also plays an important role in the economic growth of rural areas.

The March 12, 2024 meeting highlighted the need for greater upstream stakeholder involvement in forestry planning, notably on structured wildlife territories, to promote the reconciliation of land uses and increase harvest predictability for the forest industry. Maple syrup production is also booming in the region.

Centre-du-Québec and Estrie

The Centre-du-Québec and Estrie regions stand out for the abundance, diversity and productivity of their private forests, their high maple syrup potential and their well-established industrial structure, notably in the secondary and tertiary processing sectors.

The March 13, 2024 meeting highlighted the involvement of passionate stakeholders and their desire for the forest to be at the heart of their region's development. Increased use of wood in construction, better valorization of fibre and development of maple syrup potential are proposed to enhance regional economic development. However, it remains a challenge to reconcile maple syrup development with the needs of the forest industry.

The stakeholders share their concerns about invasive exotic species and increasing pressure on forests as a result of browsing by deer. Diversification of replanted species, notably through assisted migration, is proposed as a way of increasing forest resilience.

Outaouais

At the March 19, 2024 meeting, stakeholders testified to the difficulties with which the region has been confronted since 2019, notably due to the closure of a paper mill, which weakened the regional forestry industrial structure. In the absence of hardwood pulpwood buyers, it is a challenge for forestry companies to make their harvesting operations profitable and maximize resource use. In addition, several forest

industry operators say that they now have to source wood from outside Québec, where it is cheaper and of better quality. This drop in harvesting is leading to a reduction in road network maintenance by industry operators, and therefore problems of access to the land for other users.

The Outaouais region is distinguished by its vast public forests, diverse in forest species, notably noble hardwoods, and the communities that inhabit them. It is also characterized by its large number of structured wildlife areas and its potential for increasing forestry and maple syrup production in public and private forests. The region is also affected by global changes, notably the increased risks associated with invasive alien species and fires.

Laval, Laurentides and Lanaudière

The Laurentides and Lanaudière regions are characterized by the importance of vacationing, recreation and tourism, and by the number of people living in the forest, which reinforces the need to adapt forest development to meet the concerns of the local population. According to some stakeholders, forestry rights currently take precedence over other rights in the public forest. To this end, they suggest that the economic benefits of each activity be taken into account in planning, notably those of maple syrup production.

The meeting on March 21, 2024, the International Day of Forests, highlighted the need for transparency and popularization of mechanisms for participation and reconciliation of land uses. On the other hand, the multiplication of harmonization constraints to be met is a challenge that limits predictability and complicates field operations for forest contractors and industry operators. Some mention that local governance of forest land management could help to reconcile uses and foster a sense of belonging.

Abitibi-Témiscamingue

The Abitibi-Témiscamingue region is characterized by the importance of the forest for the entire population, and the economic activity that it generates. The forest land is inhabited and used by Indigenous communities, hunters, fishermen and vacationers. Forests are therefore highly coveted, and stakeholders would like to see forestry take greater account of the value of other resources, notably non-timber forest products (NTFPs). The various stakeholders want to get involved in forest management so that it better meets their needs.

At the meeting on March 26, 2024, concerns about forest fires and community protection, as well as the return to production of burnt areas, were shared. Of particular note was the importance of increasing protection efforts and developing adaptive forestry.

Other challenges raised by participants included the abundance and maintenance of forest roads, the maintenance of moose and woodland caribou habitat, and the development of markets for unsold timber.

Nord-du-Québec

The Nord-du-Québec region stands out for its innovative forest industry and the pride of the people who work there in contributing to the region's wealth and vitality. Many municipalities are forest-based, and recent mill closures have weakened some communities.

The March 28, 2024 meeting gave stakeholders an opportunity to voice their concerns, notably about the scale of the forest fires in the summer of 2023, their impact on mill supply and the needs associated with once again rendering these areas suitable for production. Some point to the increased risk of fire in the region as an opportunity to develop products from biomass. Others mention the issues associated with wood transfers from the region to outlying areas, brought about by the open market for timber.

The Paix des braves, an agreement between the Gouvernement du Québec and the Cree nation, is a step forward that sets the region apart, creating concrete forestry intervention provisions and a special consultation process for the Crees.

Montréal and Montérégie

The Montreal and Montérégie regions are characterized by their private and municipal woodlands distributed over a predominantly agricultural and urbanized territory. The forest helps reconnect citizens with nature, making it a prime location for communicating the benefits of forest development to the public. The stakeholders stressed the importance of protecting natural, wetland and riparian environments, improving forest connectivity and adapting forest development to global change.

The meeting on April 3, 2024 was an opportunity for participants to voice their concerns about invasive exotic species and the excessive browsing of overpopulated White-tailed Deer. In the absence of a local integrated land and resource management panels, the need was expressed for a forum to establish a regional strategy to deal with these issues.

Finally, private forest development is threatened by restrictive municipal regulations and the dwindling number of active forest producers.

ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRES AND BRIEFS

Comments and possible solutions were grouped mainly according to the themes and sub-themes proposed to participants in the online questionnaires, in the participants' workbook for the regional panels and in the participants' workbook for the Indigenous community consultation.

Theme 1. Sustainable Management and Forest Productivity

- Sub-theme 1. Sustainable Forest Management Approach in Québec
- Sub-theme 2. Forest Productivity
- Sub-theme 3. Access to Public Forest Land

Theme 2. Wood Supply

- Sub-theme 1. Forest planning
- Sub-theme 2. Contribution of Private Forests
- Sub-theme 3. Open Market Timber
- Sub-theme 4. Granted Forest Rights

Theme 3. Conciliation of Land Uses

Theme 4. Economic Development and Regional Benefits

- Sub-theme 1. Forest Contribution to Economic Development and Decarbonization
- Sub-theme 2. Forest Sector Innovation and Diversification
- Sub-theme 3. Regionalization of Management

Other themes

Theme 5. Indigenous Partners

- Sub-theme 1. Participation in Decision-making Processes and Consultation and Accommodation
- Sub-theme 2. Relationship between the Department, Indigenous Communities and the Forest Industry
- Sub-theme 3. Participation in Socio-Economic Development
- Sub-theme 4. Skills and Capacity Development
- Other themes

THEME 1. SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT AND FOREST PRODUCTIVITY

SUB-THEME 1. SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT APPROACH IN QUÉBEC

Main comments

A number of comments converge on the need to better integrate the various dimensions of **land-use planning** into forest management. Thus, for many stakeholders, forest land management should better integrate the following aspects:

- The management and conservation of wildlife and its habitats, notably caribou;
- Supervision of mining activity;
- Management of the road network;
- Activities of the First Nations;
- Recreational tourism;
- Maple syrup production;
- Hunting and fishing.

The importance of ensuring the adaptation and **resilience of forests** to climate change was recognized by the majority of participants, and to achieve this, an evolution of forest management would be necessary. Among the main comments received on this subject:

- Forest development is a key tool for ensuring forest resilience, notably to climate change, and reducing the risks associated with natural disturbances such as fire and invasive alien species;
- A reflection on forest adaptation and resilience in the context of global change should be based on the best available scientific knowledge. However, the latter were not presented as part of this consultation;
- The forest development approach should be revised to address market uncertainties, long-term needs and the impact of climate change;
- Nature-based solutions should be recommended in order to meet the challenges of climate change and biodiversity;
- In recent years, research institutes have issued a number of recommendations on adapting forests to climate change, but few concrete actions have been undertaken.

The stakeholders put forward that sustainable forest development should be considered to ensure the **sustainability of forest ecosystems** before that of the timber supply. Its implementation should also incorporate objectives such as forest adaptation and resilience, and wildlife habitat enhancement. Consequently, forest management should give priority to maintaining and enhancing the various functions of the forest, notably climatic, wildlife and landscape functions, and then allow timber production when the primary functions are assured. Comments received on this subject include the following:

- Restoration silviculture should be favoured over timber production silviculture, to avoid forest degradation;
- Forests should not be artificialized or adapted to the needs of industry;
- Partial cuts should be encouraged, clearcuts reduced and harvesting rates lowered;

- Forest development should be based on science and research-based knowledge;
- Silvicultural interventions should ensure that maple syrup potential is maintained in the medium and long term.

Participants in the consultation also agreed on the need for forest managers to adopt a **frame of reference** or national strategy to combat and adapt to climate change. This frame of reference should define effective measures to make forests resilient, notably with regard to natural disturbances. Reservations, questions and proposals were expressed on the measures to be implemented:

- Forest management should prioritize the diversification of tree species, focusing on those that are most resistant to fire, drought, flooding and pest infestation;
- Assisted migration by planting would be a risky and costly practice, as plantations are often simplified ecosystems with low genetic diversity;
- Ecological corridors are essential for combating and adapting to climate change, and for preserving biodiversity;
- Increasing the retention of wildlife attributes, internal structures and old-growth stands in both intensively and extensively managed areas should be a priority.

The stakeholders also mentioned that the Gouvernement du Québec should continue its efforts to create more **protected areas** in the forest environment. In terms of conservation, these stakeholders report that Québec essentially uses the strictest protected area categories so as to achieve its targets. In their view, conservation should not be limited to the "glass bell" principle. Consequently, all categories of protected areas should be involved in achieving forest conservation objectives.

The **ecosystem-based development** approach, as it has been deployed for over 10 years in public forests, is also the subject of numerous comments, ranging from abandoning the concept to fully maintaining it. Nevertheless, the majority of comments were in line with a desire to update this approach so that it can better respond to the challenges of climate change and make the forest more resilient. The main comments made by participants can be summarized as follows:

- The reliance on the natural resilience processes of forests, as envisaged by ecosystem-based development, should be continued;
- The foundations of ecosystem-based development are still relevant and deserve to be implemented in a new perspective of strengthening forest resilience to global changes;
- Since its inception, ecosystem-based development has reportedly been only partially applied, as the profitability of forestry operations is generally prioritized to the detriment of the ecosystem functions of development;
- Any reference to pre-industrial forests no longer seems viable in the context of climate change;
- The premises underlying the development of the 2010 forestry regime have evolved. The risks associated with extreme events generated by climate change have increased, and forest development should be adapted to these new realities;
- The application of ecosystem-based development is having a marked effect on allowable cuts, particularly in terms of maintaining age structure and old-growth forests;
- Targets for old-growth forests should not be lowered, since they play a crucial role in ensuring ecosystem resilience and the survival of many wildlife species, and therefore in the overall balance of forest ecosystems.

The consultation also raised questions about the **governance** of State-owned forests. Some comments questioned current forest governance, notably the role and responsibilities of the ministry responsible for public forest management.

- The Department should refocus its mission on the development of laws, policies, strategies, regulations, scientific knowledge and monitoring of forest management.
- The legislative, regulatory and normative framework is too rigid, making it impossible to adapt forest development to regional particularities and to innovate, and without giving forest engineers any latitude or ensuring their professional accountability.

Several **Indigenous communities** commented on the sustainable development approach. They indicate that they are on the front line of the effects of climate change and forest fires on the land and their way of life. For them, adaptation is not just about timber production: forest resilience is an essential condition for maintaining their traditional activities. They consider it important to maintain resilient ecosystems in order to continue enjoying the services provided by them over the long term.

- The First Nations are united in their desire to participate in combating and adapting to climate change. They are taking action in this direction and are demanding concrete and rapid action from Québec to preserve biodiversity and protect their rights and interests.
- Forest development and operations have a major influence on biodiversity and forest ecosystems, and consequently on the rights and interests of the First Nations. These operations lead to the fragmentation, simplification and homogenization of stands and landscapes, the loss of old-growth forests, the deterioration of watercourses and water quality, and the loss of wildlife habitats and biodiversity.
- The global changes threatening forests call for a more cautious approach to estimating allowable cuts.

Main avenues for proposed solutions

The solutions proposed by the participants aim to steer sustainable forest development towards concrete actions intended to meet the challenges raised by climate change.

Several possible solutions were presented to help forest development evolve towards **adaptation to climate change**. For the most part, they are part of the quest for complementarity between development and forest conservation initiatives.

- Implement an approach that continues to rely on the natural forest and its dynamism to adapt and thus promote ecosystem resilience.
- Encourage forest diversification, in terms of species and structure, notably by introducing hardwood species close to municipalities, thereby reducing the risks associated with forest fires.
- Reduce harvesting rates to maintain a greater number of mature forests capable of regenerating naturally:
 - precautionary reserves could help to better manage the risks of future disturbances and climate change, contribute to carbon sequestration and the maintenance of biodiversity, and support social values associated with the forest, including those of many Indigenous communities.
- Slow forest rejuvenation and vary the composition of forest stands by diversifying stands, while respecting the natural composition of the forest.
- Rapidly implement fire protection measures to protect human communities and key infrastructure:
 - the use of prescribed burning as a preventive measure could reduce the costs and risks associated with fighting fires.

- Create a national observatory for Québec's forests, which could report to the Auditor General of Québec, in order to mobilize scientific knowledge. This could help improve public confidence in forest management.

Other actors believe that forest adaptation should aim to:

- pursue forest normalization, i.e. the search for a more balanced distribution of age classes, through greater removal of mature and overmature forests and thus reduce forest vulnerability by rejuvenating the canopy while improving productivity and carbon sequestration;
- manage the forest across the entire forest land, even in areas designated, to a certain extent, for conservation, considering that forest development is a tool for ensuring forest resilience;
- immediately manage forests north of the northern boundary of the attributable forests to increase the area of managed forest. Conditions may be marginal in some years, but would improve from year to year.

A majority of participants suggested that **silviculture should be geared towards adapting forests** to climate change. The primary objective of silvicultural work would then be the maintenance and improvement of the natural mechanisms of forest resilience.

- Promote functional diversity during silvicultural work.
- Rapidly deploy large-scale assisted migration projects. For example, hardwood species such as sugar maple and red maple should be planted at the limits and beyond their current ranges.
- Giving free rein to hardwood regeneration reduces silvicultural effort, while helping to reduce the vulnerability of forests to future fires.
- Maintain future seed trees (on 10% to 15% of the area) during harvesting in areas at greater risk of fire.
- Maintain seed trees in salvage cuts after a natural disturbance.
- Encourage partial cuts and reduce the number of clearcuts.
- In maple stands, carry out maple-forest gardening, with more frequent, lower-intensity interventions.

One of the objectives of sustainable forest development is to contribute to the development and management of a network of protected areas. With regard to **conservation**, some participants suggest:

- including all areas excluded from forest development in Québec's protected areas report;
- expand protected area categories to meet conservation targets, for example by using sustainable-use protected areas or protected areas for maple syrup production;
- deploy connectivity corridors between protected areas.

The reflection on the sustainable forest development approach has also generated proposals on the choices to be made or the priorities to be given in terms of **financing forest management**. Considering the size of Québec's forests, the challenges of adapting to climate change and the limited financial resources available to society, participants felt that strategic choices would have to be made.

- Prioritize funding for adaptive silviculture, including the restoration of forests degraded by regeneration failures.
- Set up pilot projects for the assisted migration of species with high adaptation potential.
- Mobilize human and financial resources to support forest communities in adapting to climate change, with the creation of a budget envelope for:
 - developing innovative silvicultural practices;

- strengthening forest resilience.

With a view to revising the forestry regime, the **First Nations** emphasize that they should be part of the solution, with a view to achieving sustainable forest development. They point out that Indigenous peoples have unique knowledge and practices for the sustainable management of land and natural resources. This knowledge should be taken into account in the fight against climate change and in the efforts to tackle the biodiversity crisis. They also stress that the adopted solutions must respect their rights and aim to maintain conditions favourable to the flourishing of their cultures. They believe that more nature-based solutions offer greater potential for meeting their needs.

Like a number of other stakeholders, they recommend a reduction in forest harvesting pressure, coupled with better application of the precautionary principle in forest management. Their suggestions for the main avenues for improvement were as follows:

- Promoting the adaptive capacity of forest ecosystems should be the primary objective of forest management;
- Taking into account the various ecosystem services;
- Ensuring the conservation of mature and old-growth forests;
- Protecting and restoring valuable wildlife habitats;
- Applying appropriate water protection measures;
- Promoting connectivity by limiting fragmentation and expansion of the road network;
- Taking into account the cumulative effects of forest development;
- Better anticipating the repercussions of global change, notably fires;
- Excluding protected areas from harvesting operations;
- Revising the Chief Forester's mandate to better integrate biodiversity conservation objectives and the maintenance of the adaptive capacity of forests and their various ecosystem services;
- Diversifying the types of cut, silvicultural interventions and species replanted;
- Putting a brake on forest rejuvenation;
- Experimenting with new forest development processes, while monitoring these experiments;
- Drawing up vulnerability profiles for managed areas, identifying deficiencies in the functional diversity of forests in order to plan adaptive silviculture.

Solutions specific to northern environments, located north of the territorial boundary of attributable forests, were also mentioned:

- Considering a precautionary approach, involving local and Indigenous populations, in order to establish a coherent vision of northern environments north of the territorial boundary of attributable forests, given that forest dynamics in these environments could evolve in response to a changing climate;
- Providing access to forest inventory data compiled in Nunavik, since changes in climate and forests will influence the abundance, distribution and productivity of plant and animal species that are crucial to the way of life of the territory's Inuit, Naskapi and Cree populations.

SUB-THEME 2. FOREST PRODUCTIVITY

Main comments

Many concerns were raised on the theme of the **intensification of forestry production** on certain portions of the public forest. Some are very much in favour of this approach, while others are completely opposed. Between these two positions, a majority of comments are favourable under certain conditions, while others express a certain skepticism as to the effectiveness of this approach and its social acceptability.

The location of **areas reserved** for the intensification of forestry production appears to be a challenge for consultation between the various actors in the forest environment. Some call for these zones to be located close to communities and timber processing plants, while others call for them to be located away from populated areas so as to avoid conflicts of use.

Favourable comments mainly emphasized that this approach would make it possible to:

- bring together silvicultural investments in strategic locations and better protect these investments;
- locate timber production close to processing plants, thereby reducing transport costs and associated greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, while having a positive effect on workers' conditions;
- concentrate forestry production on certain parts of the territory, while stimulating the creation of new protected areas and thus contributing to the achievement of government conservation targets;
- encourage silviculture in areas where more economic value can be generated for less wood to be harvested;
- maintain or increase the allowable cuts;
- facilitate the harmonization of uses, the planning of interventions and increase predictability;
- promote better recovery of wood fibre in the field, and its reclamation.

Unfavourable comments, or those expressing skepticism, can be summed up as follows:

- Intensifying timber production leads to an imbalance in forest ecosystems;
- Forests should not be treated with a purely production-based vision: biodiversity must be respected in every location;
- A monoculture of trees, with selected or modified species, runs counter to respect for the integrity of forests;
- The intensification of forestry production on certain portions of the forest land would not make it possible to supply plants with the same volume of wood as currently;
- Instead, we should be focusing on better adapting our practices to users and biodiversity;
- Increased use of silviculture can be achieved without zoning;
- Silvicultural efforts should be concentrated in areas affected by natural disturbances.

Other comments are favourable if certain application conditions are met.

- Private forests should be considered first and foremost, not least because of their higher productivity and their location.
- Intensification strategies should be accompanied by increased silvicultural investment and recurring budgets.

- The production of goods with high economic value should be targeted, rather than the production of the largest volume of wood.
- The surface area of protected areas should actually increase, thus reaching the 30% target, particularly for woodland caribou, in parallel with intensification.
- Intensification should be done without artificializing forest ecosystems.
- Intensive silviculture should not result in any setbacks to ecosystem-based development objectives, such as reducing the number of old-growth forests or over-representing young forest stands.
- The use of pesticides and phytocides should remain prohibited.
- This approach should also be implemented as part of the deployment of silviculture capable of adapting to climate change.
- The costs should be borne by the forest industry.
- Site selection should be carried out in consultation with local and Indigenous communities. It should be the result of a regional participatory approach.
- This approach should incorporate objectives aimed at a circular economy.

However, some stakeholders suggest that intensification should not result in the creation of new protected areas. Instead, this intensification should be carried out in addition to the development of Québec's natural forests, thereby increasing or maintaining the allowable cut.

The stakeholders mentioned that the Gouvernement du Québec should consider the forest as a carbon sink and proceed with forest development that includes a focus on increasing the **capacity of forests to capture carbon from the atmosphere** as part of the fight against climate change. Increasing the carbon capturing capacity of forests would involve designating areas for intensified silviculture and maximizing productive forest areas, notably by reforesting forest heathlands, harvested areas or sites that have undergone natural disturbance.

- A more productive forest would store more carbon, which could then be used in wood products, encouraging substitution for other products with a higher carbon footprint.
- Some also mention that forest carbon should be considered as a marketable product that can be used to create wealth, notably through the carbon market.
- A majority of stakeholders are in favour of increasing the use of wood in construction in order to help store carbon and decarbonize the economy.

Some of the comments made on the role of forestry production in **carbon sequestration** and **decarbonization of the economy**, however, reveal a degree of skepticism.

- Many question the real benefits of carbon sequestration by managed forests in the fight against climate change, given the risks of forest fires that release large amounts of carbon into the atmosphere.
- Some also question the actual carbon sequestration in wood products and the calculation of GHG emissions from these products.
- Others stress the importance of reducing or even avoiding forest harvesting, in order to leave the carbon sequestered in ecosystems for as long as possible, or to promote forest conservation.

Several **Indigenous communities** also commented on the intensification of forestry production. The majority of these comments express serious reservations about respect for their rights, the continuation of their members' traditional activities and the maintenance of biodiversity. Some First Nations are open to the idea of intensifying forestry production, but with strict conditions attached.

Most of the received comments express major reservations and can be summarized as follows:

- Many Indigenous nations and communities have long been opposed to the designation of timber production intensification areas or similar projects;
- For Indigenous communities, areas devoted primarily to timber production represent a further dispossession of territory, with detrimental effects on traditional activities, biodiversity and the naturalness of ancestral territories;
- Artificializing stands would not be acceptable.

Comments more favourable to the intensification of forestry production, under certain conditions, can be summarized as follows:

- The deployment of intensive silviculture could, if it complies with certain specific criteria, be an acceptable compromise to mitigate foreseeable declines in allowable cuts resulting from the designation of protected areas and measures put in place to protect woodland caribou;
- It is imperative for areas of intensive forestry not to be excluded from ecosystem-based development objectives;
- The intensification of forestry production, on certain portions of the forest land, could be viewed favourably, provided that it enables plants to be supplied with the same volume, on a smaller territory;
- There should be no timber production intensification zones in family areas or territories of interest known and listed by the communities;
- Forest development should be guided by concrete, verifiable evidence of the state of forest regeneration and productivity. Allowable cuts and wood allocation should not be based on anticipated results, but on actual results;
- All government decisions on intensive development should be based on studies, scientific knowledge and the knowledge and expertise of Indigenous communities.

Moreover, some communities indicated that they would have liked to see studies and knowledge supporting intensive development in general presented as part of the consultation process.

How could forestry production contribute more to carbon sequestration and decarbonization of the Québec economy?

- Optimal management of forest carbon would lead to changes in development strategies;
- Old-growth forests represent important carbon stocks to be conserved. Protecting these forests should be part of the solution to global change;
- A national forestry strategy to combat global changes, developed in consultation with scientists and First Nations, is desirable.

Main avenues for proposed solutions

Adapting forestry practices to climate change, the return to production of fire-ravaged forests, concerted action by stakeholders, Indigenous nations and the general public, and budgetary choices consistent with forest sustainability objectives were among the issues that influenced the solutions put forward by participants in terms of **forestry production intensification and zoning**.

- Promoting intensive forestry for restoration rather than intensive forestry for wood fibre harvesting. For example, it is proposed to target degraded forests, those in a state of decline and those that have suffered regeneration accidents in order to intensify forestry production.

- Ensuring the financing of silvicultural works for at least 10 years.
- Developing and implementing pilot projects dedicated to the adaptation of forestry practices to climate change:
 - these projects could include zoning to differentiate development approaches according to local priorities;
- Creating maple syrup production and protection areas;
- In connection with timber production objectives, focusing on value rather than volume.

The **financing of forestry production intensification areas** was the subject of several proposals, which can be summarized as follows:

- Soliciting private investment to finance intensification;
- Setting up a forestry investment fund to ensure that investments are made in line with the needs of the forest;
- Increasing financial resources for silvicultural work to compensate for volume losses due to forest fires and to ensure that burned land is brought back into production;
- Setting up a fund to respond to natural disturbances;
- Implementing incentives to maximize the use of wood fibre currently left in the forest.

Finally, several possible solutions focus on the process of **selecting areas for intensification**.

- Implementing a collaborative process from the outset of the zoning process, while including representatives from the First Nations and municipalities:
 - the prioritization of intensification zones should be carried out in consultation with local and regional actors with responsibility for land-use planning;
 - local integrated land and resource management panels (TLGIRTs) could be called upon to contribute to these exercises.
- Planning for zoning to evolve as the context changes.
- Linking the process of designating sites for forestry production intensification with that of achieving the target of 30% protected areas by 2030.
- Prioritizing intensification on the most productive soils and within a 100 km radius of plants.
- Prioritizing private forests.
- Focusing on areas where silvicultural investments are already being made.
- Carrying out economic analyses when establishing zoning so as to target activities that generate the most economic value.
- Carrying out a strategic environmental assessment, overseen by the Bureau d'audiences publiques sur l'environnement du Québec (BAPE), to develop a better social consensus on forest zoning.
- Ensuring the monitoring of sites over time, including performance indicators.

Numerous solutions were put forward to ensure that forest management and wood processing contribute to **carbon sequestration** and the **decarbonization of the Québec economy**. There are two main approaches to forest carbon sequestration.

The first approach aims to maintain forest carbon stocks in ecosystems for as long as possible in order to limit greenhouse gas emissions. Participants then suggested:

- preserving mature forests, lengthening rotations and reducing clearcuts;
- developing a carbon management strategy that includes the conservation of mature forests;
- protecting peatlands and conserving old-growth forests;
- encouraging the production of large-diameter timber to maximize long-term carbon storage;
- planting long-lasting species that will not be harvested in 50-60 years;
- prioritizing timber harvesting in areas where forests have been identified as less effective at storing and capturing carbon.

Conversely, another approach proposes to increase harvesting in order to rejuvenate forests and, in turn, stimulate their growth and carbon sequestration. This approach would also make it possible to obtain more forest products with the potential to play a role in decarbonizing the economy.

- Shortening rotation periods and increasing wood yield per hectare treated through more dynamic silviculture.
- Investing in the bioeconomy.

Other possible solutions could be compatible with the two previous approaches:

- Limiting the loss of productive land by optimizing the road network;
- Reforesting agricultural wastelands and vacant lands;
- Bringing unproductive lands back into production, notably forest heathlands and stands affected by natural disturbances;
- Making silvicultural choices that generate wood suitable for the production of building materials;
- Implementing forest development strategies that aim for carbon neutrality by 2050 and carbon negativity thereafter, including the development of a comprehensive carbon balance for the forestry sector with the designation of targets for GHG emission reduction and carbon sequestration;
- Concentrating forestry activities in short circuits to limit transport and GHG emissions;
- Optimizing the use of all forest residues;
- Adopting a carbon credit protocol in public forests to reward good practices and ease the protocol applicable in private forests.

SUB-THEME 3. ACCESS TO PUBLIC FOREST LAND

The network of multi-purpose roads in State-owned forests extends over more than 470,000 km. It benefits multiple users.

The *Sustainable Forest Development Act* and the *Regulation respecting the sustainable development of forests* regulate and govern forest development activities in State-owned forests, including activities related to forest roads.

Main comments

On this theme, participants were first invited to comment on the changes that should be made to the management of the multi-purpose road network.

Various comments were made regarding the **management, planning and maintenance of the road network**:

- There is currently no long-term vision of the road network to be developed and maintained;
- More predictable forestry planning would optimize network development and reduce road construction costs:
 - the five-year time horizon anticipated in tactical integrated forest development plans is too short,
 - better integration is needed between harvesting and silvicultural planning.
- Entrusting the development of public forests to the Department leads to disengagement between companies and the land on which they operate, while discouraging investment in roads;
- The current development approach results in harvesting sites being scattered across the territory, leading to a multiplication of roads, thus increasing the negative environmental, social and economic impacts;
- The Regulation Respecting the Sustainable Development of Forests in the Domain of the State (RSDF) is too rigid and costly;
- The maintenance of the multi-purpose road network is seemingly insufficient:
 - more specifically, some stakeholders deplore the fact that the RSDF only governs road construction and rehabilitation work, but not its monitoring and maintenance,
 - user safety is also a key concern for stakeholders;
- The development of a multi-purpose road network creates access to structured wildlife areas that are not desired by managers, and for which no one is responsible for maintenance;
- Increasing the number of roads in the forest would have a negative impact on long-term allowable cuts by creating areas where trees will not be able to regrow.

The multi-purpose road network elicits concerns about **environmental protection and biodiversity**.

The stakeholders point out that forest roads lead to ecosystem fragmentation and loss of ecological connectivity, soil compaction and increased predator movement, thus weakening endangered species such as the woodland caribou. Roads are also an important vector for the establishment of invasive exotic species. Unmaintained roads contribute to the degradation of watercourses.

A number of stakeholders also pointed out that climate change and extreme weather events represent new challenges for maintaining the road network.

On the **deployment of the multi-purpose road network**, stakeholders mentioned that:

- Road development should be kept to a minimum, and the maintenance or restoration of existing roads would be better than building new ones;
- Access to the land is essential, especially for forest communities. For them, the roads are assets in support of the region's development;
- Safety issues were also raised, notably in view of the heavy traffic for lumber transport;
- New roads should not be built on the periphery of an area under study for a protected area;
- An updated map of the network should be available for consultation.

A large number of stakeholders consider that no major changes are required in terms of the responsibility for the **financing and maintenance** of the multi-purpose road network. Essentially, they suggest maintaining the "user pays" principle.

However, others consider that the **"user pays principle"** is not actually being applied.

- Not all users contribute to financing the maintenance of the multi-purpose road network.

- Territory managers (ZECs, outfitters or RCMs) receive many requests from users to maintain multi-purpose roads, even though they have neither the responsibility nor the financial means to do so.

Some stakeholders mentioned that the "user pays" principle works for construction work, but is ineffective when it comes to road maintenance. The lack of coordination means that efforts and investments cannot be optimized.

While some recognize that the opening of multi-purpose roads has enabled better access to the territory, it is also recalled that these roads initially meet the needs of industry. As such, the industry should assume greater responsibility.

The stakeholders also made more specific comments on this subject:

- State funding of forest roads in public forests creates unequal competition with the owners of private forests, who bear the vast majority of maintenance costs;
- Programs to fund road maintenance are said to be complex and ill-suited to certain users, notably maple syrup producers and vacationers.

There appears to be no consensus among participants regarding the **dismantling** of multi-purpose roads. Participants notably mentioned:

- that better upstream planning would avoid building too many roads and having to close them;
- that the decision to close a road should be taken at the planning stage;
- that the needs of all users should be taken into account before closing a road;
- that the decision to dismantle or maintain roads should reflect a considered compromise between human and ecological needs.

Some stakeholders mentioned that the closure of multi-purpose roads could be encouraged in the context of restoring certain wildlife habitats. It would make it possible to:

- Recreate natural environments;
- Reduce fragmentation of forest ecosystems, which could be beneficial for species that are sensitive to the edge effects of roads;
- Protect certain species from predation, which is facilitated by access to multi-purpose roads;
- Prevent damage to roads caused by bad weather, thereby reducing their impact on the environment. These degraded roads also represent safety risks for users.

Bringing the roads back into production would also increase timber production.

Roads could also be closed to facilitate the harmonization of uses.

- Local integrated land and resource management panels are considered to be a good venue for discussing such decisions.

Closing unused roads would also serve to reduce the maintenance costs for roads which, according to some participants, are not unsustainable in the long term.

Nonetheless, a good number of stakeholders consider that constructed roads should not, in any context, be closed once again.

- Roads are essential for intervening during forest fires.
- Dismantling operations would be too costly.
- Silvicultural work and monitoring would be compromised by road closures.

- Forest development assumes a return of the harvest over time, so there will always be a need for access to the resource.

Road construction is a major concern for many **Indigenous communities**. They notably raised the following points:

- The cumulative effects of roads in public forests (fragmentation of the territory, negative consequences on biodiversity, including caribou, repercussions on the hydrological network and increased use of public land) infringe on the rights and interests of the First Nations;
- If Québec adopts road network management plans, these should take into account the effects of climate change and wildlife;
- The growth of the network of forest roads in recent years is said to have contributed to the fragmentation of forest landscapes;
- Many infrastructures are left in poor condition due to inadequate maintenance. The high cost of maintaining secondary infrastructures often encourages companies to build new roads instead of reusing the existing road network;
- Road closures, combined with better planning and management of the territory (granting of occupancy rights, management of occupancy without rights, better wildlife monitoring), would be a means of better protecting the rights of the First Nations in relation to the practice of their activities;
- Road closures can be an economic development opportunity for communities;
- Road closure procedures are long and complex, thereby preventing quick and efficient management of the current network.

Main avenues for proposed solutions

On the changes that should be made to the **management of the multi-purpose road network**, participants proposed the following solutions:

- Provide Québec with a genuine multi-purpose road management framework that:
 - would include consultation with the MRNF, municipalities, the forest industry and users of the multi-purpose road network,
 - would address road management issues, including construction, closure, maintenance and financing of the multi-purpose road network,
 - would assess the ecological consequences in order to determine the necessary actions,
 - would include measures for adapting to climate change, as well as strategic access points for fighting forest fires.
- Provide each region with a master plan for multi-purpose roads within its territory, which would establish primary, secondary and tertiary axes;
- Develop a vision of the main framework of the road network over a minimum period of 10 years;
- Designate a project manager or planner for each region, with the task of managing the multi-purpose road network:
 - the project manager should be independent, autonomous and accountable for the designated territories,
 - he/she should be able to develop a comprehensive and coherent plan for the needs of all users.

- Integrate the development of multi-purpose roads into more strategic planning, in consultation with other users:
 - adopt a more participatory governance model to develop a concerted vision for the entire territory,
 - particularly for structured wildlife areas: plan forest development and access management at the same time.
- Create zones with specific uses, for which the management of the multi-purpose road network would be adapted;
- Amend the *Regulation Respecting the Sustainable Development of Forests in the Domain of the State* (RSDF) to allow more flexible, objective-based management and less costly infrastructures, while ensuring access to the territory and protection of water environments. For example, the RSDF could enable:
 - ford-crossings on low-use roads,
 - installation of removable culverts,
 - other road classes adapted to the intended use.
- Include normative provisions in the RSDF to cover the entire useful life of the roads and provide for their maintenance;
- Establish programs for regular road maintenance that would include:
 - monitoring road conditions, repairing damaged areas and road surfaces, and providing adequate signage to warn of the dangers of certain intense activities such as timber transportation,
 - rehabilitation of watercourse crossings,
 - adaptation of the road network to climate change,
 - forest fire response deployment.
- Develop information systems on the condition and use of multi-purpose roads;
- Introduce a system enabling all users to report work requirements to the Department's regional teams.

Other proposals are also mentioned:

- Review the forest development approach to limit road construction;
- Manage the territory by watershed, to better take into account the impact of roads on the hydrographic network;
- Prioritize the construction of winter roads;
- Raise user awareness with regard to safety and caution on forest roads;
- Fund research projects aimed at finding new ways to reduce the impact of forest roads;
- Greater control of traffic on multi-purpose roads to ensure the safety of users, notably off-road vehicle enthusiasts.

Regarding the **financing and responsibility for the maintenance** of the multi-purpose road network in public forests, various solutions were proposed:

- Make the government responsible for financing and maintaining the road network, since it is a public asset. The government should ensure that the "user pays" principle is applied to road maintenance;

- Entrust Rexforêt with the management and maintenance of the roads;
- Entrust the forest industry with the maintenance of multi-purpose roads:
 - increase the proportion of maintenance funding provided by the forest industry.
- Increase royalties on the use of natural resources and land in order to finance the road network:
 - create a reserve fund from these royalties, to which all business sectors should contribute.

Various models for **sharing responsibilities and financing** are envisaged by the participants:

- Entrust the MRNF with responsibility for primary and strategic roads, leave the management of secondary roads to regional or local organizations while, finally, leaving private enterprise with responsibility for the tertiary roads that provide access to the resource;
- Share costs between users in proportion to their respective usage;
- Reinforce the "user pays" principle by levying contributions directly on user fees and permits;
- Impose an access fee for access to forest lands in the State domain.

As mentioned above, for many stakeholders, management applied on a **local or regional** scale would be preferable.

- Entrust an organization dedicated to resource and land management with the implementation of regional strategies for network development and maintenance. This organization would manage the entire network, including the sharing of costs between the various users.
- Entrust land managers with responsibility for roads on their territory, such as RCMs or structured wildlife areas.
- Require user associations, such as vacationers, to assume greater responsibility.
- Improve the budgets of the Sustainable Forest Management Program (PADF).

Various provisions are proposed according to the types of developments or types of forest roads with regard to the **dismantling** of roads:

- Maintain only primary roads that provide access to communities or facilities, and ensure their recurring and adequate maintenance;
- Maintain and upkeep roads in intensive production areas;
- Dismantle, remove watercourse crossings and bring back into production roads included in extensive forest development areas, after bringing harvested areas back into production;
- Dismantle and put back into production tertiary roads (summer or winter harvesting site roads);
- Avoid road closures in harvesting areas used for partial cutting;
- Better anticipate the category of roads to be built when non-commercial silvicultural work is planned in subsequent years.

Other proposals are also mentioned:

- Systematically close unused roads;
- Upon the completion of forest development, transfer responsibility for maintaining the road to new users. If this is not possible, the road should be dismantled;
- Provide for the dismantling of roads in the following situations:
 - in case of major biodiversity risk, notably in the context of protecting woodland and mountain caribou,

- the territory is located in a proposed protected area,
- there is a risk of damaging a watercourse.
- Set up a compensation system for road management. For example, for each road built, close the equivalent elsewhere in the same development unit;
- Base decisions regarding road dismantling on analysis grids that include various criteria, notably the long-term usefulness of these routes for different users.

Some of the **First Nations** put forward proposals regarding the management of the multi-purpose road network:

- Develop a management plan for access roads as part of climate change strategies, but also in line with the timber production strategy to reduce fragmentation and increase forest resilience;
- Include processes to limit road expansion and plan schedules for closures and maintenance. The closing of roads after works should always be part of the harmonization tools;
- Develop an access road management plan based on a priority analysis designed to distinguish between single-use roads, whose closure should be promoted, and essential safety infrastructures, whose maintenance should be promoted;
- Finance road maintenance operations on a pay-as-you-go basis. The main accesses should be the responsibility of the government, while the industry would be responsible for secondary accesses built for harvesting purposes;
- Grant public funding for multi-purpose roads only when the applicant can demonstrate multiple use of the infrastructure;
- Review and improve road planning, including non-commercial work, from the harvest planning stage and limit the construction of new permanent roads as much as possible;
- Promote the use of temporary watercourse crossings.

THEME 2. WOOD SUPPLY

SUB-THEME 1. FOREST PLANNING

Main comments

The stakeholders point out that the **forest planning process**, under the responsibility of the Ministère des Ressources naturelles et des forêts (MRNF), is cumbersome, complex and carried out in a vacuum. The framework governing this process is rigid, and leaves little room for professional latitude. Moreover, as a result of the many stakeholders involved in the process:

- the sequence of commercial and non-commercial work is not optimal;
- there is a reduced feeling of belonging to the territory;
- there is less local knowledge of the terrain;
- there is a lack of accountability on the part of stakeholders.

There is a **disconnect between planning and forestry operations** in the field, which is detrimental to the efficiency and profitability of both harvesting and non-commercial silvicultural operations. The Department is not sufficiently accountable for results, notably with regard to the deadlines for providing planning to timber supply guarantee holders (BGA). In addition, the sectors planned by the Department do not supply all of the volumes included in the timber supply guarantees.

All stakeholders mentioned the need for greater **predictability** in forest planning. The outcome of this lack of predictability includes:

- Increased operating costs;
- Difficulties with the production of forest seedlings, non-commercial silvicultural work and labour recruitment;
- Inefficient development of the multi-purpose road network
- An obstacle to investment in product innovation and diversification;
- A lack of optimization of resources.

Other holders of rights granted in the area would like to be consulted at an early stage in the forest planning process. For example, managers of structured wildlife areas, who invest in the area in order to provide services, wish to be more involved in the process so as to ensure the future of their business.

Forest development plans are difficult for stakeholders and forest users to understand, because of their technical content and their format, which cannot be described as user-friendly. The tactical forest development plan, from which the other plans are derived, is abstract and needs to be better popularized.

The stakeholders mentioned that the **Annual Forest Harvesting Programs** (PRANs) were authorized too late. On the other hand, certain discrepancies between the PRAN and the reality on the ground result in additional operating costs, and require planning to be adapted in order to honour the granted forest rights.

More rigorous **monitoring of harvested areas** should be carried out to ensure compliance with regulations. Concerns have been raised about the availability of budgets and manpower to carry out the reforestation and follow-up work needed to achieve the expected yields. Other concerns relate to the lack of follow-up to ensure that work complies with current standards.

The stakeholders point out that forest planning should aim to **maximize the value** of the products generated on a territory, rather than the quantity of wood. The value of carbon and forest ecosystems

should be taken into account, as well as all other uses of the forest, including tourism, maple syrup production, hunting, fishing, trapping, Indigenous rights and so on.

Main avenues for proposed solutions

Many stakeholders agree on the need to develop a **common regional vision** of public land management, shared by all partners.

The stakeholders mentioned that the **State's role** should be refocused on policy development, the monitoring and management of activities, and accountability. If the State remains involved in forest planning, its role should be limited to strategic planning, while tactical and operational planning should be entrusted to a third party with regional roots.

A number of stakeholders suggest reviewing the **bodies responsible for forest planning**, notably to allow greater control of forest management by regional actors. A new decentralized governance structure, accountable to and representative of local users, should be put in place. Avoiding the application of a single overarching approach is recommended. Here are some suggested examples of how this might look:

- Appoint a regional planner or forestry commission responsible for integrating the planning of all resources, uses and values of the territory, with a mandate to propose and adopt a development plan for the territory;
- Create land-use development corporations, independent of government, accountable and responsible for reconciling different land uses, establishing development plans, supervising and monitoring silvicultural work, and ensuring accountability;
- Re-establish a regional body along the lines of the CRRNT (Commission régionale sur les ressources naturelles et le territoire);
- Decentralize and regionalize the process, while maintaining the MRNF's role in forest planning;
- Entrust Indigenous communities with the management of their traditional territories.

In addition, greater **involvement of the various upstream users** in forest planning would be desirable, particularly in terms of operational planning. To this end, the following suggestions were identified in order to better consider users' concerns in forest planning:

- Recognize the rights and interests of Indigenous communities, and place Indigenous nations at the heart of forest planning in order to establish with them projects and modes of governance compatible with their aspirations;
- Ensure the collaboration of non-commercial silvicultural companies in the development of operational forest development plans so as to increase the predictability and efficiency of their operations;
- Enhance protection measures around recreational and resort infrastructures by introducing generic, standardized norms or harmonization measures to better take them into account in planning;
- Involve the Société de protection des forêts contre le feu (SOPFEU) and the Ministère de la Sécurité publique (MSP) in forest planning, especially near communities, to take fire risks into account;
- Involve maple syrup professionals in forest planning to benefit from their expertise in maintaining the maple syrup potential of maple stands;
- Designate areas to be protected by consensus, prior to forest planning.

A majority of stakeholders would like to see the time horizon for forest planning extended to allow for greater **predictability**. This longer-term planning is needed in order to improve the competitiveness of forestry companies and their ability to invest, increase the efficiency of multi-purpose road network development, facilitate workforce recruitment and retention, and improve the reconciliation of land uses with other users.

- Return to forest planning on three distinct levels: long-term (strategic and calculation of allowable cuts), medium-term (tactical) and short-term (operational).
- Plan forestry operations over a 10 to 15-year horizon, while maintaining at all times a five-year planning horizon for sectors in which uses have been harmonized.
- Ensure long-term planning so as to better assess the effects of forest development on biodiversity and reduce the risk of disturbance to wildlife habitats.
- Provide planning to silvicultural contractors in the autumn of the previous year so as to facilitate work planning for the season.

Some stakeholders suggest a review of the forest **planning process**.

- Simplify the process, notably by reducing the number of steps and stakeholders involved.
- Increase feedback between the performers of the work and the planners thereof, in order to improve planning.
- Review, within the MRNF, the delegation of certain decisions to reduce delays, notably with regard to changes in the destination of the timber or the application of the multi-purpose road assistance program.

Some stakeholders mentioned the need for a review of the content of **forest development plans**. Here are some of the suggestions:

- Include all post-harvest silvicultural activities, notably site preparation, reforestation and thinning, in the management plan;
- Better adapt the planning of harvesting sites to realities in the field;
- Integrate analysis and objectives for the value of different environmental resources into the various planning stages;
- Consider production constraints and costs, as well as the needs of regional industry and neighbouring regions, to determine short-, medium- and long-term value objectives;
- Incorporate into tactical integrated forest development plans a monitoring of objectives and results to ensure the achievement of regional timber production strategies;
- Adapt maple syrup development plans to ensure that maple syrup potential is maintained, with more frequent, lower-intensity interventions;
- Allow more innovation in forest development plans and silvicultural work (e.g., pre-commercial thinning in intolerant hardwood stands with under-canopy softwood reforestation);
- Offer training in technologies such as LiDAR and drones, to promote their use in forest planning.

The stakeholders also made suggestions regarding a review of the **scale of forest planning**:

- Use three planning scales: provincial (strategic), regional (tactical) and local (operational);
- Vary the scale of operational planning according to the type of territory, for example, by planning on the scale of outfitter territories with exclusive rights;
- Split development units into smaller areas to enable more appropriate planning and a more realistic workload for the planner in charge;

- Align the boundaries of development units with the administrative boundaries of municipalities and RCMs so as to facilitate cooperation within the territory.

There should be greater **popularization** of the forest planning process for the general public. The "Open Forest" (Forêt ouverte) interactive map should be used to disseminate the various produced forest development plans and make them easily accessible to all.

SUB-THEME 2. CONTRIBUTION OF PRIVATE FORESTS

Main comments

The stakeholders view as highly complex the **legal and regulatory framework** that governs private forest development. Municipal bylaws are said to be numerous, inconsistent and sometimes unscientific. The main comments made to this effect are the following:

- The MRNF does not have sufficient powers or the necessary means to oversee private forest development and interact effectively with the other departments and municipalities that legislate and regulate forest development activities in private forests;
- Municipal bylaws are often left in the hands of people who are not properly trained to assess plans or interventions;
- The regulations adopted in some municipalities are so restrictive and variable from one municipality to another that it discourages many owners as well as the businesses offering to provide them with services;
- The amendment to the Municipal Taxation Act, which increased the penalties for illegal tree felling, is said to be a brake on the mobilization of forest producers;
- Maple syrup producers in private forests face administrative and regulatory challenges that hinder the development of their businesses.

The stakeholders commented on the **governance and management** of private forests, notably with regard to the resources allocated to the MRNF and regional private forest development agencies, which are said to be insufficient.

Mobilizing timber from private forests is a challenge. A small proportion of the allowable cut is harvested and marketed. Here are the comments made in this regard:

- The cost of development plans is a barrier to landowner buy-in;
- Given their productivity and proximity to plants, private forests should help mitigate declines in allowable cuts in public forests in some regions;
- Ongoing awareness-raising and education work needs to be carried out with all private owners, in order for them to perceive their forest lots as an asset with income potential, and not simply as a land asset;
- Lacking value and an attractive price for their wood, more and more private owners are abandoning silviculture in favour of conservation;
- A commitment by forest producers to protect investments made on their lots for five years would not ensure that, in the long term, these investments would be accessible in terms of timber volumes to processing plants.

The **prices offered** for timber from private forests are not high enough, which discourages owners from managing their woodlands. Here are the main comments on the subject:

- The low forest royalties charged in public forests depress the value of timber in private forests. This phenomenon is exacerbated in regions dominated by public forests;
- Private producers receive the same price per cubic metre as in the 1990s;
- The timber producers' unions lack the necessary strength to have real leverage in negotiating the prices offered to owners.

The annual timber volumes that can be purchased by the timber supply guarantee holders coming from public forests, are residual volumes determined while taking into account other sources of supply, such as timber from forests. However, the application of this **residuality** principle is questioned by some participants:

- Some plants consume little or no volume from private forests;
- Some timber producers unions would prefer medium- and long-term agreements with a few large companies, rather than numerous agreements with all of the companies established on the territory;
- Although included in the supply scenario for supply guarantee holders, access to these volumes is guaranteed.

Comments on the **financing** of private forests:

- Organizations working in private forests need long-term, predictable programs to mobilize forest owners to harvest timber, bring harvested sites or sites affected by natural disturbances back into production, and ensure education of the populations;
- Investments in private forests are more profitable than in public forests, as they generate more volume in less time. In addition, such forests are more easily accessible and the risk of natural disturbances, such as fires, is reduced;
- Investments in private forests would need to be increased, as budgets for the private forest development and development program have not been indexed and have not kept pace with increases in the cost of work, resulting in a steady decline in the area managed and the number of forest producers benefiting from the program;
- The development envelope is allocated to a limited number of long-established, accredited forestry advisors. This practice therefore always favours the same circle of professionals, restricts space for those offering more diversified services, and limits the choice of forest producers;
- The forest industry, the partner that stands to benefit most from development efforts, does not contribute enough to financing silvicultural work in private forests;
- Funding for silvicultural treatments focused on timber production are given priority over other private forest development objectives, including non-timber forest products, agroforestry, wildlife and biodiversity;
- The list of treatments eligible for financial assistance is limited compared to treatments carried out in public forests. For example, reforestation with hardwood species and partial cutting are little or non-existent.

As for **tax measures**, few municipalities take advantage of the possibility of setting a separate tax rate for forestry buildings, in accordance with the *Municipal Taxation Act*.

A number of comments relate specifically to the **development** carried out in private forests:

- Private forest development offers a number of socio-economic benefits and should be intensified, while ensuring the preservation of its ecosystem and social functions;

- Private forests should be prioritized for intensification of forest development;
- Private forests are managed in the same way as public forests, with no regard for their specific characteristics;
- The role of the private forest goes beyond timber supply, and it is important to highlight the types of development carried out by private owners to increase the ecological value of their land and to develop uses complementary to forestry, including maple syrup production.

The **production protocol for carbon credits** in private forests does not take into account the overall forest development of a territory, and is a major brake on the development of these forests.

Main avenues for proposed solutions

The stakeholders generally recommend that the government invest more resources in private forests to realize their full potential, and recognize their strategic importance in policy and their role in the context of climate change. In addition, a number of suggestions were made for improvements to the legal and regulatory framework to make it lighter and more in tune with forestry science, thereby facilitating the work of municipal and forestry stakeholders and optimizing social, economic and environmental benefits. One of the measures requested by many stakeholders is to hold a new Private Forest Summit. Here are more detailed ways to improve the contribution of the private forest.

Possible solutions are formulated for **government laws and regulations** concerning private forest development:

- Give the MRNF greater responsibility for private forest management, in order to ensure a coherent legal framework and simplify the representation needs of private forest stakeholders by making a single department responsible for this file;
- Provide a framework for private forest management in the *Sustainable Forest Development Act* and the *Regulation respecting the sustainable development of forests*;
- Introduce provisions in the *Act Respecting the Preservation of Agricultural Land and Agricultural Activities* with the aim of protecting the right to produce timber in private forests;
- Separate sustainable forest development from urban tree felling in the *Act respecting Land Use Planning and Development*;
- Strengthen the legal framework applicable to private forests to ensure the protection of rare species as well as threatened or vulnerable wildlife and plant species;
- Establish a permanent management regime for flood zones, riverbanks and coastlines;
- Diversify conservation methods for private forests so that they make a greater contribution to achieving government conservation targets, notably including a very light conservation status for forest owners who do not wish to manage their woodlots.

The stakeholders also suggested streamlining and standardizing **municipal forest development regulations**:

- Transfer the power to establish forest development regulations from municipalities to the RCMs, and harmonize existing municipal regulations at the RCM level;
- Reserve the power to regulate logging to local municipalities;
- Support the RCMs and municipalities responsible for tree felling and canopy protection regulations to ensure consistency with forest development practices, while respecting the autonomy of local governance;
- Adopt stricter municipal bylaws to protect watercourses;

- Protect investments made during zoning changes and provide for measures to compensate forest producers affected by these changes, notably with a view to preserving sensitive environments;
- Increase the penalties for infringements anticipated in the regulations.

Comments on the **governance and regionalization of private forest management**:

- Review the role and operation of regional and private forest development agencies to give them greater latitude;
- Reinstate regionalization of assistance programs and the rate schedule for the value of silvicultural work;
- Increase agencies' budgets and strengthen the means at their disposal to ensure the protection of investments;
- Conduct agency performance audits;
- Encourage the sharing of services between agencies, relax the administrative requirements imposed on them and reform the billing system;
- Include other representatives on the boards of regional private forest development agencies, notably maple syrup producers and environmental organizations.

The stakeholders suggest improvements to promote the **protection and development of private forests**:

- Improve the content of forest development plans;
- Increase support for woodland owners in their development and conservation practices, notably by offering them adapted tools;
- Intensify development, notably because of their greater productivity, accessibility and proximity to plants;
- Develop non-timber forest products (e.g., maple products, mushrooms, fruits, nuts) that add value to the local economy;
- Protect the forestry vocation and limit fragmentation (e.g., recultivation).

Other proposals concern the framework and mechanisms for **promoting maple syrup production** in private forests:

- Set up technical and financial aids specific to maple and forest development in order to provide support to maple producers producing on private land;
- Extend the application of the residuality principle to maple syrup production, so that quotas are allocated in private forests before being allocated in public forests.

Suggestions are made concerning the **supervision of roads and infrastructures**:

- Better marking of driving bans during thaw periods on the local class 1, 2 or 3 road network;
- Revise and enlarge the MRNF's Program for reimbursement of costs for forest development on multi-purpose roads for the rehabilitation of infrastructures serving forested areas, to provide financial support to municipalities whose roads serve large private forest stands.

Here are the solutions proposed to **increase wood mobilization** in private forests:

- Offer forest owners a profitable and predictable market;
- Improve incentives for private forest owners to manage their woodlots;
- Implement tools to mobilize hardwood cultivation;

- Require woodlot owners to be active or pay a special tax to finance silviculture for those that are;
- Draw inspiration from programs offered to young farmers to encourage the next generation of foresters;
- Innovate to find ways of reaching owners that are not producers.

Other proposals aim to improve **the marketing** of timber from private forests:

- Involve the Timber Marketing Board (BMMB) in the sale of timber from the private forest;
- Establish, through the BMMB, harvesting criteria, costs and royalties for private forest harvesting in order to better document this sector;
- Offer industrial beneficiaries their scripted volume from the private forest with a buyer's right of first refusal, to give them real access to "other resources" timber volumes such as those from the private forest;
- Ensure that small sawmills have access to a minimum percentage (e.g., 25%) of timber harvested from private forests;
- Modernize the timber producers unions model;
- Find outlets for residual volumes left on the cutovers;
- Require forest producers to adhere to a forest certification process, notably that of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC);
- Increase transparency in reporting on the effectiveness of contingency plans;
- Empower private owners to negotiate their own timber prices.

The stakeholders put forward suggestions to promote the application of the **residuality principle**, which aims to prioritize the use of timber from private forests by industry operators:

- Set up mechanisms to encourage or oblige industry operators to source their timber first from private forests, for example:
 - link the maintenance of timber supply guarantees (GA) to the annual purchase of a volume of timber from private forests,
 - reduce the annual volumes in public forests anticipated in timber supply guarantees when a natural disturbance affects private forests, in order to prioritize the harvesting of this timber.
- Increase public forest royalties to make private timber more attractive, or provide fewer incentives for forest rights holders to buy from the public forest;
- Annually review the determination of volumes that can be harvested in private forests, based on the actual marketing needs of forest producers over the course of the year (currently done every five years).

Some stakeholders suggest modifying the **financing** of private forests:

- Improve budgets for private forests, provide for their indexation and make them recurrent, at least for five years;
- Review the distribution of the Private Forest Development Program budgets between regions, for example:
 - by allocating budgets in proportion to the region's allowable cuts or the potential value of the products that can be made from it,

- while taking into account the remoteness of markets and the low attractiveness of the Forest Producers' Property Tax Rebate Program for forest producers in certain regions.
- Maintain the historical distribution of budgets between regions;
- Continue to lobby the Government of Canada to increase the contribution of private forests (tax schemes and the 2 billion trees program), notably to reforest areas affected by natural disturbances;
- Review the forest industry's contribution to the development of private forests;
- Create categories of forest producers, such as committed, semi-committed and basic forest planners, and assign budgets and marketing priorities to them on the basis of produced volumes;
- Modernize forest development assistance programs to include innovative, science-based approaches adapted to the specific characteristics of private forests;
- Adapt programs, standards and measures to meet the needs of large forest owners;
- Reinstate funding for forest development plans for forest producers through the Private Forest Management and Development Program, especially for new owners;
- Fund the improved forest development plans;
- Increase the range of subsidized work, notably for:
 - ecological improvement of private woodlands,
 - restoration of the banks of lakes and watercourses,
 - silvicultural treatments designed to adapt to climate change;
- Make available the rate grid for the value of silvicultural work for private forests early in the spring;
- Include a 10% risk margin and a 10% administration fee in the value of silvicultural treatments for private forests, as calculated by the Timber Marketing Board.

Modifications are proposed to better **protect public investments** in private forests:

- Adopt a regulation to protect investments carried out, requiring the repayment of sums invested when owners change direction;
- Link financial assistance in private forests to a requirement to sell harvested timber to Québec wood processing plants so that the timber is processed in Québec.

The stakeholders suggest changes to the **taxation** of forest producers so as to encourage owners to manage their woodlots:

- Make a portion of income from timber sales tax-free;
- Extend the forest income averaging measure indefinitely;
- Relax tax rules concerning the length of time certain expenses can be depreciated;
- Make it mandatory for municipalities to introduce a separate tax rate for the category of forestry buildings, and support them financially;
- Introduce a personal silvicultural savings and investment plan for forest producers;
- Introduce a new silvicultural investment tool, namely the forestry investment credit;
- Amend the *Regulation respecting the reimbursement of property taxes for recognized forest producers* in order to:
 - introduce compensation for recognized environmental services (e.g. wetland conservation) in eligible activities,

- modify the ceiling on eligible expenses.

Possible solutions aim to **increase wooded areas** and **limit deforestation**:

- Refine agricultural zoning to allow, in certain cases, the planting of forest seedlings where yields are insufficient (e.g., flood-prone farmland, soils that are difficult to drain);
- Provide a framework for greater control over deforestation in private forests so to limit competition with other uses, notably agriculture and urban development.

Suggestions were made concerning **new woodlot owners**:

- Revise the penalties for non-compliance with a regulation so that they fall on the offender in the form of a fine and not on the new purchaser of the lot. For example, the new purchaser of a lot cannot benefit from the services of private forest development agencies for 10 years if the previous owner has not complied with his/her forest development plan;
- Include forestry production in the *Protection of Land and Agricultural Activities Act* so as to prevent new buyers from abandoning forest development.

Recommendations for **forestry advisors**:

- Clarify the role and responsibilities of forestry advisors so that they can be more proactive with forest producers;
- Better equip advisors to adapt private forests to climate change by providing them with vulnerability maps, technical reference manuals and more hardwood reforestation.

The following suggestions were made to increase the contribution of private forests to the **fight against climate change**:

- Promote the benefits of development, in the carbon balance, as a new incentive in a context of monetization of carbon emissions;
- Implement policies and incentives to encourage the development of forest bioenergy from private forests;
- Offer enhanced support for adapting forest development to climate change;
- Develop a prevention and response plan for natural disasters that may occur in Québec's private forests.

Suggestions were made concerning **communications** about private forests:

- Inform forest owners of the benefits of forest development activities, notably in the context of global change;
- Publicize the amount of timber cut by forest owners and communicate the real cost of cuts;
- Conduct annual reporting at the provincial level.

SUB-THEME 3. OPEN MARKET TIMBER

Main comments

Many stakeholders are **positive** about the introduction of an open market to obtain fair market value for timber in Québec. They also appreciate the contribution of the entity created within the Department to set up this open market and ensure its operation, i.e. the Timber Marketing Board (BMMB).

- The open market would be the best tool for establishing the fair market value of timber. It would give Quebecers the assurance that forest resources are sold and used in an optimal and transparent way.
- The most efficient companies would be rewarded with an open market. By creating competition for volumes, the open market would reward performance and companies that generate more added value for each harvested tree.
- It would enable Québec to defend itself against its trading partners. Though the softwood lumber dispute with the U.S. continues, some participants feel that the situation would be even more problematic without an open market.
- Many would like to see the open market give access to timber volumes to other stakeholders, which was not possible before its introduction.
- The open market would offer greater flexibility for the sale of one-off timber volumes, notably those harvested after a natural disturbance.
- The auction would also make it possible to establish more accurately the forest royalties payable by the industry to the government.
- The open market would also be appreciated by timber producers in private forests, as it would make it possible to more accurately establish timber prices in these territories.
- The work of the BMMB has brought to light a variety of economic and statistical data useful for the understanding of the timber market. These data are also used by some stakeholders, such as cities and RCMs.

However, other participants, particularly forest rights holders, **question** the need to maintain an open market for timber.

- The initially stated objectives of the open market for timber have not been achieved in full.
- Some participants mentioned that the open market has had negative effects on:
 - forest planning;
 - harmonization of uses in the forest;
 - predictability;
 - optimization of operating costs;
 - workers' conditions.
- The BMMB does not assume the same responsibilities, obligations and conditions as forest rights holders, which leads to biases in the selection of operation zones for the open market.
- The open market has meant a loss of territorial identity for companies in the forestry sector. This situation has notably had an impact on the predictability and development of forest road networks.
- The lack of predictability caused by the open market limits the ability of forestry companies to invest and develop.
- Some stakeholders claim that the BMMB is mainly used to optimize royalties to the State, to the detriment of private stakeholders.
- The open market has led to a significant increase in forest royalties in Québec, which are higher than in other Canadian provinces, thereby creating a loss of competitiveness for Québec-based companies.
- There are other methods than the open market for calculating the fair value of timber.

- Given the importance to Québec of the profits generated by the forestry sector as a whole, less importance should be attached to determining the fair value of timber.
- Some participants questioned certain auction principles, such as:
 - the minimum price;
 - closed auctions;
 - unsold sectors, which are not taken into account when calculating the market value of standing timber.

Challenges to the functioning of the open market are also highlighted:

- The open market is less efficient in regions where there is little competition;
- Greater transparency in open market mechanisms is desirable;
- Despite the objective of promoting access to timber volumes for various stakeholders, it is still difficult for smaller companies to compete on the open market;
- The mechanism used to index the market value of standing timber is not sufficiently responsive to changes in market prices for finished products;
- Externalities such as environmental consequences are not included in the calculation of the market value of standing timber.

Indigenous stakeholders noted that:

- Any changes to the mechanism for ensuring that timber harvested from public forests is sold at fair value should be subject to consultation with Indigenous peoples.

Main avenues for proposed solutions

The participants suggested a number of **improvements and changes** to the operational provisions of the open market.

- Maintain or even increase the timber volumes sold on the open market:
 - some stakeholders are proposing to sell 100% of the timber on the open market.
- Reduce or completely withdraw timber volumes offered on the open market.
- Only sell timber on the open market for residual volumes or in exceptional situations, notably for volumes affected by natural disturbances.
- Use a floor price based on known indicators such as a finished goods index in regions where competition is weak.
- Remove the open market from regions where competitiveness is not high enough to maintain good open market conditions.
- Consider sites not sold on the open market as having zero or negative market values.
- Ensure that the BMMB assumes certain additional responsibilities and obligations, notably in forest planning processes, to be fair to other forest rights holders.
- Promote access to timber volumes on the open market for small and medium-sized companies:
 - reserve timber volumes for these categories of company.
- Have a survey carried out by independent experts, in order to formulate recommendations for achieving open market objectives.

Improvements and changes were proposed by participants regarding the **establishment of the market value** of standing timber:

- Adapt the mechanisms for establishing the market value of standing timber based on the open market for timber in line with international court rulings and the protectionist measures of foreign legislation;
- Take better account of harmonization costs when establishing the market value of standing timber;
- Integrate timber from private forests into the various mechanisms used to establish the market value of standing timber;
- Take the value of ecosystem services into account;
- Support the market value of timber on the supply costs of industry operators by means of a survey;
- Improve mechanisms for adjusting the market value of timber to the current prices of the various products resulting from its use, so that its value is more responsive to market fluctuations.

SUB-THEME 4. GRANTED FOREST RIGHTS

Main comments

There are a multitude of rights granted on public land. It is common for rights to overlap. This situation raises questions about the **compatibility and cohabitation of** different rights and **access to the territory**.

- Certain rights, particularly forestry and maple syrup rights, take precedence over others.
- Some rights are perceived as constraints on forestry rights, rather than as rights in and of themselves.
- The multiplication of rights granted on public land complicates the task of protecting biodiversity.
- A number of rights are incompatible with the mission of structured wildlife areas, or are granted without due regard for it.
- Right holders appropriate public land by acting as if their right constituted a land right, thereby interfering with or restricting other uses.
- Maintaining maple syrup production potential should be a priority to ensure the sustainability of maple stands, and maple syrup licensees should be better supported to maintain and improve the productivity of maple stands in operation.
- The vitality of the forest industry should remain a priority, and there are already enough constraints on harvesting.

Several participants commented on the **management and granting of rights** on forest land, which could be improved and optimized.

- Existing rights should be considered before granting new ones.
- Consultations should be held before granting new rights.
- The economic criteria that guide decisions to grant rights should be reviewed, notably to ensure that the most profitable rights are granted, or to give priority to Québec companies over foreign ones.

Several stakeholders also discussed the **benefits** associated with the various granted rights and the **royalties** associated with them.

- The annual royalty related to the timber supply guarantee is no longer justifiable and should be eliminated. Moreover, the government collects an annual royalty on the volumes anticipated in the timber supply guarantee, even though these volumes are not fully guaranteed in the planned sectors.
- Certain activities other than forestry could generate more interesting economic benefits, but this does not seem to be considered in the management of rights.

Finally, with regard to **forest rights**, some participants pointed to shortcomings in the current process for managing rights, and said that improvements should be made.

- Current forestry rights are insufficient to meet the needs of plants, which puts a lot of pressure on the open market.
- The current system for managing forestry rights is not conducive to obtaining attractive prices for harvested timber or for carrying out forestry operations, since some actors are in a position of strength compared to others. This limits the scope for negotiation.
- The forest management permit for supply of wood processing plants (PRAU) is an interesting tool for municipalities and communities, but weakens the supply of wood processing plants.

Indigenous communities point out that the MRNF's allocation of a large share of available timber volumes reduces its margin when it comes to taking into account major disturbances on the territory or other issues, implementing protection or conservation measures, adopting new silvicultural practices or supporting new development opportunities for other forest resources.

Moreover, the various agreements established between the government and the First Nations, such as management delegation agreements and timber harvesting permits to supply a wood processing plant, do not allow them to fully exercise the role that they wish to play¹.

Main avenues for proposed solutions

Various avenues were proposed to revise or improve the management of forest rights on forest land.

Concerning the **compatibility** and **cohabitation** between the various rights on the territory and the challenges of **access to the territory**:

- Review the forest governance framework, for example, by creating an independent organization, a development company or a designated planner responsible for granting rights;
- Give more powers and responsibilities to managers of structured wildlife areas, forest industry operators and Indigenous communities in the exercise of their rights, which they believe would improve cohabitation between different uses;
- Implement land zoning to prioritize certain rights in certain parts of the territory, with a view to improving cohabitation between different rights and optimizing land-use planning.

Regarding the improvement of the **management and granting of rights**:

- Improve current rights categories to support and enable more diversified forest uses, notably non-timber forest products;

¹ Comments and solutions specific to the First Nations regarding their participation in socio-economic development can also be found under theme 5.

- Conclude more management delegation agreements, notably more community forests and more opportunities specific to Indigenous communities;
- Consult existing rights holders before granting new rights, particularly forest industry operators and the First Nations;
- Make use of the local integrated land and resource management panels (TLGIRTs) in consultations concerning the granting of new rights;
- Accompany the granting of a right with additional conditions, notably an obligation regarding the harmonization of uses or protection of the environment;
- Review and reduce current forestry and maple syrup rights to improve environmental protection, take better account of climate change or better consider other forest uses;
- Consider the optimal use of resources in the rights granting process.

Regarding **benefits** and **royalties**:

- Eliminate the annual royalty associated with timber supply guarantees;
- Base the annual royalty on harvested volumes rather than allocated volumes;
- Return a share of forest royalties to communities so as to enable direct investment in the local forestry sector, notably by promoting local social economy enterprises;
- Assess all of the economic, social and environmental costs and benefits generated by an activity before granting or renewing a right;
- Take into account the economic impact of each activity when prioritizing the granting of rights.

Finally, on the subject of **forestry rights** in particular:

- Allocate and balance the management of volumes of forest rights holders over more than one year and between plants to improve predictability and the business environment for companies;
- Ease and simplify administrative mechanisms and grant more regional latitude to:
 - authorize wood movements between plants (art. 92 and 93 of the SFDA);
 - manage requests for small volumes, timber with no buyers and marginal species.
- Add financial incentives to ensure the harvesting of species with no buyers and less economically attractive operation zones;
- Broaden the definition of residual forest biomass and unused wood fibre to include timber with no buyers and dead wood;
- Review the application of the residuality principle to promote a better balance between timber supply and demand, and between public and private forests;
- Review contractual obligations related to forest rights so as to better protect forest contractors;
- Make PRAU holders bear the brunt of any reduction in allowable cuts, in the same way as holders of timber supply guarantees;
- Revise downwards the volumes allocated in forest rights in order to better respect the forest's production capacity;
- Limit the percentage of timber supply guarantee (GA) rights granted to a company in a given region;
- Change the concept of GA by detaching it from a particular plant;
- Adjust GAs according to the type of beneficiary, to give small sawmills greater flexibility.

Indigenous communities have stressed the importance of promoting more strategic and diversified local economic development by encouraging partnership and multi-product development as a prerequisite for access to supply.

THEME 3. CONCILIATION OF LAND USES

Public forest users are numerous and diverse. The reconciliation of land uses, the approach intended to ensure the coexistence of the granted rights and the activities of the various users of the same territory is a constant challenge.

On this theme², participants made the following comments and proposed the following solutions.

Main comments

Comments were made regarding the objectives and mandates of the **local integrated resource and land management panels (TLGIRT)**:

- For some, the TLGIRTs are essential, and do their job very well with the resources provided to them;
- TLGIRTs help to build trust between local actors, thereby improving the understanding between participants and the harmonization of uses;
- A number of participants deplored the fact that at the TLGIRTs, the focus is on forest planning, and more specifically, harvesting of wood fibre. This limitation in the role of the TLGIRTs means that some participants feel they have little say, and perceive that the TLGIRTs do not meet their needs, and that there is no real balance in the consideration of the various uses. Some mentioned that, in the long run, this situation could create a certain lack of interest among participants in the TLGIRTs;
- In the same vein, some participants deplore a lack of leeway on the part of planners to take into account the concerns raised during the TLGIRTs;
- For some participants, the TLGIRTs are more about information than consultation;
- There is a lack of real decision-making power over integrated land and resource management;
- Proposals are not heard if they have an influence on the allowable cut.

As for the **operation of the TLGIRTs**, the fact of having entrusted this role to organizations, often RCMs, is appreciated.

For some organizations, participation in the TLGIRTs is energy-consuming and difficult, and there is a lack of technical and financial support to encourage their participation. Furthermore, technical and hermetic language is used. Finally, some believe that there are too many participants in the TLGIRTs, while others are calling for more, as they feel that certain groups are under-represented.

With regard to **public consultations**, some stakeholders mentioned that:

- participants appreciate the MRNF's public consultations, but recognize that participation can be complex;
- public consultations could be better popularized and simplified for the general public;
- the partners make significant efforts to participate in the various consultations;
- delays in publishing consultation reports or strategies sometimes create dissatisfaction among the stakeholders who took part in the consultations.

Specific comments were made on public consultations on integrated forest development plans.

² It should be noted that comments and possible solutions relating to consultation with Indigenous communities can be found under theme 5.

- The means deployed to inform the public of consultations are not always effective.
- The consultation deadlines are not always sufficient.
- The organizations active on the territory and the Indigenous communities do not receive sufficient upstream consultation.
- There is little leeway for adaptations to integrated forest development plans following public consultations.
- Consultations on the major potential operation zones for forest harvesting in the operational integrated forest development plan seem too abstract for some forest users.
- On the other hand, some participants point out that recent improvements, such as the use of interactive maps, are interesting.

As part of this process, the Department asked participants to express their views on the **harmonization processes** that should apply to the various uses within the forest land.

- The vast majority of participants believe that all uses of public forest land should be subject to a harmonization process, for the following reasons:
 - it is a public asset;
 - to ensure optimal use of the land;
 - to better manage land use;
 - to facilitate dialogue and understanding between users;
 - to make users more responsible.
- However, some participants feel that harmonization processes should only be mandatory for uses that have a significant impact on the territory.
- It was also mentioned that these processes could make the system more cumbersome.
- The process of harmonizing forest development uses would give too much power to certain users, to the detriment of the forest industry.
- The notion of cumulative effects should be part of the debate on the future of the forest.

Main avenues for proposed solutions

Regarding the **role of the TLGIRTs**, the following suggestions were made:

- Modify the mandate of the TLGIRTs, notably so that they deal with other land uses, and can participate in the reconciliation of all forest uses;
- Make the TLGIRTs decision-making and accountable;
- Tailor participation in the TLGIRTs to actors' interests and the geographic and temporal scales that concern them, i.e. create panels dealing with strategic issues and others with more operational issues.

With regard to their **operation**:

- Make the TLGIRTs more inclusive, notably by including the following groups and stakeholders:
 - forestry workers and contractors,
 - biologists specializing in wildlife issues,

- holders of vacation leases on public land,
- outdoor and tourism organizations,
- the mining industry,
- non-timber forest products companies,
- and more generally, citizens.
- Give the TLGIRTs greater latitude to define their operations or, conversely, standardize their mode of operation;
- Take participants' concerns into account as early as possible in the forest planning process;
- Ensure that all participants understand the topics covered during the TLGIRTs by using a simple vocabulary and by offering financial and technical support to organizations in an effort to encourage their participation;
- Make the TLGIRT recommendations and follow-up publicly available.

With regard to **public consultations**, the proposals aim to:

- Carry out education and awareness-raising work with the population so that it can participate effectively in public consultations.
- Adapt consultations on forest development orientations to regional contexts and consult the TLGIRTs and RCMS;
- Entrust the Bureau d'audiences publiques sur l'environnement with consultations on forest development orientations.

More specifically, with regard to public consultations on **integrated forest development plans**, it is proposed to:

- Better inform users about consultations by:
 - providing personalized notices;
 - organizing more targeted promotional campaigns;
 - organizing information campaigns in the media;
 - working with municipalities to post and disseminate information about public consultations.
- Consider targeted consultations in cases where the relevant stakeholders are not represented at the TLGIRT;
- Implement mechanisms to inform forest users, notably vacationers, of the start of forest development work;
- Establish mechanisms for annual reporting on forest planning;
- Entrust operational harmonization to the MRNF;
- Conduct the consultation on operation zones that are closer to the areas that will actually be harvested;
- Include information on other land uses in the maps used for consultations;
- Use the "Open Forest" tool to present the status of all forestry operations across Québec.

With regard to the **harmonization of uses**, it is proposed to:

- Anticipate harmonization measures, similar to those for forest rights, for other rights granted in public forests;

- Delineate public land into specific zones for each use to facilitate the reconciliation of land uses;
- Conduct impact assessments when granting rights on public land;
- Create regional maple syrup panels made up exclusively of representatives of the MRNF and maple syrup producers;
- Set up an independent structure to arbitrate conflicts of use.

Solutions related to **governance** are also proposed:

- Ensure consistency between consultation structures, which are often specific to territories or business areas;
- Ensure consultation between departments in order to reconcile uses on the territory.

In terms of **information and communication**, the following solutions were suggested:

- When granting a new right, make the holder aware of the sharing of public land and the possibility of other activities taking place there, such as forest development;
- Display all rights granted by the Gouvernement du Québec on a single interactive map, such as the "Open Forest" map, to facilitate access to these data for all interested stakeholders;
- Improve the mandates granted to forestry associations to optimize public information and awareness activities.

THEME 4. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND REGIONAL BENEFITS

The forest is important for the economic development of Québec and its regions, particularly due to the magnitude of the benefits that it generates. The forestry sector also has the potential to contribute to the decarbonization of the Québec economy.

SUB-THEME 1. FOREST CONTRIBUTION TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND DECARBONIZATION

Main comments

Contribution to economic development

For communities where the forestry sector accounts for a large share of economic benefits, major investments in forest development are desirable in order to support local economic activity.

Several stakeholders pointed out that the forest is an asset with multiple possibilities, and that as such, there is a desire to:

- develop the various uses of the forest;
- diversify wood products;
- adopt a value-based approach to resources as the basis for orientations, objectives and the planning process;
- take greater account of the other benefits that society expects from the forest when making development decisions.

The participants feel that the context of the energy transition presents several **opportunities for the forestry sector**. It was notably mentioned that the forestry sector should focus on products with a low carbon footprint, and that the growing need for electricity could benefit from the development of the timber-energy sector, both for local consumption and for export. In addition, the industry cluster formula would better mobilize talent and funding to accelerate the search for and implementation of solutions. Assigning a financial value to forest carbon should also be considered.

The participants mentioned a number of **challenges associated with the development of the forestry economy**.

- A sufficiently skilled workforce is essential if the forest is to continue to contribute to the economic development of Québec and its regions. The stakeholders nevertheless pointed out that:
 - forestry professions are not highly valued;
 - the workforce, both in the forest and in wood processing, is aging and there is a shortage of new recruits;
 - efforts are needed to improve the image of forestry professions and to make the public proud of the forestry sector.
- Access to wood fibre, in a predictable way and at a reasonable cost, is necessary to ensure the development of the forestry sector.
- The difficult economic context was also mentioned by a number of stakeholders:
 - the increase in machinery costs and interest rates is not reflected in the rates set by the Department for silvicultural work;
 - a difficult economic environment is unfavourable to business investment.

- Maintaining the current industrial structure also has repercussions on development prospects:
 - falling demand for pulp could lead to a significant decline in the sawmill industry, as these two activities are highly integrated;
 - large timber volumes are left in the forest for lack of buyers, but also for lack of profitability of forestry operations.

Finally, **global changes** (climate change, invasive species and diseases, etc.) are likely to have a major impact on forest activities:

- Some stakeholders are concerned about the impact of the summer 2023 fires on forestry activities in the affected areas, with reduced opportunities expected;
- The uncertainty associated with climate change is making investments in the forest industry much riskier;
- Forests will not be the same as they were in the past, and changes in industrial structure are to be expected.

The contribution of forests and wood products to the **decarbonization of the economy** and the energy transition is recognized and supported by some participants.

- The creation of resilient, healthy and growing forests would make a positive contribution to carbon sequestration.
- To maximize decarbonization, it is important to promote short supply chains, processing and local use of wood.

The stakeholders underlined the many opportunities presented by the forestry sector in decarbonizing the economy, notably with regard to forest carbon, which should be assigned an economic value and could create wealth for Québec.

However, others believe that claims about the forestry sector's contribution to decarbonizing the economy should be treated with caution, and that the services provided by forests should not be reduced to carbon sequestration alone.

- It is claimed that the forestry sector is more of a carbon emitter.
- The whole of the sector's production chains and forest products should be considered to obtain a fair assessment of the sector's contribution to decarbonizing the economy.
- It would be important to draw up a complete profile of the net contribution of forest harvesting to the forest carbon balance.

Main avenues for proposed solutions

To make the forest contribute more to **economic development**, jobs and regional benefits, the participants propose several possible solutions:

- Consider regionalizing forest management to better develop regional potential. It is notably proposed to let the regions develop their own models, in accordance with provincially-defined guidelines;
- Provide for royalties on forest harvesting to benefit regions, municipalities and Indigenous communities;
- Diversify forest uses and activities to create value through integrated land and resource management;

- Integrate the entire forestry sector into the circular economy concept, for example by creating regional business clusters around primary processing plants, or by promoting companies with integrated processing models;
- Prioritize forest development and wood markets based on Québec's interests and needs:
 - use a "Qualité Québec" certification for wood products;
- Envision the forest's contribution to regional development through recreation, tourism, maple syrup production and other non-timber forest products, or through conservation.

The participants highlighted a number of elements that, in their view, represent **development opportunities** for the forestry sector.

- Focus on the value of the wood harvested rather than setting objectives solely on volumes:
 - Focus on value-added processing (secondary and tertiary processing);
 - develop the value of all forest resources
 - implement means to maximize the use of wood materials and by-products, particularly for forest biomass projects.
- Further develop the biomass sector in synergy with greenhouse production in order to contribute to Québec's food sovereignty objectives.
- Concentrate forestry operations in areas of intensive forestry production to maintain the allowable cut while protecting more land.

Solutions are also proposed to meet the **challenges** associated with the development of the forestry economy.

- Offer predictable access to wood fibre:
 - over a horizon of at least 10 years in order to encourage investment;
 - resolve the uncertainty surrounding the protection of woodland caribou;
 - establish clear guidelines for the development of protected areas.
- Invest massively in silvicultural work to maintain and increase attributable volumes:
 - adopt the budgets needed to implement the National Timber Production Strategy and bring back into production areas affected by natural disturbances.
- Find innovative solutions for woods with no buyers, and support regional initiatives in this area.
- Take steps to address **workforce** issues, promote succession planning and encourage active silvicultural workers:
 - maintain training programs, including in vocational training centres, to ensure a quality workforce;
 - support the adoption of new technologies by businesses;
 - undertake a major campaign to promote forestry professions;
 - continue the pilot project in Bas-Saint-Laurent aimed at improving working conditions in forest development, and apply it province-wide.

To make the forestry sector more of a solution for **decarbonizing the economy**, stakeholders mentioned these elements:

- Increase the productivity of forest land to increase carbon sequestration;

- Further promote wood as a low-carbon alternative:
 - demonstrate the contribution of wood products by developing tools and methods for quantifying carbon sequestration;
- Maximize the use of wood in the construction sector in Québec:
 - adapt the *Building Code* to encourage wood construction,
 - adopt a more ambitious policy for integrating wood in construction,
 - make it compulsory to use a percentage of wood in new buildings,
 - impose a carbon balance for each type of construction;
- Promote short circuits and the circular economy:
 - bring plants closer to the resource in order to shorten timber transport distances,
 - concentrate processing operations as much as possible in a single sector,
 - implement means to maximize the end-of-life management of wood products;
- Develop a forest carbon management strategy:
 - continue acquiring knowledge about forest carbon,
 - consider carbon management as part of integrated forest development plans,
 - include the conservation of old-growth forests in the solutions,
 - limit soil disturbance during forest development operations;
- Assessing the potential for producing forest carbon offsets on public lands:
 - put an economic value on forest carbon;
- Relaxing the *Regulation respecting afforestation and reforestation projects* eligible for the issuance of offset credits on privately-owned *land* allows forest owners to derive additional revenue from their properties;
- Support research and development to optimize the use of wood in the ecological transition:
 - continue research into the carbon balances of different forest development scenarios and silvicultural treatments,
 - Promote the electrification of forestry machinery and transport.

The idea of making greater use of wood materials in infrastructure construction, with the aim of replacing other materials that emit more GHGs, has been the subject of several possible solutions. Some of them call on the forestry sector to apply the **principle of the circular economy** and increase initiatives to further reduce its carbon emissions.

- Prioritize long-life wood products and manage the end-of-life of wood materials more effectively, so that they can be recycled and ultimately used to produce energy. This would increase carbon storage while limiting the need for virgin fibre, limiting methane emissions and generating energy.
- Wood products should be subject to a full life-cycle analysis to quantify their real contribution to decarbonizing the economy. This would in turn encourage the production of wood materials with a better carbon balance.
- The majority of harvested timber volumes should be transformed into long-life forest products.
- Setting up a biomass processing network in the regions would facilitate the development of this sector.

- Optimize the consumption of fossil fuels in forestry operations, or replace them.
- Electrify forestry operations and timber transport.

Several comments and possible solutions point to a reduction in timber harvesting in public forests, mainly to ensure forest resilience while helping to maintain biodiversity and carbon sequestration, but also to meet social expectations. As a result, solutions are being sought to **adapt the economy of forest communities**.

- Initiate an economic transition process in the forestry sector in order to support the economic diversification of forest communities. This transition plan should be developed in consultation with workers, unions, companies and regional actors:
 - develop support programs for forest-dependent communities to ensure a gradual and equitable economic transition;
 - consider the process of modernizing the forestry sector and diversifying the regional economic fabric as an adaptation measure.
- Create an economic diversification fund for forest regions. This fund, which could be developed with federal government support, would be used to modernize the timber industry and diversify the economic fabric of forest communities. An advisory committee should be set up to develop this plan in partnership with stakeholders.

SUB-THEME 2. FOREST SECTOR INNOVATION AND DIVERSIFICATION

Main comments

Innovation remains essential for the transformation of the forest sector and the growth of its productivity. Significant productivity gains have already resulted from the mechanization of harvesting operations. A number of tools are available to the forestry sector to continue this progress, and could be developed further: autonomous trucks, drones, satellite images, LiDAR technology, interactive mapping, mechanization of non-commercial silvicultural work, etc.

However, sometimes rigid standards and regulations are holding back **innovation and modernization of forestry operations**, both harvesting and non-commercial silvicultural work, in a context of labour shortages.

The stakeholders put forward certain essential conditions for the sector to be able to innovate and modernize effectively:

- Develop new niches while respecting existing ones;
- Make the most of great flexibility;
- Have access to financial resources;
- Ensure biodiversity maintenance
- Act in line with GHG reduction targets;
- Involve local and regional actors.

Several stakeholders addressed the issue of financing innovation and modernization. For some, investments should be borne by forestry companies, while for others, the State or research institutes should be responsible for them.

The more an economy is diversified, the better it is equipped to withstand difficult economic conditions and market cycles. Some stakeholders are anticipating future challenges in timber supply, notably due

to declines in allowable cuts associated with climate change and the achievement of protected area targets. In this context, the need to diversify not only wood products, but all forest-dependent economic activities, is a recurring theme.

The stakeholders believe that a diversified forestry sector should:

- capitalize on the services offered by the forest, such as maple syrup production, hunting and fishing;
- add value to non-timber forest products such as mushrooms, essential oils, food products and pharmaceuticals;
- support a circular timber economy;
- facilitate the transition of workers to new niches.

For many stakeholders, it is imperative to maintain strong initial processing to enable the emergence and maintenance of second and third processing. These activities add value to products and generate jobs, while requiring smaller timber volumes.

The use of **forest biomass** is a recurring theme in comments and proposed solutions for innovation and diversification in the forestry sector.

With a few exceptions, the use of forest biomass is viewed positively by the participants insofar as it is recognized as a carbon-neutral energy source. The wide availability of this resource on cutovers and in the processing chain would develop an interesting and almost unlimited market for Québec's forest industry.

In some regions, the potential for transition projects to forest biomass would appear to be particularly attractive in the agricultural sector, notably because of the exploitable agricultural woodlands that ensure a constant supply of local products. Some also see it as a tool for reducing the risk of forest fires by eliminating ground fuels.

Biomass supply and processing costs represent a major obstacle to the development of a biomass industry in Québec. Its use is also an issue for many participants, notably because of the transportation, storage and low energy efficiency of biomass. Some participants are concerned about the impact of biomass harvesting on wildlife, biodiversity and soils.

Main avenues for proposed solutions

Diversification of economic activities in forest regions is essential to ensure the resilience of local communities to economic and environmental change. The forest economy should focus on maintaining the integrity of the forest and its capacity to adapt to global change, while adapting to it and creating new opportunities and markets.

Many stakeholders believe that the process of diversifying the forestry sector should include all stakeholders and be carried out according to regional realities. It should also consider new climatic conditions, as well as labour shortages.

The participants proposed several concrete measures to enable the forestry sector to innovate and diversify:

- Develop new products and **value-added wood products**, particularly in a context where allowable cuts are revised downwards and allocated volumes cannot meet demand. To achieve this, however, it is necessary to adapt our industrial structure and invest in the development and marketing of these products:

- the valorization of timber with no buyers and inferior quality timber, including timber damaged by natural disturbances, is often mentioned. It is important to optimize the use of every cubic metre of harvested timber. Many believe that this measure would also help maintain jobs in forestry regions over the long term,
- for some, increasing the added value of wood products would reduce the pressure of forest development on land and ecosystems,
- several participants stressed the importance of the durability of these new products.
- Develop **non-timber forest products** (NTFP). It is suggested that the MRNF should identify potential NTFP development sites and propose a development strategy for each of Québec's regions;
- Use the **available new technologies**. Several stakeholders are proposing to increase and facilitate the use of satellites, drones and the LiDAR system to plan, carry out and monitor forestry operations:
 - it is also proposed that the MRNF should set up digital transformation programs for the forestry sector and ensure a technology watch,
 - other participants felt that it would be appropriate to develop planning and consultation tools using artificial intelligence.
- Promote **workforce recruitment and training**:
 - there is notably a proposal to facilitate collaboration between companies and training establishments, and to introduce continuing education programs that consider the needs and evolution of the forestry sector,
 - a recruitment strategy could be developed;
- **Modernize forestry practices and equipment**, notably by mechanizing non-commercial work, which would create more specialized jobs in the regions, reducing the size of harvesting equipment, using GPS in machinery, and so on:
 - support the technological and digital transformation efforts of forest contractors.
- Modernize plants to make them more competitive and less labour-intensive;
- Ensure access to the cellular network throughout the territory to promote and support innovation while improving worker safety;
- Optimize timber transport, either by reducing distances, favouring rail transport or developing less polluting means of transport;
- Promote the **use of wood in construction**:
 - improve training of architects and material engineers on the use of wood and adopt a regulation to oblige the use of wood in construction,
 - promote the sequestration potential of wood products in the context of climate change.
- Develop networks of contractors to pool knowledge, resources and partnerships for large-scale, profitable contracts;
- Ensure a predictable, profitable and supportive business environment in order to develop innovation within forestry companies.

Research is essential to increase innovation and diversification in the forestry sector, and concerns all of the sectors listed above. Several stakeholders suggested establishing partnerships between research institutes, government, industry and forestry groups. The research needs expressed by the participants involve:

- establishment of silviculture best practices;
- development of new products or new uses for species without buyers;
- automation of forestry operations;
- search for innovative outlets for existing products;
- acquisition of knowledge about the properties and quality levels of NTFPs growing in the region;
- use of new technologies in day-to-day forestry operations;
- search for solutions to labour shortages;
- development of less polluting equipment (transport and operations).

The **financing of** innovation and diversification is a subject that comes up time and time again in the possible solutions. It is proposed to:

- set up programs to support innovation and diversification, such as measures to encourage the acquisition of electric or hybrid forestry equipment;
- increase the budgets, accessibility and visibility of programs such as the Programme de modernisation des opérations forestières (Forest Operations Modernization Program), the Écoleader Fund, the Programme Innovation Bois (Wood Innovation Program) and the Programme d'aménagement durable des forêts (Sustainable Forest Management Program);
- integrate new measures into the Plan for a Green Economy in order to support innovation in the supply chain;
- increase fuel prices to finance innovation;
- use a stand's financial maturity model to secure and convince investors;
- maintain support for regional wood niches of excellence.

Many stakeholders believe that **forest biomass** should be used more extensively in public buildings. Some also believe that its use should be encouraged in the home. It could also hold great promise for the farming and maple syrup industries.

To reduce costs and achieve profitability, a number of solutions were proposed:

- Develop a large-scale biomass supply chain;
- Concentrate biomass harvesting and identify areas where biomass extraction could be profitable;
- Encourage small-scale projects;
- Process biomass close to harvesting sites or consumer plants;
- Offer financial incentives to harvest less profitable materials;
- Support and finance biomass projects (supply and processing). This could involve a policy of developing the forestry energy sector;
- Encourage the establishment of new processing plants and upgrade existing plants in order for them to be able to process biomass;
- Introduce preferential tariffs, tax measures or tax credits for the use of biomass by industries and businesses.

Several stakeholders also suggest integrating biomass harvesting into forestry planning processes, so that all of the material can be harvested in a single pass. They also suggest prioritizing whole-tree harvesting.

However, some stakeholders are concerned about the environmental consequences of developing the biomass sector.

- Choose short cycles to avoid increasing the carbon balance as a result of its transport over long distances.
- Leave some of the residual biomass on the cutovers so as to contribute to soil fertility.
- Harvest biomass only in areas where the litter is of good quality and the soil is not thin or poor or at risk of becoming impoverished.
- Plan biomass extraction to minimize interference with wildlife habitats.

SUB-THEME 3. REGIONALIZATION OF MANAGEMENT

Main comments

The *Sustainable Forest Development Act* established a forest regime with the purpose of ensuring integrated and regionalized management. Participants were asked to express their views on changes that could be made to encourage **regional actors to become more involved** in public forest management.

In this respect, the comments received illustrate that many stakeholders would like to see greater regionalization of forest management.

- Decentralizing the management model and participation mechanisms would make it possible to better consider local values and needs.
- The forest management framework is rigid and sometimes makes it difficult to take regional specificities into account. So-called "wall-to-wall" or global approaches also limit the extent to which regional realities are considered:
 - the prescriptive approach should be replaced by management by objectives, thereby leaving more room for regional and local adaptation.
- A decentralization of powers would be required in order to:
 - bring decision-making closer to the field;
 - maximize the involvement in decision-making of professionals with expertise and knowledge of the territory;
 - encourage collaboration;
 - take better account of other land users in planning.
- Some participants feel that there is a missing link since the abandonment of regional consultation structures such as regional conferences of elected representatives and the commissions régionales des ressources naturelles et du territoire (CRRNT).

At the other end of the spectrum, some stakeholders point to the risks of greater management **regionalization**.

- The consideration of regional particularities could hinder the achievement of objectives or compliance with national guidelines.
- The MRNF should retain a central role in development orientations, since some issues transcend territorial boundaries.
- Municipalities are not sufficiently equipped to assume forest management mandates.

- Some participants fear that local managers will be more at the mercy of the influence of certain interest groups.
- The vision surrounding regional development would be at risk of changing frequently due to political changes at this level of governance.

Some participants also felt that the revenues generated by the various uses of the land and its resources should be used primarily to improve the quality of life in local communities.

The Department has also deployed various mechanisms to allow local communities and Indigenous communities to participate in management and development of the forest environment. As part of this process, participants were asked to give their opinion on these **management delegation mechanisms** for optimizing forest development on these territories.

A number of challenges relating to the management of these territories were raised:

- Management delegation models are too uniform and do not allow for regional adaptations;
- Budgets allocated to delegates are said to be insufficient, or even non-existent;
- It is difficult to make forest development activities profitable on these territories, especially given their small size;
- The same rules apply to delegated territories as to forest development units, despite their distinct realities and particularities.

The stakeholders see advantages to these models, including the fact that delegated territories are closer to the relevant populations, while also enabling communities to better participate in planning and gain a better understanding of the issues.

Improvements could be made by the MRNF. Some participants mentioned that the concept of the community forest has not been addressed.

Indigenous communities expressed an interest in a more regionalized vision of forest land-use planning. However, they believe that certain conditions should be met:

- Indigenous communities have special rights, and should not be considered simply as a stakeholder among the other users of the land;
- The question of the development of natural resources and of the territory should be discussed regularly with the Indigenous communities.

Main avenues for proposed solutions

The participants discussed a number of possible solutions for **involving regional stakeholders** in forest management.

For many participants, resource and land management should be delegated to regional bodies. The type of organization and management models vary according to the stakeholders in question.

- Revise the governance framework to assign responsibilities to the right territorial levels.
- Give more land management responsibility to the TLGIRTs.
- Decentralize powers to regional MRNF branches.
- Give RCMs full responsibility for managing intramunicipal public lands and the royalties derived from them.

- Recreate a model analogous to the old CRRNTs, which brought together all of the territory's users and covered the different types of rights.

To **support regional and local development**, some participants propose a variety of actions.

- Pay royalties to local and Indigenous communities
- Support municipalities in the fight against invasive alien species.
- Align development unit boundaries with RCM boundaries to ensure better consideration of local issues.
- Substantially enhance the Sustainable Forest Management Program, notably the component associated with intramunicipal public lands.

For other participants, priority should be given to recreational and tourism development or conservation.

- Develop the network of regional parks as an engine of economic development for the regions.
- Require that a minimum of 15% of the municipal territory be maintained in conservation.

With regard to **management delegation models**, participants proposed various solutions:

- Develop management delegation models adapted to regional realities, that:
 - meet community needs,
 - are aimed at achieving locally-determined development objectives,
 - are large enough to ensure profitable operations;
- Deploy the proximity forest concept, i.e.:
 - develop a policy and produce a practical guide to introduce the concept.

Some participants felt that the MRNF should be more involved in supporting the delegates, notably:

- provide support and training;
- improve budgets for activities in these areas.

For some participants, the MRNF should better manage the activities of the delegates:

- Mandate forest development in delegated territories. Forest rights should be granted on condition that they supply wood processing plants;
- Implement performance indicators, harvest volume management and associated reporting.

Some **First Nations** would like to be able to establish their own management and development methods, in which their knowledge of the territory would be put to good use. To this end, they advocate the set-up of joint decision-making governance structures to ensure fair representation of the parties involved.

The First Nations also wish to diversify forest land management and encourage Indigenous development and conservation initiatives, including community forests and sustainable use protected areas.

OTHER THEMES

In addition to the four main themes suggested in this process, participants commented on other topics. These will also be taken into account as part of the debate on the future of the forest.

Forestry workers

- Several stakeholders deplored the fact that none of the four main themes directly addressed worker-related issues.
- It is recommended that the government develop a strategy to enhance the value of forestry work:
 - this strategy should address the issue of worker compensation in the forest development sector, and more specifically the inclusion of hourly rates;
 - the inclusion, in the rate grid for the value of silvicultural treatments, of social benefits for workers is also recommended.
- A diagnostic of the state of the workforce in the forestry sector, including recommendations, would be relevant.
- Efforts to attract workers should be stepped up:
 - improved working conditions and access to training are mentioned as possible solutions.
- Set up of concerted initiatives between the relevant stakeholders, including various ministries, industry and worker representatives, to agree on actions to be taken to tackle the various challenges facing the forestry sector:
 - support workers in the planned transition from the forestry sector.

Forest culture

- Develop new information initiatives aimed at primary and secondary school students.
- Steps should be considered to foster social acceptability and change public perceptions of forest development.
- Some participants deplore the fact that the MRNF does not respond to criticism of the forestry sector in the media.
- Promote a forestry culture to give people a sense of belonging to the region and demonstrate the benefits of forests and wood:
 - support the network of regional forestry associations.
- Conduct national communication and awareness-raising campaigns.

THEME 5. INDIGENOUS PARTNERS

The First Nations and Inuit representatives were invited to comment on and propose solutions to all of the themes. However, theme 5 was reserved exclusively for them.

From the outset, it was made clear that the consultation process was in keeping with the Northern Agreements and the agreements between Québec and Indigenous nations or communities, with no change to the MRNF's other obligations and commitments to Indigenous people.

The information on Indigenous communities found in the report is drawn from comments made by these communities as part of the Future of the Forest process, as well as from concerns previously expressed by them.

SUB-THEME 1. PARTICIPATION IN DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES AND CONSULTATION AND ACCOMMODATION

Main comments

The First Nations put forward a strong interest in forest governance. For several years now, they have been expressing dissatisfaction with their participation and consultation in forest development decision-making processes. They point out that they have already shared various concerns, issues and needs in previous consultation processes. The main comments are as follows:

- The First Nations deplore the fact that they are not considered as essential partners in any decision, whether on a strategic level or in the context of forest harmonization processes, while the forestry regime has had and still has detrimental effects on their rights;
- They feel that the current consultation processes are inadequate, and that they do not allow their concerns to be sufficiently taken into account and to exert a real influence on the implementation of forest development;
- The model for consulting Indigenous communities on integrated forest development plans does not meet the needs of some stakeholders, and generates a significant workload for these communities;
- The First Nations report that accommodation measures are insufficient, and that the negative and cumulative effects of forestry on biodiversity and their way of life are not taken into account;
- They indicate that the feedback is inadequate.

Main avenues for proposed solutions

In order to increase and improve their participation and consultation in decision-making processes, the First Nations are asking to be given a leading role in forest management. They also consider it essential to be involved upstream in all forest development decisions, including the determination of allowable cuts and the granting of forest harvesting rights. Many of them stress the importance of:

- setting up forest and land co-management mechanisms that enable the First Nations to decide, jointly with the Gouvernement du Québec, on forest land-use planning options, including conservation areas;
- obtaining the consent of the relevant First Nations before authorizing any forestry activity;
- ensuring respect for Indigenous rights, interests, knowledge and traditional laws, and enshrining them in law;

- conducting systematic consultations as far upstream as possible in the decision-making process, and throughout the entire process, from strategic orientations to the detailed planning of worksites and roads;
- ensuring the application of duly agreed agreements and consultation procedures;
- avoiding the authorization of forest development activities in certain sectors or zones designated by the First Nations (e.g., sectors used by members for their activities or sectors reserved for wildlife regeneration);
- recognizing the First Nations' expertise and knowledge of land and resource management;
- enabling genuine exchanges based on science and Indigenous knowledge;
- recognizing and taking into account the negative and cumulative effects of forestry on biodiversity and their way of life;
- providing adequate and timely feedback and follow-up on how the concerns of the First Nations have been addressed in each consultation;
- committing to the efforts to find solutions based on a nation-to-nation vision.

SUB-THEME 2. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE DEPARTMENT, INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES AND THE FOREST INDUSTRY

Main comments

Indigenous stakeholders point out that forestry is a complex field involving many levels and stakeholders. They point out that the roles of the Department and industry are unclear, and that the various partners involved are not always aware of the concerns and interests of Indigenous communities. A better understanding on both sides would improve collaboration in forest development activities.

Main avenues for proposed solutions

In an effort to improve relationships between the Department, Indigenous communities and the forest industry, the First Nations proposed the following avenues:

- The roles of the Department and the forest industry should be clarified, particularly with regard to the forestry planning consultation process and harmonization measures;
- It is important to foster and promote peer-to-peer, nation-to-nation relationships, and to be more responsive to the concerns of Indigenous communities;
- The Department should set up clear communication processes with the First Nations and keep them up to date;
- Inter-regional consistency should be ensured by the Department in its relations with the First Nations;
- It should be ensured that departmental representatives have a sufficient level of knowledge of Indigenous specificities; training on Indigenous realities would be essential;
- The Department should designate a competent, present and proactive contact person for each First Nation, who would visit the communities regularly to foster the development and maintenance of a trusting relationship;
- The Department should adequately inform the various stakeholders of the First Nations' concerns, interests and knowledge.

In addition, non-Indigenous stakeholders suggested fostering more regular and sustained communication with family representatives from Indigenous communities. The importance for Québec of concluding treaties and agreements with Indigenous communities to normalize relations and create a predictable and structuring economic environment was also mentioned.

SUB-THEME 3. PARTICIPATION IN SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Main comments

The First Nations generally insist on the importance of their communities and members receiving the economic benefits of forest land development. The First Nations consider tools such as forestry agreements with Québec that include socio-economic components, the granting of forest rights to their communities and management delegation agreements to be interesting, but feel that they should be redefined. Until this is achieved, certain gaps remain from their point of view, which would prevent them from exercising the stewardship and governance role that they wish to exercise on the territory.

Main avenues for proposed solutions

A number of solutions were proposed to enable the First Nations to consolidate and even increase their role as economic development actors at all levels:

- Conclude new management delegation agreements;
- Continue work on community forests. This concept raised expectations among the First Nations, and caused disappointment in the context of its limited application;
- Allocate more timber volumes to Indigenous communities, according to criteria that they deem more equitable;
- Apply economic accommodations, which would enable Indigenous individuals and businesses to gradually develop their expertise and become more self-sufficient, so that they can benefit from more opportunities and contracts;
- Support communities involved in forest resource transformation projects from a decarbonization perspective (e.g., community cogeneration projects);
- Promote diversification in the forestry sector, with First Nations wishing to participate in the development of other markets, such as the sale of carbon credits, non-timber forest products, maple syrup production, mycology, etc.;
- Bring together major provincial partners (MRNF, Investissement Québec, Ministère de l'Économie, de l'Innovation et de l'Énergie, etc.) to reflect on and implement programs specific to the First Nations, in a context in which the current funding sources available to them do not allow for the sustainable emergence of Indigenous forestry sector entrepreneurs;
- Implement measures to integrate young Indigenous people into forestry employment, as well as measures to support and promote certified Indigenous businesses;
- Reflect on a management model in which the First Nations wishing to do so can harvest, acquire, sell, process, transport and market forest resources, according to their needs and aspirations, their traditional institutions and laws, without royalty payments;
- Favour established Indigenous businesses by giving them priority over blocks sold on the open market and over other forest rights holders when determining the annual harvesting schedule;

- Encourage economic reconciliation by ensuring that the First Nations benefit from the development of forest resources, whether through profit sharing, partnership opportunities with industry or employment opportunities for their members;
- Ensure that the First Nations have the knowledge and expertise that they need to fully reap these economic benefits.

SUB-THEME 4. SKILLS AND CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

Main comments

The First Nations support the objective of better supporting the development of their members' forestry skills. They note that the native workforce is available and located close to forest resources and regional timber processing hubs. The local actors (Department, industry and First Nations) should work together to develop this potential. However, some First Nations believe that the Indigenous workforce is still underestimated.

They believe that the entire industry, including supervisors and foremen in the field, should be sensitized to the realities of the First Nations, so as to be more attentive to their specificities and avoid any form of devaluation of the Indigenous workforce. In addition, they point out that the "extreme productivity" model is not entirely applicable to Indigenous values.

For the First Nations, the development of forestry skills and capabilities also requires in-depth knowledge of the territory and its dynamics. And yet, the First Nations feel that they do not have sufficient financial and technical resources, notably to collect data on land use and occupation and to respond adequately to consultations.

Main avenues for proposed solutions

In order to foster the development of the skills and capacities required for their involvement in sustainable forest development, the First Nations proposed the following solutions:

- Support the structures put in place by Indigenous communities as well as the deployment of new ones;
- Make Indigenous entrepreneurs aware that profitability and respect for the rights, values and needs of Indigenous communities can coexist;
- Increase training of forest industry actors with regard to Indigenous realities;
- Ensure that Indigenous entities become promoters of vocational training, so as to recognize and promote Indigenous learning, and encourage greater adaptation of educational content and practical learning to facilitate integration into the workforce. Sufficient budgets should be allocated for this purpose;
- Create bipartite entities (First Nations-Québec) whose main mandate would be the economic development of Indigenous nations and communities, with sufficient human and financial resources;
- Support training for Indigenous staff interested in forestry (e.g., coaching days, targeted training on certain topics, such as calculating allowable cuts and the role of the Chief Forester).

OTHER THEMES

Main comments

The First Nations also addressed themes other than those proposed in the Tables de réflexion sur l'avenir de la forêt process.

From the outset, a number of criticisms were levelled at the consultation process implemented as part of this reflection process:

- The First Nations deplored the lack of joint reflection prior to drafting of or co-construction of a vision for the future of the forest;
- Some indicated that the deadlines were too short or that the information provided was incomplete;
- A government-to-government relationship would have been desirable. Some considered that the Tables de réflexion sur l'avenir de la forêt initiative is a missed opportunity for reconciliation. A more in-depth dialogue would have been essential.

Some stressed the importance of adequate feedback following this reflection. The MRNF is expected to detail the steps that will be taken to integrate the comments and concerns received, within a reasonable timeframe. The First Nations also consider that their involvement will be inevitable for the continuation of the reflections, the decisions to be taken and their implementation.

Some of the First Nations feel that the results of the Tables de réflexion sur l'avenir de la forêt initiative must be harmonized with other governmental exercises that are being developed concurrently or imminently, while reiterating their desire to be involved in these processes. Specific mention is made of the 2030 Plan for a Green Economy, the Plan Nature 2030 (2030 Nature Plan), the Gaspé Woodland and Mountain Caribou Strategy, northern conservation territories, sustainable-use protected areas, Indigenous-initiated protected areas and the Climate Change Adaptation Strategy for Forest Management and Development.

Many, if not all, of the First Nations and Indigenous organizations raised issues relating to the recognition and respect of Indigenous and treaty rights, including Indigenous title, and the implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. The same applies to the principles set out in the November 2021 Declaration of the Assembly of Chiefs. Québec's actions should also be inspired by the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, as well as the Convention on Biological Diversity and its "Agenda 21" action plan. Many also refer to the notions of consent, co-management, conservation, royalties and self-government.

Moreover, the First Nations feel that Québec should recognize the damage caused by forestry to their rights, lands, resources, activities, cultures, traditions, lifestyles, livelihoods, identities and well-being, in addition to its effects on the maintenance of biodiversity and the fight against climate change.

Main avenues for proposed solutions

Several of the First Nations and Indigenous organizations that responded to the consultation are asking the Gouvernement du Québec to recognize their rights and interests, for example by adding a section on this subject to the *Sustainable Forest Development Act*. Some specify that the addition of such a section would aim to mitigate the impact of forest development on the rights and activities of First Nations members, by ensuring the conservation of a forest quality essential to the maintenance of their distinctive cultures and ways of life.

The First Nations are also proposing that the government commit to respecting the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and other declarations in the management of forest

resources, and more specifically the following principles: governance and self-determination of Indigenous peoples, economic development, revenue sharing, protection of rights and biodiversity.

Conclusion

In the wake of the summer 2023 forest fires experienced in Québec, and the Chief Forester's opinion published in September of that same year, a global reflection on forest management and development was essential. This participatory approach was the starting point for a new direction in forest development approaches and practices.

The many submitted comments and proposals highlight the points of convergence, as well as divergence, among stakeholders interested in the future of the forest.

It is clear that participants want to see measures taken to adapt and ensure the resilience of forest ecosystems. The resilience and vitality of forest communities are also essential elements in this reflection. To this end, many stakeholders stressed the importance of resource and land management being consistent with regional development objectives. Numerous proposals were put forward to improve forest development and productivity, timber supply, reconciliation of land uses and the contribution of forests to sustainable economic development, taking into account environmental and social issues.

In addition to their reflections on the four themes open to the whole population, the Indigenous communities also put forward proposals for partnerships to be established or strengthened in the forestry sector. They would notably like the Gouvernement du Québec to recognize their leading role in forest management, and for the solutions developed to reflect a nation-to-nation vision.

The results of this participatory process, summarized in this report, will be taken into account to guide government actions that will notably contribute to ensuring the sustainability of the forest, so that it can continue to generate environmental, social and economic benefits for present and future generations.

Appendices

APPENDIX 1. LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

BAPE	Bureau d'audiences publiques sur l'environnement du Québec
BMMB	Bureau de mise en marché des bois (known in English as the Timber Marketing Board)
CRRNT	Commission régionale sur les ressources naturelles et le territoire
FSC	Forest Stewardship Council
GA	Timber Supply Guarantee (in French: Garantie d'approvisionnement)
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GPS	Global Positioning System
SFDA	Sustainable Forest Development Act
LiDAR	Light Detection and Ranging
MEIE	Ministère de l'Économie, de l'Innovation et de l'Énergie
RCM	Regional County Municipality (in French: MRC or Municipalité régionale de comté)
MRNF	Ministère des Ressources naturelles et des Forêts
PADF	Sustainable Forest Management Program (in French: Programme d'aménagement durable des forêts)
NTFP	Non-Timber Forest Products (in French: PFNL or Produits forestiers non ligneux)
PRAN	Programmation annuelle des activités de récolte (known in English as Annual Forest Harvesting Program)
PRAU	Forest Management Permit for Supply of Wood Processing Plants (in French: Permis d'intervention pour la récolte de bois aux fins d'approvisionner une usine de transformation du bois)
RSDF	Regulation Respecting the Sustainable Development of Forests in the Domain of the State (in French : RADF or Règlement sur l'aménagement durable des forêts du domaine de l'État)
SFMS	Sustainable Forest Management Strategy (in French: SADF or Stratégie d'aménagement durable des forêts)
SOPFEU	Société de protection des forêts contre le feu
TLGIRT	Local Integrated Land and Resource Management Panel (in French: Table locale de gestion intégrée des ressources et du territoire)
ZEC	Controlled Zone (in French: Zones d'exploitation contrôlée)

APPENDIX 2.LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS INVITED TO REGIONAL TABLES, BY REGION

Bas-Saint-Laurent (February 13, 2024)	
Organization name	Presence
Agence régionale de mise en valeur des forêts privées du Bas-Saint-Laurent	X
Association des grands propriétaires forestiers du Québec	X
Association régionale des trappeurs du Bas-Saint-Laurent	
Bégin & Bégin	X
Bois d'œuvre Cedrico inc. (Causapscal)	X
Cascades Canada ULC (Cabano)	X
Coopérative forestière Haut Plan Vert	X
Coopérative forestière de la Matapédia	X
Conseil régional de l'environnement du Bas-Saint-Laurent	X
Fédération des groupements forestiers du Bas-Saint-Laurent	X
Fédération de l'industrie manufacturière — Confédération des syndicats nationaux (FIM-CSN)	X
Foremo	X
FPIInnovations	X
Groupe Lebel inc. (Price)	X
MRC des Basques	X
MRC de la Matanie	X
MRC de Rimouski-Neigette	
OBAKIR	X
Pourvoirie de la Seigneurie du lac Métis	X
Producteurs et productrices acéricoles du Québec (PPAQ) — Bas-Saint-Laurent–Gaspésie	X
Timiskaming First Nation	X
Regroupement des gestionnaires de zecs du Bas-Saint-Laurent	X
Regroupement des locataires des terres publiques du Québec (RLTP)	X
SEREX	X
Somival	X
Syndicat des producteurs forestiers du Bas-Saint-Laurent	X
Uniboard Canada inc. (Sayabec)	X
Unifor	X

Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM)	X
Université du Québec à Rimouski (UQAR)	X

Côte-Nord (February 20, 2024)	
Organization name	Presence
Agence de mise en valeur des forêts privées de la Côte-Nord	X
Arbec, Bois d'œuvre inc. (Port-Cartier)	X
Bioénergie AE Côte-Nord Canada inc.	X
Boisaco	X
Centre d'expérimentation et de développement en forêt boréale (CEDFOB)	X
Centre sylvicole Forestville	
Conseil de bande des Innus de Pakua Shipu	
Conseil des Innus d'Ekuanitshit	
Conseil des Innus de Pessamit	
Conseil des Innus d'Unamen Shipu	
Conseil de la Première Nation des Innus Essipit	X
Coopérative de travailleurs forestiers de Sainte-Marguerite	X
Coopérative forestière La Nord-Côtière	X
Côte-Nord environment	X
Fédération de l'industrie manufacturière — Confédération des syndicats nationaux (FIM-CSN)	X
Groupeement agroforestier Côte-Nord inc.	X
Innu Takuaikan Uashat mak Mani-Utenam (ITUM)	
MRC de Manicouagan	X
MRC de Sept-Rivières	X
MRC La Haute-Côte-Nord	X
Naskapi Nation of Kawawachikamach	
Nation Innue Matimekush — Lac John	
Nord-Forêt inc.	X
Organisme de bassin versant Haute-Côte-Nord (OBVHCN)	X
Pourvoirie du lac Cyprès	
Première Nation des Innus de Nutashkuan	X
Producteurs et productrices acéricoles du Québec (PPAQ)	

Produits forestiers Résolu	X
Regroupement des gestionnaires de zecs de la Côte-Nord	
Regroupement des locataires des terres publiques du Québec	X
Regroupement des trappeurs de la Côte-Nord	
Manicouagan-Uapishka Biosphere Reserve (RMBMU)	X
Société du Plan Nord	X
Syndicat des Métallos	X
Syndicat des propriétaires forestiers de la région de Québec	X
Unifor	X
Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM)	
Université du Québec en Abitibi-Témiscamingue (UQAT)	X
Université Laval	

Gaspésie–Îles-de-la-Madeleine (February 22)	
Organization name	Presence
Agence régionale de mise en valeur des forêts privées de la Gaspésie–Les-Îles	X
Association provinciale des trappeurs indépendants	
Cedrico	X
Conseil de l'eau du Nord de la Gaspésie	X
Conseil régional de l'environnement de la Gaspésie	
Coopérative forestière de la Gaspésie	X
Damaboïs	X
Fédération de l'industrie manufacturière — Confédération des syndicats nationaux (FIM-CSN)	X
FOREMO	
Gesgapegiag Mi'gmaq First Nation	X
Groupe de scieries GDS	X
Groupe Lebel inc.	X
Groupement forestier coopératif Baie-des-Chaleurs	
Groupement forestier Rocher Percé	X
Listuguj Mi'gmaq Government	
MRC de Bonaventure	X
MRC de la Haute-Gaspésie	X

Nation micmaque de Gespeg	
Pépinière Baie-des-Chaleurs inc.	
Pourvoirie de la Seigneurie du lac Métis	
Producteurs et productrices acéricoles du Québec (PPAQ) — Bas-Saint-Laurent–Gaspésie	X
Regroupement des gestionnaires de zecs de la Gaspésie	
Regroupement des locataires des terres publiques du Québec	
Scierie Saint-Elzéar inc.	X
Secrétariat Mi'gmawei Mawiomi	
Services forestiers Maxifor	
Société de gestion des rivières de Gaspé	X
Solidarité Gaspésie	X
Syndicat des producteurs de bois de la Gaspésie	X
Unifor	
Université du Québec à Rimouski	
Université Laval	
Ville de Bonaventure	X
Ville de Sainte-Anne-des-Monts	X

Saguenay–Lac-Saint-Jean (February 27, 2024)	
Organization name	Presence
Agence de gestion intégrée des ressources (AGIR)	X
Agence régionale de mise en valeur des forêts privées du Saguenay	
Alliance forêt boréale	X
Arbec, Bois d'œuvre inc.	X
Association des entrepreneurs en travaux sylvicoles du Québec	X
Association des grands propriétaires forestiers du Québec	X
Association forestière Saguenay–Lac-Saint-Jean	X
Association québécoise des entrepreneurs forestiers (AQEF)	X
Association régionale des trappeurs du Saguenay–Lac-Saint-Jean	
Centrale des syndicats démocratiques (CSD)	X
Centre de géomatique du Québec	X
Conseil de la Première Nation des Innus Essipit	X

Conseil régional de l'environnement et du développement durable du Saguenay–Lac-Saint-Jean	X
Coopérative forestière Ferland-Boilleau	X
Fédération de l'industrie manufacturière — Confédération des syndicats nationaux (FIM-CSN)	X
Foresco Holding	X
FPIInnovations	
Groupe Forestra	X
MRC du Fjord-du-Saguenay	X
MRC de Lac-Saint-Jean-Est	X
MRC Maria-Chapdelaine	X
Organisme de bassin versant Lac-Saint-Jean	X
Pépinière Boucher	X
Pourvoirie Poulin de Courval	X
Première Nation des Pekuakamiulnuatsh	X
Producteurs et productrices acéricoles du Québec (PPAQ)	X
Produits forestiers Petit-Paris inc.	X
Produits forestiers Résolu inc.	X
Regroupement des locataires des terres publiques du Québec	X
Regroupement régional des gestionnaires de zecs du Saguenay–Lac-Saint-Jean	X
Scierie Girard inc.	X
Scieries du Lac Saint-Jean inc.	X
Scierie Martel Itée	
Société Sylvicole Mistassini	X
Syndicat des Métallos	X
Syndicat des producteurs de bois du Saguenay–Lac-Saint-Jean	X
Unifor	X
Université du Québec à Chicoutimi	X
Ville de Dolbeau-Mistassini	X
Ville de Saguenay	X
Ville de Saint-Félicien	X
West Fraser	X

Capitale-Nationale and Chaudière-Appalaches (February 29, 2024)	
Organization name	Presence
Agence de mise en valeur des forêts privées des Appalaches	X
Association des grands propriétaires forestiers du Québec	X
Charlevoix Outfitters Association	X
Association des propriétaires de boisés de la Beauce	X
Association régionale des trappeurs de la Capitale-Nationale	
Bechedor — private nursery	X
Centrale des syndicats démocratiques (CSD)	
Centre d'enseignement et de recherche en foresterie (CERFO)	X
Clermond Hamel Itée	
Conseil régional de l'environnement Chaudière-Appalaches (CRECA)	X
Conseil régional de l'environnement de la Capitale-Nationale	X
Conseillers forestiers de la région de Québec	X
Coopérative de gestion forestière des Appalaches	X
Entreprise forestière Les Sapins Verts inc.	
Fédération de l'industrie manufacturière — Confédération des syndicats nationaux (FIM-CSN)	
FPIInnovations	X
Groupe Lebel	X
Groupement forestier Beauce-Sud	
Groupement forestier du Sud de Dorchester	X
Maibec	X
Matériaux Blanchet	X
MRC de Beauce-Sartigan	
MRC de Portneuf	
Nation huronne-wendat	X
Organisme de bassin versant des rivières Sainte-Anne, Portneuf et du secteur La Chevrotière (CAPSA)	
Producteurs et productrices acéricoles du Québec (PPAQ) — Côte-du-Sud	
Producteurs et productrices acéricoles du Québec (PPAQ) — Québec–Rive-Nord	X
Regroupement des gestionnaires de zecs de Chaudière-Appalaches	X

Regroupement des gestionnaires de zecs de la Capitale-Nationale	X
Regroupement des locataires des terres publiques du Québec (RLTP)	X
Scierie Dion et fils	X
Société en commandite Stadacona WB — Papiers White Birch	X
Syndicat des producteurs de bois de la Côte-du-Sud	X
Unifor	X
Université Laval	X
Ville de Saint-Raymond	X
Zec Batiscan-Neilson	X

Mauricie (March 12, 2024)	
Organization name	Presence
Agence régionale de mise en valeur des forêts privées mauriciennes	X
Arbec, Bois d'œuvre inc.	X
Association des grands propriétaires forestiers du Québec	X
Association des trappeurs Mauricie–Bois-Francs	
Association forestière de la Vallée du Saint-Maurice	X
Association régionale des gestionnaires de zecs de la Mauricie	X
Azteck Foresterie	X
Bassin Versant Saint-Maurice	X
Centrale des syndicats démocratiques (CSD)	X
Centre d'innovation des produits cellulosiques	X
Commonwealth Plywood	X
Conseil des Atikamekw d'Opitciwan	
Conseil des Atikamekw de Wemotaci	X
Conseil de la Nation Atikamekw (CNA)	
Coopérative forestière du Bas Saint-Maurice	X
Coopérative forestière du Haut Saint-Maurice	X
Environnement Mauricie	X
Fédération de l'industrie manufacturière — Confédération des syndicats nationaux (FIM-CSN)	X
FPIInnovations	X
Groupe forestier Arthabaska-Drummond	X

Kruger Wayagamack S.E.C.	X
MRC Mékinac	X
Pourvoirie Domaine touristique La Tuque inc.	
Pourvoirie Wabanaki	X
Producteurs et productrices acéricoles du Québec (PPAQ) — Mauricie	
Produits forestiers Mauricie S.E.C.	X
Reboisement Mauricie	X
Syndicat des producteurs de bois de la Mauricie	X
Unifor	X
Université Concordia	
Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières (UQTR)	X
Ville de La Tuque	X
WestRock	

Centre-du-Québec and Estrie (March 13, 2024)	
Organization name	Presence
Agence régionale de mise en valeur des forêts privées de l'Estrie	X
Association des grands propriétaires forestiers du Québec	X
Association forestière du Sud du Québec	X
Association provinciale des trappeurs indépendants — Conseil de l'Estrie inc.	
Cascades	
Centrale des syndicats démocratiques (CSD)	X
Conseil régional de l'environnement du Centre-du-Québec (CREQC)	
Domtar inc.	X
Fédération de l'industrie manufacturière — Confédération des syndicats nationaux (FIM-CSN)	X
Groupement forestier coopératif Saint-François	X
Inovem	X
J.M. Champeau	X
Kruger Énergie Bromptonville S.E.C.	X
Laforêt, Coopérative de services forestiers	X
MRC du Haut-Saint-François	
Multi-Forêt Pelletier	

Producteurs et productrices acéricoles du Québec (PPAQ) — Estrie	X
Regroupement des locataires des terres publiques du Québec (RLTP)	
Regroupement régional des zecs de l'Estrie	X
Services forestiers François Martel	X
Syndicat des producteurs forestiers du Sud du Québec	X
Tafisa Canada inc.	X
Unifor	X
Université de Sherbrooke	X
Vexco inc.	X
W8banaki	X

Outaouais (March 19, 2024)	
Organization name	Presence
Algonquins of Barriere Lake	
Agence des forêts privées de l'Outaouais	X
Association des pourvoiries de l'Outaouais	X
Association provinciale des trappeurs indépendants — Conseil Outaouais	
Commonwealth Plywood	X
Conseil régional de l'environnement et du développement durable de l'Outaouais (CREDDO)	X
Enviro Éduc-action	X
Fédération de l'industrie manufacturière — Confédération des syndicats nationaux (FIM-CSN)	X
FPIInnovations	
Groupe forestier du Pontiac inc.	
Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg	X
Lauzon — Planchers de bois exclusifs inc.	X
Les conseillers forestiers de l'Outaouais	X
Louisiana-Pacific Canada Ltd.	X
MRC de Papineau	X
MRC Pontiac	X
MRC Vallée-de-la-Gatineau	X
Office des producteurs de bois de Pontiac	X

Papier Masson — Papiers White Birch	X
Producteurs et productrices acéricoles du Québec (PPAQ) — Outaouais-Laurentides	X
Produits forestiers Résolu Canada inc.	X
Regroupement des locataires des terres publiques du Québec (RLTP)	X
Services de coupe GR inc.	X
Société sylvicole de la Haute-Gatineau	
Unifor	X
Université du Québec en Outaouais	X
Université Laval	
Ville de Gatineau	X
Zecs Outaouais	X

Laval, Lanaudière et Laurentides (March 21, 2024)	
Organization name	Presence
AGIR Maskinongé	X
Agence régionale de mise en valeur des forêts privées — Laurentides	X
Alliance des propriétaires forestiers Laurentides-Outaouais	X
Association des trappeurs professionnels du Québec (ATPQ) — Lanaudière	X
Association forestière du sud du Québec	
Bernard de Valicourt inc.	X
Biomasse du lac Taureau	X
Centre de développement des composites du Québec (CDCQ)	
Club Notawissi	X
Commonwealth Plywood	X
Conseil des Atikamekw de Manawan	
Conseil régional de l'environnement des Laurentides	X
Coopérative forestière du Haut Saint-Maurice	X
Fédération de l'industrie manufacturière — Confédération des syndicats nationaux (FIM-CSN)	X
FPIInnovations	X
Forestiers R.B.E. Lasalle	X
Groupe Crête	X
Innofibre	

Mohawks of Kanesatake	
MRC Antoine-Labelle	
MRC des Laurentides	
MRC de Matawinie	
Municipalité de Saint-Donat	X
Municipalité de Saint-Michel-des-Saints	X
Pépinière de Harrington	X
Pourvoirie Coin Lavigne	
Producteurs et productrices acéricoles du Québec (PPAQ) — Lanaudière	X
Producteurs et productrices acéricoles du Québec (PPAQ) — Outaouais-Laurentides	X
Regroupement des gestionnaires de zecs de Lanaudière	
Regroupement des locataires des terres publiques du Québec (RLTP)	X
Regroupement régional des gestionnaires de zecs des Hautes-Laurentides	X
Scierie Saint-Michel	X
Table Forêt Laurentides	X
Terra Bois — Coopérative forestière	X
Uniboard Canada	X
Unifor	X
Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM)	X
Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières (UQTR)	
Université du Québec en Outaouais (UQO)	

Abitibi-Témiscamingue (March 26, 2024)	
Organization name	Presence
Action boréale	X
Agence régionale de mise en valeur des forêts privées de l'Abitibi	X
Arbec, Bois d'œuvre	
Association forestière de l'Abitibi-Témiscamingue (AFAT)	X
Association des gestionnaires de zecs de l'Abitibi-Témiscamingue	
Association des trappeurs de l'Abitibi-Témiscamingue	X
Centre technologique des résidus industriels (CTRI)	X
Chalets Baie des Plongeurs	

Chantiers Chibougamau	X
Communauté anicinape de Kitcisakik	
Conseil de la Nation Anishnabe du Lac-Simon	X
Conseil de la Première Nation Abitibiwinni	
Conseil régional de l'environnement de l'Abitibi-Témiscamingue (CREAT)	X
Coopérative forestière de Girardville	
Coopérative de travailleurs sylvicoles Abifor	X
Entreprises Forestières L.P.L.	X
Fédération de l'industrie manufacturière — Confédération des syndicats nationaux (FIM-CSN)	
FPIInnovations	X
Groupement forestier coopératif Abitibi	X
Horizon Nord	X
Horizon SF	X
Interfor	X
Kebaowek First Nation	
Long Point First Nation	
MRC d'Abitibi-Ouest	X
MRC Témiscamingue	X
Organisme de bassin versant du Témiscamingue (OBVT)	X
Producteurs et productrices acéricoles du Québec (PPAQ) — Outaouais-Laurentides	
Produits forestiers Résolu	X
Régionale des zecs des Hautes-Laurentides	X
Regroupement des locataires des terres publiques du Québec (RLTP)	X
Serres coopératives de Guyenne	X
Syndicat des producteurs de bois	X
Timiskaming First Nation	
Unifor	X
Université du Québec en Abitibi-Témiscamingue (UQAT)	X
Ville d'Amos	X
Ville de Rouyn-Noranda	X
Ville de Senneterre	X
West Fraser	X

Wolf Lake First Nation	
------------------------	--

Nord-du-Québec (March 28, 2024)	
Organization name	Presence
Accès 49/Nord inc.	X
Administration régionale Kativik	
Association forestière du Saguenay–Lac-Saint-Jean (AFSLSJ)	
Barrette-Chapais Itée	X
Chantiers Chibougamau	X
Comité consultatif de l'environnement Kativik	
Comité consultatif pour l'environnement de la Baie-James (CCEBJ)	
Conseil Cris-Québec sur la foresterie (CCQF)	X
Coopérative forestière de Girardville	
FPIinnovations	X
Gouvernement de la nation crie	X
Gouvernement régional Eeyou Istchee Baie-James	
Granules 777	
Horizon Nord	
Horizon SF	
Interfor	X
Matériaux Blanchet	
Plantation d'arbres M.M.	X
Pouvoirie Rivière aux Feuilles inc.	
Producteurs et productrices acéricoles du Québec (PPAQ)	
Produits forestiers Résolu	X
Regroupement des locataires des terres publiques du Québec (RLTP)	X
Société Makivik	
Unifor	
Université du Québec en Abitibi-Témiscamingue (UQAT)	X
Université Laval	X
Ville de Chapais	X
Ville de Chibougamau	X

Ville de Lebel-sur-Quévillon	X
Ville de Matagami	X

Montérégie and Montreal (April 3, 2024)	
Organization name	Presence
Agence forestière de la Montérégie	X
Armand Duhamel & fils inc.	
Association des grands propriétaires forestiers du Québec	X
Association des trappeurs Montréal/Laval/Montérégie	
Association forestière du sud du Québec	X
Barrette Wood	
Cascades	X
Centrale des syndicats démocratiques (CSD)	
Centre d'études des procédés chimiques du Québec (CEPROCQ)	
Conseil régional de l'environnement de Montréal	X
Domtar	X
Emballages Kruger S.E.C.	X
Entreprise Denis Roy	X
Fédération de l'industrie manufacturière — Confédération des syndicats nationaux (FIM-CSN)	
Goforest inc.	X
Goodfellow inc.	
Groupe forestier des Cantons	X
Les Clubs 4-H du Québec	X
Mohawks of Akwesasne	
Mohawks of Kahnawá:ke	
Polytechnique Montréal	
Producteurs et productrices acéricoles du Québec (PPAQ)	X
Regroupement des locataires des terres publiques du Québec (RLTP)	X
RF Biotiques	X
Scierie West Brome inc.	
Syndicat des Producteurs forestiers du Sud du Québec	X
Unifor	

Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM)	X
Université McGill	

APPENDIX 3. LIST OF FIRST NATIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS INVITED TO THE TABLES DE RÉFLEXION SUR L'AVENIR DE LA FORÊT

Communities
Algonquins of Barriere Lake
Communauté anicinape de Kitcisakik
Conseil des Atikamekw de Manawan
Conseil des Atikamekw d'Opitciwan
Conseil des Atikamekw de Wemotaci
Conseil des Innus de Ekuanitshit
Conseil de la Nation Anishnabe du Lac Simon
Conseil de la Première Nation Abitibiwinni
Conseil de la Première Nation des Innus Essipit
Conseil des Innus de Pessamit
Innu Takuaikan Uashat Mak Mani-Utenam
Kebaowek First Nation
Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg
Long Point First Nation
Mohawks of Akwesasne
Mohawks of Kahnawá:ke
Mohawks of Kanesatake
Montagnais de Pakua Shipi
Montagnais de Unamen Shipu
Naskapi Nation of Kawawachikamach
Nation huronne-wendat
Nation Innu Matimekush — Lac John
Première Nation des Innus de Nutashkuan
Première Nation des Pekuakamiulnuatsh
Timiskaming First Nation
Timiskaming First Nation
Wolf Lake First Nation
Organizations
Administration régionale Kativik

Assemblée des Premières Nations Québec-Labrador
Conseil de la Nation Atikamekw
Gouvernement de la nation crie
Institut de développement durable des Premières Nations du Québec et du Labrador
Secrétariat Mi'gmawei Mawiomi
Société Makivik
W8banaki
Comités de mise en œuvre des ententes en milieu nordique
Comité consultatif de l'environnement Kativik
Comité consultatif pour l'environnement de la Baie-James
Conseil Cris-Québec sur la foresterie

ANNEXE 4. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS PRESENT AT THE RENCONTRE NATIONALE DE RÉFLEXION SUR L'AVENIR DE LA FORÊT (NATIONAL MEETING FOR TABLES DE RÉFLEXION SUR L'AVENIR DE LA FORÊT) (APRIL 11, 2024)

- Agences régionales de mise en valeur des forêts privées
- Alliance forêt boréale
- Association des biologistes du Québec
- Association des consultants en foresterie du Québec
- Association des entrepreneurs en travaux sylvicoles du Québec
- Association des grands propriétaires forestiers du Québec
- Association des producteurs de copeaux du Québec
- Association québécoise des entrepreneurs forestiers
- Centrale des syndicats démocratiques
- Centre d'enseignement et de recherche en foresterie
- Conseil Cris-Québec sur la foresterie
- Conseil de l'industrie forestière du Québec
- Fédération des pourvoiries du Québec
- Fédération québécoise des coopératives forestières
- Fédération des producteurs forestiers du Québec
- Fédération québécoise des gestionnaires de zecs
- Fédération québécoise des municipalités
- Formabois
- FPInnovations
- Fédération de l'industrie manufacturière (FIM-CSN)
- Groupements forestiers Québec
- Nature Québec
- Observatoire régional de recherche sur la forêt boréale
- Office des producteurs de plants forestiers du Québec
- Ordre des ingénieurs forestiers du Québec
- Producteurs et productrices acéricoles du Québec
- Regroupement des associations forestières régionales du Québec
- Regroupement des locataires des terres publiques du Québec
- Regroupement des organismes de bassins versants du Québec
- Regroupement national des conseils régionaux de l'environnement du Québec
- Société pour la nature et les parcs du Canada — Section Québec
- Synchronex
- Syndicat des Métallos
- Unifor
- Union des municipalités du Québec
- Université du Québec
- Université Laval

*Ressources naturelles
et Forêts*

Québec

