2014

# Annual Monitoring Report

## SFM Indicators and High Conservation Values

Liscomb River High Conservation Value Forest Area
©Tree Top Images

**WOODLANDS**

**PORT HAWKESBURY PAPER**

## Executive Summary


The 2014 Annual Monitoring Report provides a summary of Port Hawkesbury Paper's safety, environmental, and forest management progress in the Woodlands Unit. Since 2002, Port Hawkesbury Paper (PHP) has been monitoring and reporting on a suite of sustainable forest management indicators to measure its progress towards achieving targets regarding social, economic, environmental, and cultural forest values. Long-term monitoring of these values allows the public to better understand PHP's forest management activities, and the goals and objectives we set to ensure our forest management is having a positive impact and to implement action items in areas that we are not. This is an important element of continual improvement, which PHP strives for every day.

This report also summarizes the effectiveness monitoring program for High Conservation Value Forests (HCVF). These values were first identified in 2008 for Forest Stewardship Council® (FSC®) certification and updated in March 2015 to include new knowledge and information. Annual monitoring is conducted to assess the effectiveness of the measures used to maintain or enhance the identified values.

## Contents

# About the Woodlands Unit




With a dedicated staff of 23 people, the company's Woodlands Unit currently manages 30% of the Crown land in Nova Scotia, which represents 58% (roughly 523,000 hectares) of the Crown land in the seven eastern counties. As a result of 45 years of silviculture activities on these lands, the forest will increase in economic activity over the next 20 years.

Our wood supply primarily comes from the seven eastern counties of Nova Scotia with additional wood purchased in central Nova Scotia. The Woodlands Unit provides silviculture services and information on sustainable forest management practices to private woodland owners. Additionally, we provide training on best management practices for Crown and private contractors and operators. In addition to acquiring softwood pulpwood from the managed forest, Port Hawkesbury Paper also manages its forest lands to produce high quality softwood and hardwood logs for sale to local sawmills and buyers.

As the largest Crown license holder in eastern Nova Scotia, we believe that good business includes strong community support and involvement, environmental awareness, continued growth in forest management and contribution to the Nova Scotia economy. The public use of

Crown lands for recreation, accessibility, hunting and fishing illustrates the wide variety of values held by the general public. To achieve sustainable forest management, the needs of all stakeholders must be assessed and managed appropriately.

Forest management certification is one of many tools to support the sustainability of Port Hawkesbury Paper. Certification is a voluntary process by which planning, procedures, systems and performance of on-the-ground forestry operations are audited by a qualified and independent third party against a predetermined standard. Forest operations found to be in conformance with the given standard are issued a certificate. Port Hawkesbury Paper supports the mutual recognition of credible forest certification systems that take into account national and regional characteristics such as natural conditions, forest ownership structures and legislation.

Forest operations at Port Hawkesbury Paper are carefully planned to deliver a valuable, sustainable resource that satisfies economic, social, and environmental benefits. More specifically, Port Hawkesbury Paper works diligently to ensure sustainable harvests, increased forest productivity, and protection for wildlife, water, and recreational resources. With the use of high-end computer mapping and software systems, we supervise our operations to strict standards to ensure we continually meet or exceed our expectations for a healthy productive forest for the future.

**Port Hawkesbury Paper's Crown Land Forest Management Area**

PHP's Defined Forest Area (DFA) is located in the seven eastern counties of Nova Scotia. The geographic extent of the DFA is shown in Figure 1. The company manages approximately 523,000 hectares of Crown lands through a license agreement with the provincial government within the DFA. The land inventory managed by PHP is broken down into four main components (Table 1).

In addition to acquiring wood from PHP company managed lands, the company harvests wood from private woodland owners through short-term stumpage leases. Private wood is also procured from private suppliers that operate on private woodlands located in central and eastern Nova Scotia. Private wood is purchased at roadside and the company provides competitive pricing. In addition, the company provides silviculture services and training in sustainable forest management practices to encourage good stewardship practices.

The public use of Crown lands for recreation, accessibility, hunting and fishing, to name a few, illustrates the wide variety of values held by the general public. Tourism plays an important role in the regional economy; as a result, unique challenges in meeting the needs of all stakeholders must be assessed and managed appropriately. The NSDNR has implemented an integrated resource management (IRM) land use approach for the management of Crown lands.




**PHP's Crown Land-base as per the Forest Utilization License Agreement**

The Crown land-base was assembled using photo-interpreted forest inventory flown in 2008 and 2009 as a base. Historic treatment GIS data were incorporated from PHP and government databases to update the spatial boundaries and attributes of the forest inventory. Wildlife habitat, ecosystem data, special management layers, and hydrology and roads layers were compared, agreed upon and amalgamated where appropriate to create the most recent and accurate dataset possible.

As land-base layers are overlaid, attributes are coded to allow for partitioning of results based on forest and non-forest values. The total land area includes all area, crown wilderness area and non-forested land are removed to create the forested land-base. After removing permanent exclusions (off limits to forest management prescriptions), the remainder is the working land-base which contributes to wood supply. The working land-base is largely occupied by special management lands, which dictate treatment prescription details. The below table summarizes the land-base net down.

| Landbase Category | | | | | Area(ha) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Total Land Area | | | | | 699,090 |
| 1.a Protected Area Land | 108,532 | | | | |
| 2. Land Outside Protection | | | | | 590,558 |
| 2.a Non-Forested Land | 98,782 | | | | |
| 3. Forested Landbase (FLB) | | | | | 491,776 |
| 3.a Inoperable/Subjective Removals | | 38,064 | 38,064 | | |
| 3.b Land Use Restrictions (IRM C3) | | 545 | 512 | | |
| 3.c 12 Percent Areas | | 77,943 | 65,076 | | |
| 3.d.1 DNR Lynx Habitat Buffers | | 24,523 | 18,836 | | |
| 3.d.2 DNR Moose Habitat Buffers | | 10,980 | 8,314 | | |
| 3.d.3 Coastal Plains Flora Buffers | | 106 | 77 | | |
| 3.e DNR Old Growth Policy | | 19,585 | 7,213 | | |
| 3.f Aboriginal Offered Lands | | 0 | 0 | | |
| 3.g Other Regional Harvest Exclusions | | 18,581 | 7,759 | | |
| *3 FLB Exclusions Sub-Total* | | | 145,850 | | |
| 4. Working Landbase (WLB) | | | | | 341,097 |
| 4.a Watercourse Buffers (20m) | | 36,980 | 15,822 | 15,822 | |
| 4.b Marten Patches | | 21,804 | 9,786 | 9,255 | |
| 4.c Deer Wintering Areas | | 18,082 | 10,904 | 10,436 | |
| 4.d Mainland Moose Areas (Softwood) | | 90,454 | 66,869 | 63,518 | |
| 4.e IRM - C2 Areas | | 247,010 | 149,922 | 112,265 | |
| 4 Working Landbase (WLB) | | | | 211,296 | |
| 5. WLB No Restrictions | | | | | 134,630 |

**Landbase breakdown for Eastern Crown Land**

# Key Commitments to Safety


**Woodlands Safety Results**

The Woodlands Safety Results show a strong trend towards zero lost time accidents and medical aids. However, we continue to promote employee and worker safety through effective training programs, monitoring, and communication to strive towards our objective of zero safety incidents year after year.




A Lost Time Accident occurs when an employee or worker is injured on the job which results in lost work time. There was one lost-time accident in 2014.

A Medical Aid occurs when an employee or worker is injured on the job and requires medical aid, but does not result in lost work time. There were two medical aids in 2014.

# Key Commitments to the Environment




Monitoring and reporting on Woodlands environmental performance is an integral part of achieving responsible forest management across the working landscape. Harvest contractors working on Crown land on behalf of the company are audited by PHP three times a year - Winter, Summer and Fall. Compliance and performance is checked against a range of items related to layout compliance, operational safety and environmental compliance, and job quality. Contractors must obtain a certain percentage or higher in each category to be eligible for a bonus payment.

With a total of 40 audits completed, harvest contractors continue to achieve a very high level of overall compliance and performance as shown in the 2014 results. This is due in large part to the long-standing working relationship between the company and its Crown land harvest contractors. Working together to monitor performance, share information, and strive to continually improve has resulted in strong on-the-ground results.

PHP also audits its private suppliers. A total of 30 suppliers were audited in 2014. Using the previous quarter's deliveries, wood suppliers are randomly chosen to be audited by a PHP Area

Supervisor. Private supplier audits are performed on active jobs when possible. However, auditing a completed job may be necessary with smaller suppliers.

Below are summaries of PHP's Crown and private supplier audit program for 2014. Areas of deficiencies are highlighted in orange. If the deficiencies are consistently on-going or deemed to be of significant concern, communications are made to suppliers to improve performance.

**Crown Contractor Audit Results – Winter 2014**













1 **WEEKLY INSPECTIONS COMPLETED ACCURATELY**

**LAYOUT COMPLIANCE**
2 Followed Cutting Boundaries
3 Wildlife clumps (as per instructions)
4 Wildlife corridors (50M min)
5 Properly buffered watercourses and wetlands
6 Residual Trees retained (10/Ha)
**OPERATION COMPLIANCE**
7 First Aid Supplies
8 First Aid trained personnel (Copies to be made available)
9 Personal Protective Equipment
Fire Protection Equipment
10 · Crew
11 · Machines
12 Remote Location Emergency Plan
13 Proper Warning Signs Posted on 2-way Public Traffic Road
14 System to check on Employees who Work Alone
15 Current Documentation
16 Lock Out - Tag Out Policy in place
Fuel & Oil Storage:
17 · Spill Kit
18 · Pumps (able to be locked for transport or off duty.)
19 · Trailer Permits if not floated.
20 · Central collection spot for Hazardous Material. (2.04)
21 . WHMIS and TDG trained personnel (Copies to be made available)
22 . Waste oil disposal system in place
23 · Tanks Properly Labeled / Placarded to TDG and WHIMS Regulations
24 . Storage tanks located not closer than 100m from any watercourse
**Water Quality:**
25 . Bridges used and Erosion controlled on approaches to stream crossing
26 . Temporary bridges removed, water courses cleared of debris
27 . No evidence of siltation
28 Machine Rutting: Within Guidelines (or as permitted by Supervisor)
29 Ground Disturbance: Within Guidelines
30 Safety Meeting Minutes
31 EMS Training - New Employees
32 Biodegradable Chain Oil used
Total
**JOB QUALITY**
ALL JOBS
Housekeeping:
33 · Garbage & Litter collected to be discarded
34 · No Discarded Parts/Tires
35 · Disposed of Hazardous Materials
36 Road drains and culverts cleared of debris
37 Unmerchantable hardwood trees protected
38 Damage To Leave Trees Acceptable
39 · Plantations
40 · Spacing
41 · Regeneration
**NON - CLEARCUT TREATMENTS HARVEST**
42 Tree Spacing
43 Basal Area
44 Trail spacing
45 Trail width
46 No Damage To Leave Trees

## Crown Contractor Audit Results – Summer 2014









1 **WEEKLY INSPECTIONS COMPLETED ACCURATELY**

**LAYOUT COMPLIANCE**

2 Followed Cutting Boundaries
3 Wildlife clumps (as per instructions)
4 Wildlife corridors (50M min)
5 Properly buffered watercourses and wetlands
6 Residual Trees retained (10/Ha)
OPERATION COMPLIANCE

**OPERATION COMPLIANCE**

Water Quality:

7 . Bridges used and Erosion controlled on approaches to stream crossing
8 . Temporary bridges removed, water courses cleared of debris
9 . No evidence of siltation
10 Machine Rutting: Within Guidelines (or as permitted by Supervisor)
11 Ground Disturbance: Within Guidelines
Total

**JOB QUALITY**

Housekeeping:

12 · Garbage & Litter collected to be discarded
13 · No Discarded Parts/Tires
14 · Disposed of Hazardous Materials
15 Road drains and culverts cleared of debris
16 Unmerchantable hardwood trees protected
17 Damage To Leave Trees Acceptable
18 · Plantations
19 · Spacing
20 · Regeneration
21 UTILIZATION <= 2 M3/HA

**NON - CLEARCUT TREATMENTS HARVEST**

22 Tree Spacing
23 Basal Area
24 Trail spacing
25 Trail width
26 No Damage To Leave Trees

## Crown Contractor Audit Results – Fall 2014













1 **WEEKLY INSPECTIONS COMPLETED ACCURATELY**

**LAYOUT COMPLIANCE**
2 Followed Cutting Boundaries
3 Wildlife clumps (as per instructions)
4 Wildlife corridors (50M min)
5 Properly buffered watercourses and wetlands
6 Residual Trees retained (10/Ha)
OPERATION COMPLIANCE
**OPERATION COMPLIANCE**
Water Quality:
7 . Bridges used and Erosion controlled on approaches to stream crossing
8 . Temporary bridges removed, water courses cleared of debris
9 . No evidence of siltation
10 Machine Rutting: Within Guidelines (or as permitted by Supervisor)
11 Ground Disturbance: Within Guidelines
Total
**JOB QUALITY**
Housekeeping:
12 · Garbage & Litter collected to be discarded
13 · No Discarded Parts/Tires
14 · Disposed of Hazardous Materials
15 Road drains and culverts cleared of debris
16 Unmerchantable hardwood trees protected
17 Damage To Leave Trees Acceptable
18 · Plantations
19 · Spacing
20 · Regeneration
21 UTILIZATION < = 2 M3/HA
**NON - CLEARCUT TREATMENTS HARVEST**
22 Tree Spacing
23 Basal Area
24 Trail spacing
25 Trail width
26 No Damage To Leave Trees

## Private Supplier Audit Results – 2014





**Legal Requirements**
1. Properly buffered watercourses and wetlands.
2. Wildlife clumps left on site.
3. Coarse woody debris left on site.
4. No construction debris/slash in stream.
5. No silt source from road entering stream.
6. There is no evidence of un-cleaned oil spills over 100 litres.
7. Personal protective equipment
8. First Aid Kit
9. Training records shown for First Aid, WHMIS, and TDG (as required)- within 1 month
10. Fire protection equipment as required for crew and machines
11. Fuel tanks properly labeled/placarded/stored/secured to TDG and WHMIS regs.
12. Lock Out - Tag Out in place

**Operations Management Plan**
14. Operations Management Plan
15. Property and cut boundaries flagged.

**Roads and Landings**
16. Take off ditches or cross culverts present and functional
18. No blockage of natural drainage.
19. Haul roads ditched and crowned.
20. Road graveled where needed.
21. No ditches running into stream.
23. Proper size culvert or bridge used.
26. Landing location minimizes risk of stream siltation.

**Operating Practices**
27. Forwarder trails on driest locations.
28. Forwarder approach to roadside chosen to minimize damage.
30. Supplier has demonstrated efforts to minimize rutting.
31. Portable bridge used.
32. Immature stands are preserved.
33. Harvested merchantable trees have been fully utilized.
34. Wood is piled outside of the special management zone.
36. Boundary lines kept clear of brush.
13. Fuel storage is more than 30 metres from stream.

**Equipment**
38. Fuel and oil leaks are not present on machinery.
39. Spill kit available on job.

**Housekeeping**
40. Garbage is properly contained and disposed of.
41. Used oil is properly disposed of.

**Best Management Practices - Other**
42. Conservation of known critical wildlife habitat elements, biodiversity & species at risk
43. SMPs followed in known Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value
44. SMPs followed for known invasive exotic plants and animals
45. Known characteristics of special sites preserved
46. Harvest residues (slash, limbs, tops) adequately distributed/utilized

# Sustainable Forest Management Indicators


The mission of the Woodlands Unit is to provide a reliable, cost effective and high quality supply of wood through the implementation of Sustainable Forest Management.

The vision of Port Hawkesbury Paper LP Woodlands Unit is "that the forest resources, for which we have responsibility, will sustain healthy ecosystems and natural biodiversity, provide a continuous and expanding supply of valuable wood and conserve the forest characteristics of value to society, wildlife and the environment."

Through the Port Hawkesbury Paper Sustainable Forest Management Policy, the Woodlands Unit implements its Mission and Vision for Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) through 15 Guiding Principles of SFM, 6 Guiding Principles of Wood Procurement, and 16 Standard Practices for SFM.

## Indicators of Sustainable Forest Management

For over a decade, PHP has been monitoring and reporting on a variety of sustainable forest management (SFM) indicators. To measure sustainable management over time for a range of forest values, indicators were developed to monitor progress in the maintenance or enhancement of those values.

The Woodlands monitoring program for SFM indicators consists of internal assessments and audit programs. Results from these programs are analyzed and summarized on an annual basis to determine if targets are being achieved or have failed to meet set targets. Accordingly, this identifies management actions that must be adjusted to achieve desired outcomes.

Local-level SFM indicators were developed according to the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers' criteria for sustainable forest management. These criteria are:

- Conservation of Biological Diversity
- Forest Ecosystem Condition and Productivity

- Conservation of Soil and Water Resources
- Forest Ecosystem Contributions to Global Ecological Cycles
- Multiple Benefits to Society
- Accepting Society's Responsibility for Sustainable Development

## CRITERION 1 - CONSERVATION OF BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

**Conserve biological diversity by maintaining integrity, function, and diversity of living organisms and the complexes of which they are part.**

### Indicator 1.1 - Species Diversity - Significant Species

| | |
|---|---|
| OBJECTIVE | Managing and mitigating effects on known occurrences of endangered and threatened species. |
| INDICATOR | Annual review of NSDNR's Significant Species and Habitats Database and other species status lists. |
| TARGET<br>Complete annual review of NSDNR's Significant Species and Habitats Database, and other species status lists, and implement appropriate management activities where necessary. | VARIANCE<br>None allowed |
| 2014 Update | The Significant Habitat database is updated each year by the provincial Department of Natural Resources and provided to PHP to be used in forest management planning activities. The 2014 Significant Habitat database maintained by NSDNR contains 31,371 ha of significant species habitats potentially affected by forest management activities on PHP's landbase. The significant species identified in the 2014 data are categorized into the following:<br><br>Deer Wintering Area 21,665 ha<br>Migratory Bird 260 ha<br>Moose Wintering 5,652 ha<br>Species of Concern 1,075 ha<br>Species at Risk 1,522 ha<br>Other Habitat 1,197 ha<br><br>The 2014 data are used in operational planning and is reviewed by NSDNR during the harvest approval process. Other species status and appropriate management strategies have been incorporated into PHP's High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) Assessment Report. |

*Moose (Mainland population) - Endangered*

*"The native population of moose in Nova Scotia is limited to approximately 1000 individuals in isolated sub-populations across the mainland. The population has declined by at least 20% over the past 30 years with much greater reductions in distribution and population size over more than 200 years, despite extensive hunting closures since the 1930's. The decline is not well understood but involves a complex of threats including: over harvesting, illegal hunting, climate change, parasitic brainworm, increased road access to moose habitat, spread of white-tailed deer, very high levels of cadmium, deficiencies in cobalt and possibly an unknown viral disease.*

*Moose on Cape Breton Island are not risk as they are abundant and the result of a re-introduction of moose from Alberta in the 1940's."*

*Source: http://novascotia.ca/natr/wildlife/biodiversity/species-list.asp*

## Indicator 1.2 - Genetic Diversity - Connectivity Management Zones

| | |
|---|---|
| OBJECTIVE | To maintain landscape level Connectivity Management Zones (CMZs) according to company connectivity guidelines. |
| INDICATOR | Percent of CMZs managed according to connectivity guidelines. |
| TARGET<br>Maintain a compliance level of 100% of the total number of CMZs meeting the 100 m solid cover with minimum 30% crown closure. | VARIANCE<br>10% |
| 2014 Update | All 46 CMZs assessed for 100 m solid cover with minimum 30% crown closure met the connectivity guidelines for 100% compliance. |




| | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % Compliance | 100 | 93 | 100 | 98 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Indicator Target | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |






## Indicator 1.3 - Protected Areas - Protected Area Strategy

| | |
|---|---|
| OBJECTIVE | To identify and maintain areas reserved from harvest under a protected areas strategy on Crown and freehold lands. |
| INDICATOR | Proportion of area reserved from harvest under a protected area strategy by EPU. |
| TARGET<br>Maintain 12% of total area reserved from harvest under a protected area strategy. | VARIANCE<br>+/- 1% |
| 2014 Update | |

| Ecoregion | Percent Protected |
|---|---|
| 1 - Cape Breton Taiga | 72% |
| 2 - Cape Breton Highlands | 59% |
| 3 - Uplands | 25% |
| 4 - Eastern | 19% |
| 5 - Northumberland | 19% |
| 8 - Atlantic Coastal | 42% |

These percentages are expected to increase in the coming year as the provincial government finalizes a new protected area strategy.

*Source: NS Department of Environment, French River Wilderness Area*

**Indicator 1.4 - Protected Areas - Old Forest**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| OBJECTIVE | To maintain old forest conditions throughout the landscape. | |
| INDICATOR | Percent of DFA by EPU protected for old forest values. | |
| TARGET<br>Maintain 8% of forest areas in old forest condition. | | VARIANCE<br>+/- 1% |
| 2014 Update | In 2014 the total area reserved as old forest across the forest management area was 16 %. | |

*Old Forest Area, Guysborough County, Andrea Doucette, PHP*

## CRITERION 2 - FOREST ECOSYSTEM CONDITION AND PRODUCTIVITY

Conserve forest ecosystem condition and productivity by maintaining the health, vitality, and rates of biological production.

### Indicator 2.1 - Forest Ecosystem Resilience - Natural Regeneration

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| OBJECTIVE | To promote Acadian forest characteristics through the use of natural regeneration. | |
| INDICATOR | Proportion of appropriate natural regeneration in company's reforestation program. | |
| TARGET<br>Naturally regenerate with appropriate species 50% of total annual reforestation area. | | VARIANCE<br>+/- 10% |
| 2014 Update | In 2014, 60 % of the total reforestation program was naturally regenerated. | |




| | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % Natural Regeneration | 85 | 50 | 53 | 52 | 63 | 56 | 58 | 63 | 60 | 60 |
| Indicator Target | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 |

*Red Spruce Natural Regeneration, Derek Geldart, PHP*

**Indicator 2.2 - Forest Ecosystem Resilience - Harvest Treatments**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| OBJECTIVE | Reduce clearcut area by applying alternative harvest treatments in appropriate ecoregions. | |
| INDICATOR | Proportion of total (softwood and hardwood) area harvested using unevenaged, thinning, shelterwood, selection cut and/or partial cut techniques by EPU. | |
| TARGET<br>Increase non-clearcut treatments in appropriate ecoregions to represent 40% of total harvest by 2015 and 50% of total harvest by 2025. | | VARIANCE<br>+/- 5 Year Period |
| 2014 Update | In 2014, the percent of total harvest representing non-clearcut treatments was 45%. | |




| | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % Non-Clearcut | 39 | 30 | 30 | 43 | 42 | 29 | 33 | 30 | 28 | 26 | 44 | 37 | 45 |
| Indicator Target 2015 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |

*Red Spruce Shelterwood, Matthew McKenna, PHP*

**Indicator 2.3 - Forest Ecosystem Productivity - Forest Health**

| | |
|---|---|
| OBJECTIVE | To minimize fire, insect and disease occurrence across the forest landscape. |
| INDICATOR | Area (by ha) of forest killed by fire, insect and disease. |
| TARGET<br>Less than 500 ha of forest killed by fire, insect and disease. | VARIANCE<br>+ 1000 ha |
| 2014 Update | There was no evidence or recorded data by NS Department of Natural Resources for total forest killed by fire, insect, or disease in 2014. |




**Indicator 2.4 - Forest Ecosystem Productivity - Budworm Hazard**

| | |
|---|---|
| OBJECTIVE | To minimize budworm hazard on the Cape Breton Highlands. |
| INDICATOR | Area (by ha) killed by budworm outbreak on the Cape Breton Highlands. |
| TARGET<br>To have zero hectares of forest killed by a budworm outbreak. | VARIANCE<br>+ 800 ha |
| 2014 Update | In 2014, 0 ha of forest in Cape Breton Highlands was killed by a budworm outbreak. |



## CRITERION 3 - CONSERVATION OF SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES

Conserve soil and water resources by maintaining their quantity and quality in forest ecosystems.

### Indicator 3.1 - Soil Protection - Steep Slopes

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| OBJECTIVE | To avoid regular harvesting in identified steep slope areas. | |
| INDICATOR | Area (by ha) of regular harvest in steep slope areas. | |
| TARGET<br>Maintain no regular harvest in areas with greater than 30% average slope. | | VARIANCE<br>+ 20 ha |
| 2014 Update | A total of 12 hectares was harvested in areas with greater than 30% average slope.<br><br>NOTE: This indicator is based on spatial data that identifies slopes > than 30% average using contour data. It is not based on the actual % slope for any given area as could be determined on-the-ground. Therefore, to calculate the results for the indicator, a GIS exercise is done which overlaps the steep slope data with completed harvest jobs to determine non-conformances. Most often, the areas showing as harvested are slivers due to inaccuracies in the data. | |

*MacKenzie Mountain - CB, Matthew McKenna, PHP*




| | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ha of regular harvest | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 15 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 12 |
| Indicator Target | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Indicator 3.2 - Water Protection - Watersheds

| | |
|---|---|
| OBJECTIVE | To protect hydrological functions in all watersheds. |
| INDICATOR | Proportion of identified watershed area (that is managed by PHP) in a closed forest condition. |
| TARGET<br>Each watershed shall have 80% of its area (that is managed by PHP) in a closed forest condition. | VARIANCE<br>- 5% |
| 2014 Update | PHP has identified 17 watersheds throughout its management area that are monitored specifically for closed forest condition (> 10 years of age). Watershed size ranges from the smallest at 9 hectares to the largest at 51,293 hectares. In 2014, all 17 watersheds had 80% or more of its area in a closed forest condition. |

| **Watershed Name (and total hectares managed by PHP)** | **% Closed Forest 2014** | **% Closed Forest 2013** | **% Closed Forest 2012** | **% Closed Forest 2011** | **% Closed Forest 2010** | **% Closed Forest 2009** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Antigonish Municipal Watershed (647 ha) | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Guysborough 1 Municipal Watershed (2515 ha) | 96% | 100% | 100% | 92% | 93% | 93% |
| Guysborough 2 Municipal Watershed (9 ha) | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Inverness Municipal Watershed (125 ha) | 92% | 95% | 95% | 97% | 97% | 97% |
| Pictou Municipal Watershed (40 ha) | 100% | 90% | 88% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Victoria Municipal Watershed (962 ha) | 98% | 96% | 98% | 98% | 98% | 100% |
| Baddeck River Watershed (15545 ha) | 94% | 95% | 99% | 93% | 93% | 97% |
| East River Watershed (9468 ha) | 93% | 95% | 94% | 89% | 89% | 91% |
| Grand River Watershed (5662 ha) | 85% | 82% | 85% | 82% | 82% | 81% |
| Liscomb River Watershed (12760 ha) | 90% | 91% | 96% | 90% | 90% | 93% |
| Margaree River Watershed (29118 ha) | 89% | 98% | 100% | 91% | 92% | 96% |
| Middle River Watershed (15757 ha) | 87% | 94% | 99% | 92% | 92% | 95% |
| Mira River Watershed (13337 ha) | 92% | 100% | 100% | 92% | 93% | 92% |
| New Harbour River Watershed (452 ha) | 99% | 98% | 98% | 99% | 99% | 99% |
| North River Watershed (16108 ha) | 83% | 92% | 96% | 79% | 84% | 93% |
| River Inhabitant Watershed (4922 ha) | 93% | 96% | 96% | 94% | 94% | 94% |
| St. Mary's River Watershed (51293 ha) | 93% | 93% | 96% | 90% | 90% | 92% |

*St. Mary's River Watershed, Andrea Doucette, PHP*

### Indicator 3.3 - Water Protection - Riparian Zone Management

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| OBJECTIVE | To protect and maintain all riparian functions. | |
| INDICATOR | Number of riparian zone non-conformance incidents. | |
| TARGET<br>To have zero non-conformance incidents. | | VARIANCE<br>None allowed |
| 2014 Update | One harvest job in 2014 did not meet the requirements for maintaining a minimum 20 meter wide riparian buffer. | |




### Indicator 3.4 - Water Protection - Roads and Stream Crossings

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| OBJECTIVE | To reduce negative impacts on water quality resulting from road construction. | |
| INDICATOR | Number of road construction and stream crossing incidents (new and upgrades) according to company guidelines. | |
| TARGET<br>To have zero non-conformance incidents. | | VARIANCE<br>None allowed |
| 2014 Update | In 2014, there were no incidents related to road construction and stream crossings. | |




| | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| # of Incidents | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Indicator Target | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

*New bridge installation, Paul MacDonald, PHP*

## CRITERION 4 - FOREST ECOSYSTEM CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL ECOLOGICAL CYCLES

Maintain forest conditions and management activities that contribute to the health of global ecological cycles.

### Indicator 4.1 - Forest Carbon - Harvest Volume

| | |
|---|---|
| OBJECTIVE | To reduce carbon emissions. |
| INDICATOR | Period average volume per hectare harvested. |
| TARGET<br>Increase the average harvest volume by 20% within the next 25 years. | VARIANCE<br>+/- 5 Year Period |
| 2014 Update | The average volume per hectare harvested was 75 $m^3$/ha. This is based on all treatments excluding commercial thinnings. |




| | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Average Volume/ha | 80 | 64 | 76.3 | 93 | 48 | 60 | 62 | 65 | 63 | 67 | 86 | 68 | 75 |
| Indicator Target | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 |

**Indicator 4.2 - Forest Carbon - Total Growing Stock**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| OBJECTIVE | To contribute to total carbon storage through maintenance of above-ground carbon pool. | |
| INDICATOR | Total growing stock of both merchantable and non-merchantable species on forest lands. | |
| TARGET<br>Total growing stock of 21,221,500 $m^3$ | | VARIANCE<br>+/- 1,000,000 $m^3$ |
| 2014 Update | The total growing stock for softwood is estimated to be 17,895,038 $m^3$ and the total growing stock for hardwood is estimated to be 15,019,044 $m^3$. | |

**Indicator 4.3 - Forest Land - Road Construction**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| OBJECTIVE | To minimize amount of deforested land. | |
| INDICATOR | Width of permanently disturbed area due to road construction. | |
| TARGET<br>Reduce average road width of newly constructed roads by 10%. | | VARIANCE<br>5% +/- |
| 2014 Update | The average road width of newly constructed roads in 2014 was 11 meters. | |




| | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Average Road Width | 13.2 | 15.8 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 8.7 | 7.9 | 8.5 | 7.6 | 7.5 | 11.0 |
| Indicator Target | 11.8 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 11.8 |

*Photo: Lefort Road Bridge, Cape Breton, PHP*

## CRITERION 5 - MULTIPLE BENEFITS TO SOCIETY

Sustain flows of forest benefits for current and future generations by providing multiple goods and services.

### Indicator 5.1 - Timber and Non-timber Benefits - Hardwood Management

| | |
|---|---|
| OBJECTIVE | To increase the future value of the hardwood resource. |
| INDICATOR | Area (by ha) of hardwood management. |
| TARGET<br>Manage 2,800 hectares of hardwood in the first five year period of the 2015 Long-Term Plan. | VARIANCE<br>+/- 500 ha |
| 2014 Update | In 2014, the area of hardwood management was 1,152 ha. In previous years, the amount of hardwood management to improve stand quality was much lower prior to 2013 due to poor markets for the low-grade hardwood typically found in many forest stands.<br><br>In 2012, Nova Scotia Power commissioned a 60-megawatt steam turbine on the PHP mill site, which uses low-grade material such as hardwood. The needs of the steam turbine allowed for the increased management of hardwood stands, since the turbine would act as a market for low-grade hardwood that is commonly generated during harvest. This also provides for an increase in high quality hardwood logs for local sawmills. |



*Single Tree Selection, Obidary Road, Antigonish*

**Indicator 5.2 - Communities and Sustainability - Harvest Level**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| OBJECTIVE | To continue to harvest at a sustainable rate. | |
| INDICATOR | Annual harvest level. | |
| TARGET<br>Harvest 400,000* m3 of softwood per year. | | VARIANCE<br>-10% |
| 2014 Update | In 2014, the volume amount harvested was 320,000 $m^3$ of softwood (80% of annual harvest level). | |



*Softwood clearcut harvest, Liscomb, Matthew McKenna, PHP*

### Indicator 5.3 - Communities and Sustainability - Third Party Requests

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| OBJECTIVE | Where appropriate, provide economical, recreational and cultural opportunities to the general public. | |
| INDICATOR | Number of reasonable third party requests approved. | |
| TARGET<br>Approve all reasonable third party requests received each year. | | VARIANCE<br>10 requests |
| 2014 Update | A total of 23 third party requests were received in 2014 and all were approved. | |

### Indicator 5.4 - Fair Distribution of Benefits and Costs - Sales to Other Mills

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| OBJECTIVE | To ensure fair distribution of forest resources. | |
| INDICATOR | Proportion harvest volume sold to other buyers. | |
| TARGET<br>Sell at least 40% of annual harvest volume to other buyers. | | VARIANCE<br>+/- 5 Year Period |
| 2014 Update | In 2014, the company sold 30% of the annual harvest volume to other buyers. | |




| | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % sold to other buyers | 25 | 13 | 28 | 34 | 72 | 23 | 30 | 22 | 27 | 20 | 28 | 35 | 30 |
| Indicator Target | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |

## CRITERION 6 - ACCEPTING SOCIETY'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Soceity's responsibility for sustainable forest management requires that fair, equitable and effective forest management decisions are made.

### Indicator 6.1 - Aboriginal and Treaty Rights - Respect First Nations

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| OBJECTIVE | To provide opportunities to better understand, recognize and respect local Mi'kmaw and Treat Rights. | |
| INDICATOR | Number of opportunities to meet with Mi'kmaw community representatives. | |
| TARGET<br>Ensure a minimum of six opportunities to meet with Mi'kmaw individuals/communities/organizations annually. | | VARIANCE<br>- 1 Meeting |
| 2014 Update | In 2014, the company met on 5 separate occasions with Mi'kmaw communities and individuals. | |

### Indicator 6.2 - Aboriginal and Treaty Rights - First Nation Agreements

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| OBJECTIVE | To build capacity within Mi'kmaq communities to provide increased employment opportunities for Mi'kmaw individuals. | |
| INDICATOR | Volume harvested under agreements with Mi'kmaq communities. | |
| TARGET<br>To increase the softwood and hardwood volume harvested under First Nation agreements to 60,000 tonnes. | | VARIANCE<br>- 5,000 tonnes |
| 2014 Update | In 2014, the total volume harvested was 20,784 tonnes. | |




| | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Annual harvest level | 22,144 | 6,424 | 15,734 | 25,582 | 21,804 | 23,985 | 12,327 | 11,144 | 16,501 | 20,784 |
| Target | 62,750 | 62,750 | 62,750 | 62,750 | 62,750 | 62,750 | 62,750 | 62,750 | 62,750 | 60,000 |

**Indicator 6.3 - Respect Aboriginal Traditions - FAC Participation**

| | |
|---|---|
| OBJECTIVE | To ensure meaningful Mi'kmaw participation in the Forest Advisory Committee (FAC). |
| INDICATOR | Number of regular FAC meetings attended by a Mi'kmaw representative or designate. |
| TARGET<br>To engage Mi'kmaq participation in six FAC meetings annually. | VARIANCE<br>- 2 meetings |
| 2014 Update | In 2014, 0 out of 4 FAC meetings were attended by a Mi'kmaw representative. |




| | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| # of FAC Meetings Attended | 5 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Indicator Target | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 4 |

### Indicator 6.4 - Public Participation - Opportunities for Participation

| | |
|---|---|
| OBJECTIVE | To engage the public in sustainable forest management planning. |
| INDICATOR | Number of FAC meetings and general public opportunities/avenues for public participation. |
| TARGET<br>Ensure a minimum of six FAC meetings annually, public open-houses and/or regional forest tours. | VARIANCE<br>None |
| 2014 Update | In 2014, the FAC met on 4 separate occasions. A total of 6 meetings with presentations were held with municipal councils in PHP's operating area. PHP also held an open house in Port Hawkesbury Paper to present its new 2015 Long-term Plan and Protected Areas Gap Analysis, and hosted the Canadian Woodlands Forum Fall Meeting, which included a forest tour. |




| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| # FAC Meetings & Other Public Opportunities | 9 | 10 | 15 | 13 | 11 | 12 | 18 | 18 | 9 | 12 | 15 | 12 |
| Indicator Target | 9 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |

### Indicator 6.5 - Decision-Making - Education and Extension

| | |
|---|---|
| OBJECTIVE | To advance sustainable forest management principles through commitments to research and extension. |
| INDICATOR | Level of investment and contribution to education and extension initiatives. |
| TARGET<br>The company will provide $0.03 of direct and/or in-kind contributions to education and extension initiatives for every $m^3$ harvested within the defined forest area. | VARIANCE<br>+/- $0.01 |
| 2014 Update | In 2014, $0.66 for every $m^3$ harvested was contributed to education and extension initiatives. |




| | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Indicator Target | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.09 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.43 | 0.66 |
| Indicator Target | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 |

# Summary of SFM Indicators

Since 2002, the Woodlands Unit has developed, monitored and reported on a suite of SFM indicators. During that time, indicators have been revised or removed to be replaced with better indicators based on a new understanding of forest dynamics. PHP has made significant progress in achieving several of our targets and others are on their way. To improve their conditions over time, management decisions and activities will be implemented to result in indicators trending towards their desired targets.

- Target Achieved within Acceptable Variance
- Target On-going
- Target Not Achieved within Acceptable Variance

| | |
|---|---|
| 1.1 Annual review of NSDNR's significant species and habitats database, and other species status lists. | |
| 1.2 Percent of CMZs meeting the 60% closed forest condition guideline. | |
| 1.3 Proportion of area reserved from harvest under a protected areas strategy by EPU. | |
| 1.4 Percent of defined forest area by EPU protected for old forest values. | |
| 2.1 Proportion of natural regeneration in reforestation program. | |
| 2.2 Proportion of total (softwood and hardwood) area harvested using unevenaged, thinning, shelterwood, selection cut and/or partial cut techniques by EPU. | |
| 2.3 Area of forest disturbed by fire, insect and disease. | |
| 2.4 Area (by ha) affected by budworm outbreak on the Cape Breton Highlands. | |
| 3.1 Area (by ha) of regular harvest in steep slope areas. | |
| 3.2 Proportion of identified watershed area (that is managed by PHP) in closed forest condition. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 3.3 Number of riparian zone non-conformance incidents. |  |
| 3.4 Number of road construction and stream crossing incidents according to company guidelines. |  |
| 4.1 Yearly average volume per hectare harvested. |  |
| 4.2 Total growing stock of both merchantable and non-merchantable species on forest lands. |  |
| 4.3 Width of permanently disturbed area due to road construction. |  |
| 5.1 Area (by ha) of hardwood management. |  |
| 5.2 Annual harvest level. |  |
| 5.3 Number of reasonable 3rd party requests approved. |  |
| 5.4 Proportion harvest volume sold to other mills. |  |
| 6.1 Number of opportunities to meet with Mi'kmaw community representatives. |  |
| 6.2 Volume harvested under agreements with Mi'kmaq communities. |  |
| 6.3 Number of regular FAC meetings attended by Mi'kmaw representative or designate. |  |
| 6.4. Number of FAC meetings and general public opportunities/ avenues for public participation. |  |
| 6.5 Level of investment and contribution to education and extension initiatives. |  |

# High Conservation Value Forest Effectiveness Monitoring Program

## Introduction

This HCVF Effectiveness Monitoring Program was developed to fulfill the requirements of Principle 9 of the FSC Maritimes Standard. To meet Principle 9 of the standard, forest managers must complete an assessment of their forest lands to identify high conservation values. There are six distinct categories that give an area critical conservation significance. FSC Canada defines an HCVF as:

*High Conservation Value Forests are those that that possess one or more of the following attributes:*

*a) Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant:*

> *i) Concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g., endemism, endangered species, refugia); and/or*
>
> *ii) Large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most (if not all) naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.*

*b) Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.*

*c) Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g., watershed protection, erosion control).*

*d) Forest areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g., subsistence, health) and/or critical to local communities‟ traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).*

Once HCVF's are identified on the land-base, the forest manager must decide how these areas will be managed to maintain or enhance the values that are present. Where values exist, monitoring is needed to show that the prescribed management is effective. PHP's effectiveness monitoring program identifies two stages of monitoring for several HCVF's.

The first level of monitoring is for the basic operational procedures or special management practices that have been identified for the value (e.g. buffer zones, maintenance of special habitat characteristics, protection). This level of monitoring is typically done on an annual basis. It is also important at this stage of monitoring to ensure that PHP is aware of and implementing the best management approach, prescriptions, and/or special management practices as defined

by an outside organization. Therefore, PHP will also contact known experts and/or organizations to gather any new available information regarding management or to verify that its current management approach is the best at that time. All HCV's have an identified operational monitoring protocol that is implemented on an annual basis.

The second level of monitoring, if applicable, is strategic monitoring to determine if the HCV attribute(s) are being maintained on the landscape. For example, for a species at risk such as Boreal Felt Lichen, it is important to determine that the identified forest habitat is still suitable and that the species is still present in the habitat. Contrary to operational monitoring, not all HCV's require a strategic level of monitoring. For example, the HCV of old forest are legally protected and therefore, not available for active forest management. Therefore, the attribute of maintaining old forests on the landscape is automatically preserved. Alternatively, strategic monitoring is important for species at risk when the objective is to maintain areas of good forest habitat for a threatened species, and to ensure that the species is still present in this habitat.

For strategic monitoring, PHP recognizes that there is a required level of involvement by government agencies and/or other organizations for the monitoring of species populations and health. It is PHP's intention to collaborate with these agencies to collect the necessary information.

## HCVF Category 1 – Biodiversity – Species at Risk

### HCV – American Marten Habitat

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Species at Risk – Habitat and Population** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Maintain and/or enhance American Marten habitat in home range patches |
| INDICATOR | Reserve stand structure as required within harvest areas located within the American Marten Habitat Management Zone |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Habitat management requirements are implemented through the DNR approval process for Crown lands. Monitor implementation of stand structure reserve using TFM. Verify annually that special management practices are still current and/or make operational changes as needed. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM); PHP & DNR field audits | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low to Moderate - Dependent on PHP's required level of involvement |
| LONG-TERM STRATEGIC MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | American Marten population recovery |
| INDICATOR | Population estimates / use within the Marten Habitat Management Zone |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Every 3 years. Baseline year is 2014. | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>DNR is responsible for population inventory and studying habitat use. PHP is responsible for obtaining this data. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>American Marten Recovery Team<br>DNR Biologist Peter Austin-Smith | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low to High - Dependent on PHP's required level of involvement |
| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION | |
| These prescriptions are applied throughout the Cape Breton Highlands:<br>- 12-14 standing and live mature trees per ha must be left evenly spaced throughout the harvest site;<br>- These are in addition to all other requirements of the Wildlife Habitat and Watercourse Protection Regulations;<br>- Large yellow birch trees should be left standing where possible; | |

- Special management practices for commercial thinning operations in marten patches;

- Harvest sites should maintain at least 100 m3 of coarse woody debris/ha and mean maximum diameter of downed logs should exceed 22 cm.

There are also 30 home range patches established within the Marten Habitat Management Zone. These patches may 'migrate' within the zone, but must be a minimum 500 ha in size, circular in shape, and contain a minimum 60% marten habitat as described in the marten recovery strategy.

**2014 MONITORING UPDATE**

1. All harvest treatments applied throughout the Cape Breton Highlands included the above management prescriptions as required and approved by DNR regional staff.
2. A total of 204 hectares (0.3%) was treated in 2014 inside the Marten Habitat Management Zone as per DNR's approval process.
3. The American Marten Recovery Strategy (2007) estimates that the Marten population is less than 50 individuals. A re-introduction program began in 2007, which brought 130 individuals into Cape Breton from New Brunswick. A total of 35 individuals were collared, but their movements were lost approximately 6 months after release. DNR does have pictures, have live-trapped, recorded tracks in snow and have received reports/sightings of marten in the Cape Breton Highlands (Peter Austin-Smith, pers. comm., 2013). A goal of the Marten Recovery Team is to have >= 30 marten in Cape Breton by 2010, >= 100 by 2030 and >= 350 by 2040.
4. Some work happening related to habitat issues for both American Marten and Canada Lynx (joint recovery team). Still being developed by DNR Species at Risk group. Looking to get more funding to do habitat modeling and management issues in CB Highlands. Nothing approved yet; still in discussion phase.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES

Marten Special Management Practices, NSDNR July 2012; Proposed Marten Recovery Strategy, NSDNR May 2006; Status Report on American Marten, F. Scott June 2001; Weaseling their Way Back into Cape Breton? Assessing the Feasibility of Augmenting the Cape Breton Island Marten Population Through Habitat Suitability and Individual-based Modeling, Rebecca Jepessen, Acadian University Thesis, 2010.

# HCV – Mainland Moose Habitat

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Species at Risk – Habitat and Population** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Maintain and/or enhance Mainland Moose habitat |
| INDICATOR | Reserve stand structure as required within harvest areas located within the five Significant Mainland Moose Population Concentration areas mapped by NSDNR |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Habitat management requirements are implemented through the DNR approval process for Crown lands. Monitor implementation of stand structure reserve using TFM. Verify annually that special management practices are still current and/or make operational changes as needed. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM); PHP & DNR field audits | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low to Moderate - Dependent on PHP's required level of involvement |
| LONG-TERM STRATEGIC MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Mainland Moose population recovery |
| INDICATOR | Population estimates / use of population concentration areas |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Every 3 years. Baseline year is 2014. | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>DNR is responsible for population inventory and studying habitat use. PHP is responsible for obtaining this data. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>Mainland Moose Recovery Team<br>DNR Biologist Mark Pulsifer | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low to High - Dependent on PHP's required level of involvement |
| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION | |
| - Moose shelter patches (within 250 metres of the edge of any forest harvest (partial or clearcut) a minimum of two closed canopy coniferous stands > 3 hectares in area)<br>- Moose retention patches (Smaller coniferous must also be retained within each harvest area to provide temporary shelter and concealment)<br>- Moose buffers (Forested buffers should be retained around and or near open wetlands, watercourses, and waterbodies)<br>- Roads and access points (Development of roads and improved trails should be avoided where | |

| |
|---|
| extended extraction trails can be used as an alternative)<br>- Coarse woody debris (leave tree tops and substantial amounts of woody debris on extraction trails to discourage access)<br>- Decommission roads to reduce human access |
| 2014 MONITORING UPDATE |
| 1. All harvest treatments within the mainland moose concentration areas included the above management prescriptions. Currently, there are concerns within DNR about the special management practices for mainland moose, so future harvest treatments in the moose concentration areas are assessed and approved individually by DNR for specific habitat requirements.<br>2. The Mainland Moose Recovery Plan (2007) estimates approximately 1000-1200 individuals on mainland Nova Scotia. This is the most current information available on mainland moose population numbers.<br>3. No changes have been made to the special management practices for mainland moose as issued by DNR; however, there are current discussions within the department about modifications to the SMPs. A guidance document was provided to PHP on April 13, 2014 which outlined guidance regarding moose retention patches for a specified time period (January 20 to July 18, 2014). The guidance document is now obsolete.<br>4. Mersey Tobeatic Research Institute had been contracted to develop a Mainland Moose Recovery Action Plan, which will outline planned activities for moose habitat monitoring and management, and population recovery. This Plan was delivered to the Department of Natural Resources in spring 2014. PHP has requested a copy from the Department once it becomes publicly available. |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES |
| Mainland Moose Special Management Practices, NSDNR July 2012; Recovery Plan for Mainland Moose in Nova Scotia, March 2007 |

## HCV – Canada Lynx Habitat

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Species at Risk – Habitat and Population** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Maintain and/or enhance Canada Lynx habitat |
| INDICATOR | Reserve stand structure in lynx bog buffers within harvest areas located throughout the Cape Breton Lynx Range |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Habitat management requirements are implemented through the DNR approval process for Crown lands. Monitor implementation of stand structure reserve using TFM. Verify annually that special management practices are still current and/or make operational |

| | |
|---|---|
| | changes as needed. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM); PHP & DNR field audits | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low to Moderate - Dependent on PHP's required level of involvement |
| LONG-TERM STRATEGIC MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Canada Lynx population recovery |
| INDICATOR | Population estimates / use of treed bog leave areas |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Every 3 years. Baseline year is 2013. | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>DNR is responsible for population inventory and studying habitat use. A joint project between DNR and Acadian University is assessing the efficacy of the 100 meter treed bog buffers. The project began in January 2013 and is expected to end in 2014. PHP is responsible for obtaining the results of this work. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>Canada Lynx Recovery Team<br>DNR Biologist Peter Austin-Smith | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low to High - Dependent on PHP's required level of involvement |
| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION | |

- To supplement red squirrel habitat, which is an important food source for lynx, a wider buffer strip of 100 m of unharvested forest should be left around all treed bogs in the Cape Breton lynx range.

- Where possible, decommission secondary, non-main trunk forest access roads following harvest.

- Plan access roads to have dead ends.

- Plan harvesting to allow decommissioning of sectors of road networks.

- Where possible, narrow and orient road right-of-ways to create shade conditions to reduce snow compaction, thereby reducing ease of travel for coyotes.

- Maintain a continuous supply of >50ha patches of mid-regeneration (15-35-year old) conifer dominated habitat that supports high densities of snowshoe hare over each lynx management unit.

- Create a landscape that will maintain a continuous presence of a mosaic of successional stages, especially mid-regeneration patches that will support resident lynx.

- Employ silvicultural techniques that create, maintain, or prolong use of stands by high populations of snowshoe hares.

- Retain coarse woody debris for denning sites.

| 2014 MONITORING UPDATE |
|---|
| 1. All harvest treatments within the Cape Breton lynx range where treed bogs were identified, a 100 meter strip of unharvested forest was left as approved by DNR regional staff.<br>2. The Canada Lynx Recovery Strategy (2005) estimates approximately 50-500 individuals in the Cape Breton lynx range. This is the most current information available on Canada lynx population numbers.<br>3. No changes have been made to the special management practices for Canada Lynx as issued by DNR.<br>5. Some work happening related to habitat issues for both American Marten and Canada Lynx (joint recovery team). Still being developed by DNR Species at Risk group. Looking to get more funding to do habitat modeling and management issues in CB Highlands. Nothing approved yet; still in discussion phase.<br>4. DNR and Acadia University are using transect sampling and back-tracking to record/measure habitat use and presence by Canada lynx, snowshoe hare and red squirrel within 100 meter treed bog buffers and adjacent stands. The work is undertaken between January and March 2013 and 2014. Statistical results are expected by Acadia University in the fall of 2014 and DNR has made funding requests to conduct surveys for another field season. |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES |
| Canada Lynx Special Management Practices NSDNR July 2012; Lynx Recovery Strategy Feb 2007; Endangered Canada Lynx Proposed Project: Assessing the interim 100 metre buffers around highland bogs, DNR 2014 |

## HCV – Wood Turtle Habitat

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Species at Risk – Habitat and Population** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Maintain and/or enhance Wood Turtle habitat |
| INDICATOR | Implementation of temporal and spatial special management practices for wood turtles |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Habitat management requirements are implemented through the DNR approval process for Crown lands. Monitor implementation of temporal and spatial requirements using TFM. Verify annually that special management practices are still current and/or make operational changes as needed. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM); PHP & DNR field audits | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low to Moderate - Dependent on PHP's required level of involvement |

| LONG-TERM STRATEGIC MONITORING PROGRAM | |
|---|---|
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Wood Turtle population recovery |
| INDICATOR | Population estimates |

| | |
|---|---|
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Every 3 years. Baseline year is 2014. | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>DNR is responsible for population inventory and studying habitat use. PHP is responsible for obtaining this data. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>Wood Turtle Recovery Team<br>DNR Biologist Mark Pulsifer | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low to High - Dependent on PHP's required level of involvement |

**FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION**

- Adjust the timing and location of motorized vehicle use for forest management activities to when Wood Turtles are inactive or less likely to be occupying terrestrial habitat (Nov – March)

- Use temporary bridge crossings for perennial streams to avoid altering stream bank, creating erosion and sedimentation, damaging stream bed, and impacting overwintering turtles.

- Forest management roads and landings should not be constructed parallel to watercourses within 200 m of watercourses where wood turtles occur.

- Special management practices for overwintering, nesting, and basking (see DNR Special Management Practices 2012).

**2014 MONITORING UPDATE**

1. All harvest treatments where wood turtles are presumed to be have the above management prescriptions implemented as approved by DNR regional staff.
2. The population of wood turtles in PHP's operating area is estimated to be approximately 3,500 individuals (M. Pulsifer, pers. comm., 2013)
3. No changes have been made to the special management practices for wood turtle as issued by DNR.
4. Monitoring for new locations has not been a funding priority for DNR, and outside funding has been significantly reduced. A graduate student working on overwintering habitat and communal distribution has just finished his MSc at Acadia. There is nothing significantly different with DNR's understanding of wood turtle distribution within the watershed.
5. DNR is not receiving reports of dead turtles that can be linked directly to the forest industry.

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES**

Wood Turtle Special Management Practices NSDNR July 2012; Protecting and Conserving Wood Turtles: A Stewardship Plan for NS, 2003

## HCV – Bicknell's Thrush Habitat

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Species at Risk – Habitat and Population** | |
|---|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Maintain and/or enhance Bicknell's Thrush habitat | |
| INDICATOR | Implementation of temporal and spatial special management practices for Bicknell's Thrush | |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Identify planned pre-commercial thinning activities in Bicknell's Thrush habitat in the Highlands, so field surveys by Bird Studies Canada can first be conducted to identify presence/absence of the bird during their breeding/nesting season (May, June, July). Monitor implementation of leave patches in thinned/cleared areas using a GIS overlay. Verify annually that special management practices are still current and/or make operational changes as needed. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM); PHP and Bird Studies Canada field audits | | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low – Bird Studies Canada has consistently completed Bicknell's Thrush surveys each spring if PHP has pre-commercial thinning activities planned for that summer. |
| LONG-TERM STRATEGIC MONITORING PROGRAM | | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Bicknell's Thrush population recovery | |
| INDICATOR | Population estimates | |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Every 3 years. Baseline year is 2014. | | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Bird Studies Canada annually monitors high elevation bird species through the High Elevation Landbird Program. Since 2002, the Bicknell's Thrush has been monitored in the Cape Breton Highlands to gather critical information about population status and habitat use. Approximately 20 to 30 routes are monitored each June with the continued goal of monitoring long-term trends of the Bicknell's Thrush. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>- Bird Studies Canada - Becky Stewart/Holly Lightfoot<br>- Cape Breton Highlands National Park – | | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low – Bird Studies Canada has consistently taken the lead on Bicknell's Thrush habitat and population research. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Matt Smith<br>- International Bicknell's Thrush Conservation Group (http://www.bicknellsthrush.org/)<br>- High Elevation Landbird Report: 10-year Summary, March 2012 | |

FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION

- Industrial forest stands that support Bicknell's Thrush should remain un-thinned until the trees are no longer at a successional stage that is suitable for nesting, as determined by further research.

- If clearing, construction and/or thinning in Bicknell's Thrush breeding habitat cannot be avoided, activities should be performed outside of the bird breeding season, before June 1st and after July 31st, to prevent the direct destruction of nests, eggs, nestlings, fledglings or adult birds.

- When forest clearing and thinning in Bicknell's Thrush breeding habitat cannot be avoided, patches of intact forest should be left whenever possible. These patches should:
  - cover at least one quarter hectare;
  - be located 20 to 50 metres from the uncut or unthinned edge; and
  - contain intact undisturbed underbrush.

2014 MONITORING UPDATE

1. Three Bicknell's Thrush surveys were needed in unthinned BITH habitat areas in the CB Highlands working forest in 2014. BITH was not observed to be present in either survey.
2. The current rough population estimate for the Bicknell's Thrush in Canada is between 40,570 and 49,258 birds, and it was previously estimated that approximately 1,200 breed in NB and NS (HELP Report, March 2012).
3. No changes have been made to the special management practices for Bicknell's Thrush as issued by Bird Studies Canada.
4. In March 2012, Bird Studies Canada released a 10-year summary report of their High Elevation Landbird Program. The results for Bicknell's Thrush monitoring found that the sampling intensity was not enough to detect statistically significant trends in population and habitat use.
5. In 2012-13, Bird Studies Canada refined HELP, using a Generalized Random Tessalation Stratified sampling design to randomly select routes and increase sampling intensity in Cape Breton, thus enabling us to meet international, national and regional information needs (HELP Report, March 2012).
6. In March 2014, Bird Studies Canada released High Elevation Landbird Program: Annual Report for Cape Breton Highlands National 2013-2014, which is a report of their last two years work on monitoring Bicknell's Thrush in the Cape Breton Highlands. The report states:

*"With similar sampling intensity as last year, detections of Bicknell's Thrush in 2013 were up slightly on Cape Breton. Routes near Lake of Islands and Tipover Lake in the center of the National Park were especially productive. However, Bicknell's Thrush was absent again this year from Benji's Lake Trail where they had been consistently detected over the past 10 years. Bicknell's Thrush continue to be detected on Money Point, which although is designated an*

| |
|---|
| *Important Bird Area by Bird Life International, is not afforded any formal protection. Of particular note, Bicknell's Thrush was detected on twice as many routes on Cape Breton compared to northern New Brunswick, despite more routes (49 in total) surveyed in New Brunswick. Furthermore, slightly more individual thrush were detected on Cape Breton (26) than New Brunswick (20).*<br>*The combination of Port Hawkesbury Paper "year since last cut" data and Bicknell's Thrush potential habitat data proved successful in predicting areas where Bicknell's Thrush were present in 2013. These results suggest this is a viable approach and new routes will be established using this combination of data for the spring 2014 survey season allowing for broader scale coverage in Cape Breton's industrial forest. Furthermore, adding "year since last cut" as an important variable will help to develop predictive models for other areas in the Maritimes."* |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES |
| Conserving the Bicknell's Thrush: Stewardship and Management Practices for High Elevation Forest, 2009; High Elevation Landbird Program: 10-year Report, March 2012<br>High Elevation Landbird Program: Annual Report for Cape Breton Highlands National 2013-2014 |

## HCV – Rusty Blackbird Habitat

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Species at Risk – Habitat and Population** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Maintain and/or enhance Rusty Blackbird habitat |
| INDICATOR | Reserve stand structure in Rusty Blackbird habitat |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Monitor implementation of reserve stand structure using field audits. Verify annually that special management practices are still current and/or make operational changes as needed. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM); PHP field audits | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low – PHP currently monitors for riparian buffer management on its operational field audits |
| LONG-TERM STRATEGIC MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Rusty Blackbird population recovery |
| INDICATOR | Population estimates |

| | |
|---|---|
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Every 3 years. Baseline year is 2014. | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>DNR is responsible for population inventory and studying habitat use. PHP is responsible for obtaining this data. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>NSDNR | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low to High - Dependent on PHP's required level of involvement |
| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION | |
| - PHP implements the Wildlife Habitat and Watercourse Protection Regulations, which is deemed sufficient for Rusty Blackbirds since they tend to occupy forests near the edges of wetlands, bogs, rivers and streams.<br>- PHP also establishes 100 meter buffers around all treed bogs in Cape Breton for Canada Lynx habitat management, which is also presumed to be beneficial for Rusty Blackbird. | |
| 2014 MONITORING UPDATE | |
| - There was one infraction regarding implementation of Wildlife Habitat and Watercourse Protection Regulations in 2014 due to the layout for the block occurring in the winter when there was a heavy snow load. Therefore, the stream was not visible at that time. Procedures were modified to ensure that layout activities are completed prior to the winter season. Lynx bog buffers have been implemented as required.<br>- The population of Rusty Blackbird in Nova Scotia is currently unknown. | |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES | |
| COSEWIC assessment and status report on the Rusty Blackbird *Euphagus carolinus*in Canada (2006) | |

## HCV – Roseate Tern Habitat

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Species at Risk – Habitat** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Maintain Roseate Tern Habitat |
| INDICATOR | Reserve stand structure in Roseate Tern habitat |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Maintain a 200 meter buffer zone along the coast at Fisherman's Harbour. Within this buffer zone, no management will occur. |

| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM) | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low – PHP does not conduct forest management activities within the 200 meter buffer zone. |
|---|---|
| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION | |
| - PHP does not conduct forest management activities within the 200 meter buffer zone at Fisherman's Harbour.<br>- Other critical habitat for the Roseate Tern is located on offshore islands. | |
| 2014 MONITORING UPDATE | |
| A GIS overlay using completed harvest treatment data from 2014 shows that there have been no forest management activities within the 200 meter buffer zone at Fisherman's Harbour. | |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES | |
| Roseate Tern Recovery Strategy 2006 | |

## HCV – Olive-Sided Flycatcher Habitat

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Species at Risk – Habitat** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Olive-sided Flycatcher Habitat |
| INDICATOR | Reserve stand structure in Olive-sided flycatcher habitat |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>PHP is currently participating in a working committee with Bird Studies Canada on a Habitat Stewardship Program project called 'Forest Birds at Risk'. The purpose of the project is to "provide guidance in the collection of habitat information and forest management practices that could potentially enhance conservation efforts for these species, and to evaluate their value in the Maritime context." Since this project is currently underway, special management practices have not yet been defined for the above bird species. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>ACCDC | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low – PHP does not yet implement SMP's |

| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION |
|---|
| The habitat characteristics of olive-sided flycatcher are minimally impacted by forestry activities due to where they typically inhabit. PHP leaves snags throughout its operations and the presence of tall trees can be found in several PHP silviculture treatments (e.g. single selection, group selection, partial cuts, shelterwoods, patch cuts, red spruce management). PHP also provides habitat features such as forest edges, openings, and clearcuts. Therefore, specific special management practices are deemed to be not necessary at this time and PHP believes there is adequate habitat across the forest management area. However, if special management practices are developed by government or other agencies, they will be implemented as applicable to forest management. If an active nest is located during regular operational activities, the activity will be stopped and the local DNR Wildlife Biologist will be notified so appropriate measures can be implemented. |
| 2014 MONITORING UPDATE |
| The 'Forest Birds at Risk' project with Bird Studies Canada is still active, so SMP's have not yet been finalized for this species. |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES |
| Forest Birds at Risk Project, Bird Studies Canada |

## HCV – Eastern Whip-Poor-Will Habitat

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Species at Risk – Habitat** | |
|---|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Eastern Whip-poor-will Habitat | |
| INDICATOR | Reserve stand structure in Eastern Whip-poor-will habitat | |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>PHP is currently participating in a working committee with Bird Studies Canada on a Habitat Stewardship Program project called 'Forest Birds at Risk'. The purpose of the project is to "provide guidance in the collection of habitat information and forest management practices that could potentially enhance conservation efforts for these species, and to evaluate their value in the Maritime context." Since this project is currently underway, special management practices have not yet been defined for the above bird species. |

| DATA SOURCES<br>ACCDC | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low – PHP does not yet implement SMP's |
|---|---|
| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION | |
| The habitat characteristics of whip-poor-will are minimally impacted by forestry activities due to where they typically inhabit. PHP creates forest edges and openings through active management, as well as even-aged stands that can contain well-spaced trees. Therefore, precautionary specific special management practices are deemed to be not necessary at this time and PHP believes there is adequate habitat across the forest management area. However, if special management practices are developed by government or other agencies, they will be implemented as applicable to forest management. If an active nest is located during regular operational activities, the activity will be stopped and the local DNR Wildlife Biologist will be notified so appropriate measures can be implemented. | |
| 2014 MONITORING UPDATE | |
| The 'Forest Birds at Risk' project with Bird Studies Canada is still active, so SMP's have not yet been finalized for this species. | |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES | |
| Forest Birds at Risk Project, Bird Studies Canada | |

## HCV – Eastern Wood Peewee Habitat

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Species at Risk – Habitat** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Eastern Wood Peewee Habitat |
| INDICATOR | Reserve stand structure in Eastern wood peewee habitat |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>PHP is currently participating in a working committee with Bird Studies Canada on a Habitat Stewardship Program project called 'Forest Birds at Risk'. The purpose of the project is to "provide guidance in the collection of habitat information and forest management practices that could potentially enhance conservation efforts for these species, and to evaluate their value in the Maritime context." Since this project is currently underway, special management practices have not yet been defined for the above bird species. |

| DATA SOURCES<br>ACCDC | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low – PHP does not yet implement SMP's |
|---|---|

| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION |
|---|
| The Eastern wood peewee can be impacted by forest management activities since this species of bird prefers mature and intermediate age stands of deciduous and mixed forests. However, PHP manages the forest management area by creating a range of age classes through forest modeling, long-term planning, and operational planning. Also, PHP manages deciduous and mixed forest stands with a variety of harvest treatments that can still maintain adequate forest structure (e.g. single selection, group selection, partial cuts, shelterwoods, patch cuts). The above figure shows the Maritime Breeding Bird Atlas data for the species. In eastern Nova Scotia where PHP operates, the breeding evidence shows a variety of results with the most common type being 'possible' evidence.<br><br>Forestry practices that maintain large tracts of intermediate aged forest with closed canopy and limited clear cuts (less than 10 ha) along with thinning to remove mature trees and large-diameter woody growth should provide adequate habitat for Eastern Wood-Pewees (Stauffer and Best 1980, Crawford et al. 1981).<br><br>Therefore, precautionary specific special management practices are deemed to be not necessary at this time and PHP believes there is adequate habitat across the forest management area. However, if special management practices are developed by government or other agencies, they will be implemented as applicable to forest management. If an active nest is located during regular operational activities, the activity will be stopped and the local DNR Wildlife Biologist will be notified so appropriate measures can be implemented. |
| 2014 MONITORING UPDATE |
| The 'Forest Birds at Risk' project with Bird Studies Canada is still active, so SMP's have not yet been finalized for this species. |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES |
| Forest Birds at Risk Project, Bird Studies Canada |

## HCV – Canada Warbler Habitat

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Species at Risk – Habitat** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Canada Warbler Habitat |
| INDICATOR | Reserve stand structure in Canada warbler habitat |

| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>PHP is currently participating in a working committee with Bird Studies Canada on a Habitat Stewardship Program project called 'Forest Birds at Risk'. The purpose of the project is to "provide guidance in the collection of habitat information and forest management practices that could potentially enhance conservation efforts for these species, and to evaluate their value in the Maritime context." Since this project is currently underway, special management practices have not yet been defined for the above bird species. |
|---|---|
| DATA SOURCES<br>ACCDC | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low – PHP does not yet implement SMP's |

| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION |
|---|
| The habitat characteristics of Canada warbler are minimally impacted by forestry activities due to where they typically inhabit. PHP creates regenerating stand structures and forest edge through active management, which is preferred by this species, but also avoid steep slope areas, ravines, swamps, and bogs. The provision of stumps and coarse woody debris left by PHP is also believed to create understory conditions preferred by the Canada warbler. Furthermore, PHP does not contribute to habitat loss by converting swamp forests to agricultural land. Therefore, precautionary special management practices are deemed to be not necessary at this time and PHP believes there is adequate habitat across the forest management area. However, if special management practices are developed by government or other agencies, they will be implemented as applicable to forest management. If an active nest is located during regular operational activities, the activity will be stopped and the local DNR Wildlife Biologist will be notified so appropriate measures can be implemented. |
| 2014 MONITORING UPDATE |
| The 'Forest Birds at Risk' project with Bird Studies Canada is still active, so SMP's have not yet been finalized for this species. |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES |
| Forest Birds at Risk Project, Bird Studies Canada |

# HCV – New Jersey Rush Habitat

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Species at Risk – Habitat** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Maintain New Jersey Rush Habitat |
| INDICATOR | Administratively protect New Jersey Rush habitat identified in NSDNR's Significant Habitat database and Atlantic Canada Conservation Data Centre database |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Monitor annual harvest operations to ensure New Jersey Rush habitat is administratively protected from all forest management activities. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM) | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low – PHP does not conduct forest management activities within New Jersey Rush habitat |
| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION | |
| - PHP does not conduct forest management activities within New Jersey Rush habitat identified in NSDNR's Significant Habitat database and Atlantic Canada Conservation Data Centre database | |
| 2014 MONITORING UPDATE | |
| A GIS overlay using completed harvest treatment data from 2014 shows that there have been no forest management activities in identified New Jersey Rush habitat. | |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES | |
| Recovery Strategy and Management Plan for Multiple Species of Atlantic Coastal Plain Flora 2010 | |

## HCV – Boreal Felt Lichen Occurrences

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Species at Risk – Habitat and Population** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Protect identified locations of Boreal Felt Lichen |
| INDICATOR | Administratively protect identified locations of Boreal Felt Lichen by establishing 100 meter buffer around site |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Monitor annual harvest operations to identify areas needing Boreal Felt Lichen presence/absence surveys prior to active operations. Locations of Boreal Felt Lichen are buffered by 100 meters and excluded from forest management activities. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM); Boreal Felt Lichen Potential Habitat Layer | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Moderate – PHP financially contributes annually to Boreal Felt Lichen surveys. Surveys are conducted by an expert lichenologist. |
| LONG-TERM STRATEGIC MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Boreal Felt Lichen population recovery |
| INDICATOR | Population estimates |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Every 3 years. Baseline year is 2014. | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>DNR is responsible for population inventory and studying habitat use. PHP is responsible for obtaining this data. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>NSDNR; NSDOE | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low to High - Dependent on PHP's required level of involvement |
| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION | |
| - In planned harvest operations containing potential Boreal Felt Lichen habitat, a field survey is conducted to determine if Boreal Felt Lichen is present on site. If found, a 100 meter no harvest buffer is left around the site. | |
| 2014 MONITORING UPDATE | |
| - In 2014, there were 14 planned harvest sites surveyed for Boreal Felt Lichen. Boreal Felt Lichen was not found across the survey area.<br>- Since 2008, PHP has worked with the Mersey Tobeatic Research Institute to conduct Boreal Felt Lichen surveys. Prior to these surveys, there were three known locations of Boreal Felt Lichen. Since PHP and MTRI's surveys began, the number of known locations has increased to 45. | |

| |
|---|
| - NSDNR recently published a paper entitled "Forest Harvesting Impacts on Mortality of an Endangered Lichen at the Landscape and Stand Scales". This paper supports the 100 meter protection buffer around known Boreal Felt Lichen sites to maintain the micro-climate around the site. NSDNR is also currently working on a habitat supply research paper. NSDNR will also be working on improving the predicted habitat model for Boreal Felt Lichen. NSDNR will also be monitoring how different buffer widths affect microclimate using iButtons (micro-climate data loggers). Currently, there are about 24 iButtons in the field which are being used to assess the variation between and within stands. This information will help determine the sample size needed for a future buffer width study. |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES |
| Boreal Felt Lichen Recovery Strategy; Boreal Felt Lichen Recovery Team |

## HCV – Vole Ears Lichen Occurrences

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Species at Risk – Habitat and Population** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Protect identified locations of Vole Ears Lichen |
| INDICATOR | Administratively protect identified locations of Vole Ears Lichen according to SMP |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Spatial data of known vole ears lichen has been provided to PHP by the NS Department of Environment. There are no known locations of vole ears lichen in the 7 eastern counties where PHP operates. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM); Boreal Felt Lichen Potential Habitat Layer | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low – There are no known locations of Vole Ears Lichen in PHP's management area |
| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION | |
| - Due to the known locations and predictive habitat to exist outside of PHP's forest management area, there are no special management practices identified at this time for vole ears lichen. PHP is a participating member of the provincial Lichen Recovery Team, so should any change occur where special management practices are required on PHP's lands, they will be implemented. | |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES | |
| COSEWIC Assessment and Status Report, 2009; NSDNR | |

## HCV – Blue Felt Lichen Occurrences

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Species at Risk – Habitat and Population** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Protect identified locations of Blue Felt Lichen |
| INDICATOR | Administratively protect identified locations of Blue felt lichen according to SMP |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Spatial data of known vole ears lichen has been provided to PHP by the NS Department of Environment. There are known locations of vole ears lichen in the 7 eastern counties where PHP operates. Of the 104 locations, 13 are located in the 7 eastern counties. Of the 13 located in the 7 eastern counties, 3 are located in PHP's forest management area and are in TFM for planning and operations. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM); Boreal Felt Lichen Potential Habitat Layer | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low – A survey was conducted for the two known locations of blue felt lichen in PHP's management area. |
| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION | |
| - Of the three locations known to exist on PHP's lands, one is located in a candidate protected area and is currently under a harvest moratorium. The other two locations are located in the working forest. These two locations are nearby to planned harvest operations. In the fall of 2014, PHP requested a survey of each area by an expert field lichenologist to verify if the lichen is still present. The lichen was present in both locations, so a 100 meter no harvest buffer will be maintained around each location, which is the same practice used for boreal felt lichen in Nova Scotia. | |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES | |
| Blue felt lichen occurrence data, NSDEL | |

## HCV – Eastern White Cedar

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Species at Risk – Habitat and Population** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Protect identified locations of Eastern White Cedar |
| INDICATOR | Protection of all known locations of Eastern White Cedar |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Ensure all known locations of Eastern White Cedar in PHP's management area are protected from harvest activities. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM); NSDNR, NSDEL, ACCDC databases | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low – PHP does not conduct include the harvest of Eastern White Cedar in its management |
| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION | |
| - PHP does not include the harvest of Eastern White Cedar in its forest management. Queries of the NSDNR forest inventory, as well as reviews of the rare species databases from NSDNR, NSDEL, and ACDCC, did not identify eastern white cedar stands for lands managed by PHP.<br><br>No known stands of eastern white cedar occur within PHP's area of operation. | |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES | |
| A Management Plan for Native Occurrences of Eastern White Cedar in Nova Scotia, 2010 | |

## HCV – Black Ash

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Species at Risk – Habitat and Population** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Protect identified locations of Black Ash |
| INDICATOR | Protection of all known locations of Black Ash |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Ensure all known locations of Black Ash in PHP's management area are protected from harvest activities. |

| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM); NSDNR, NSDEL, ACCDC databases | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low – PHP does not conduct include the harvest of Black Ash in its management |
|---|---|
| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION | |
| - PHP does not include the harvest of Black Ash in its forest management. Queries of the NSDNR forest inventory, as well as reviews of the rare species databases from NSDNR, NSDEL, and ACDCC, did not identify black ash stands for lands managed by PHP.<br><br>No known stands of black ash occur within PHP's area of operation. | |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES | |
| N/A | |

## HCV – Frosted Glass Whiskers Habitat

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Species at Risk – Habitat** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Maintain Frosted Glass Whiskers Habitat |
| INDICATOR | Administratively protect Frosted Glass Whiskers habitat identified in NSDNR's Significant Habitat database and Atlantic Canada Conservation Data Centre database |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Monitor annual harvest operations to ensure Frosted Glass Whiskers habitat is administratively protected from all forest management activities. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM) | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low – PHP does not conduct forest management activities within Frosted Glass Whiskers habitat |
| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION | |
| - PHP does not conduct forest management activities within Frosted Glass Whiskers habitat identified in NSDNR's Significant Habitat database and Atlantic Canada Conservation Data Centre database | |
| 2014 MONITORING UPDATE | |
| A GIS overlay using completed harvest treatment data from 2014 shows that there have been no forest management activities in identified Frosted Glass Whiskers habitat. | |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES | |
| Management Plan for the Frosted Glass Whiskers, Nova Scotia Population, 2011 | |

## HCV – Cold Water Refugia Sub-watersheds

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Long-term hydrologic functions** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Maintenance of thermal cover for Atlantic Salmon and Brook Trout habitat |
| INDICATOR | Maintain minimum 50% crown closure at the stand level with the exception of stands containing non-wind firm trees. |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Monitor implementation of stand structure reserve using GIS overlay of completed harvest treatments with cold water refugia sub-watershed areas. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM) | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low – PHP monitors this internally with resources currently available. |
| LONG-TERM STRATEGIC MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Maintenance of thermal cover for Atlantic Salmon and Brook Trout habitat |
| INDICATOR | Maintenance of normal long-term hydrologic functions |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Every 3 years. | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>PHP will explore a long-term monitoring program with partners such as NS Department of Aquaculture and Fisheries, and Fisheries and Oceans Canada, to monitor stream temperatures pre and post-harvest in a sample area of stands within cold water refugia sub-watersheds to determine effectiveness of thermal cover retention. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>- NS Department of Aquaculture and Fisheries<br>- Fisheries and Oceans Canada | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low to High – dependent on level of involvement by PHP |
| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION | |
| - Cold water refugia areas are managed to maintain as much thermal cover as possible by leaving a minimum 50% crown closure wherever possible at the stand level following harvest treatments.<br>- The only exception is in stands containing a high proportion of non-wind firm trees, such as balsam fir or white spruce that are vulnerable to blowdown.<br>- No intensive forest management will occur in these HCVF's (i.e. establishing FSC defined plantations). | |

| |
|---|
| 2014 MONITORING UPDATE |
| The below table shows total treated harvest jobs in cold water refugia areas to date in 2014. For areas where a clearcut or thinning was completed, the stand type was not conducive to maintaining minimum 50% crown closure. That is, these stands were dominated by non-wind firm trees such as fir or spruce. The single selection treatment maintained a minimum 50% crown closure following harvest. |




| |
|---|
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES |
| N/A |

## HCV – International Bird Areas

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Migratory birds habitat** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Maintain and/or enhance migratory bird habitat |
| INDICATOR | Reserve stand structure in Important Bird Areas (IBA's) |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Currently, all identified IBA's in PHP's operating area are not impacted by forest management activities due to their location (i.e. off shore islands or inaccessible forest areas). Specific protocols for monitoring birds at IBAs are in development and will leverage and adapt existing monitoring programs that are directly relevant to the IBA Program (IBA Canada website). Verify annually that spatial list of IBA's is up-to-date for PHP's operating area. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM); IBA Canada | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low – PHP does not conduct forest management |

| | |
|---|---|
| | activities in IBA's, therefore, monitoring is not considered necessary. |
| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION | |
| - The Scaterie Island IBA site is located within the boundaries of a legally-designated protected wilderness area. No harvesting is permitted to occur within this site.<br>- Coastal IBA sites are not impacted by PHP's forest management activities, therefore, no special management practices are required.<br>- IBA sites Cape North and Central Cape Breton Highlands have been addressed in Category 1, Question 1 for Bicknell's thrush. Additionally, the Cape North IBA site contains significant concentrations of Boreal owl. For this HCVF, no harvesting currently occurs and is not expected to occur in the future. Should harvest plans be developed, a management strategy for this HCVF will be developed. | |
| 2014 MONITORING UPDATE | |
| PHP has not conducted any forest management activities in IBA's identified within the forest management area. | |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES | |
| IBA Canada website http://www.ibacanada.ca/ | |

## HCV – Red Spruce

| HIGH CONSERVATION VALUE – RED SPRUCE | |
|---|---|
| HCV ATTRIBUTE | Natural Red Spruce Stands |
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Manage red spruce stands according to PHP Work Instruction for red spruce |
| INDICATOR | Management and maintenance of red spruce stands to improve the quality of uneven-aged conditions over time. |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Verify that annual harvest completions in natural red spruce stands were implemented using PHP's work instruction for red spruce management. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM) | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low – PHP has forest cover and historical data that shows natural red spruce stand locations. The PHP planner identifies these areas for management. |

FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION

Red Spruce Dominated Stands

- Strive for two to three cohort stand structures.
- Over time, we will strive to increase the area of multiple ages in many stands.
- Promote natural red spruce regeneration
- At harvest (other than tending), trees should be large and of high value. Management (spacings, thinnings) should be carried out to help meet this objective.
- Retain overstory structure, including snags; future snags; other tolerant species; and residual red spruce component – both individuals when windfirm and in clumps (structure and seed).

Immature stands

The option for immature red spruce stands is to partially remove the overstory in 2-3+ stages separated by a period of 10 to 20 years. The trees retained should be windfirm and quality immature trees. This helps ensure increased value of residual stand and regeneration establishment, and subsequent regeneration release(s).

Maturing stands

As a preferred option, a modified shelterwood treatment providing increased retention will be implemented, with a plan for two ages initially, with the intent of a third as the newly regenerated stand grows into the existing overstory canopy. As possible, considering tree ages and wind firmness:

Step One: Initial shelterwood harvest is modified to include more patch retention, by doubling the present wildlife clump retention – move to 20 trees per hectare, with patches scattered throughout the treatment area (i.e. an irregular shelterwood)

Step Two (once regeneration is 60 cm tall at 5-10 yrs): Overstory harvest to release regeneration is needed (regeneration protection harvest techniques implemented). The retention includes both small patches of residuals, as well as individuals (as available, few isolated pines/hemlock/hardwoods, and snags with designated red spruce retention). Ten living trees per hectare are required. Shelterwood completed with adequate established regeneration.

Step Three (15-35 yrs): The young and immature stand is tended as it grows (space – thin).

Longer term: As trees grow into the upper canopy, some of the patches and individual trees will be harvested, excluding designated wildlife clumps and legacy trees.

At this time (in the future), three cohorts are introduced in to the stand with the intent of patterning an uneven-aged structure.

In some instances, trees in the forest stand planned for treatment are not wind-firm and excessive blowdown and significant wood losses would occur following implementing one of the treatments described above. If the stand is determined to be a high risk for blowdown, an alternative treatment may be implemented (eg. strip cuts), or it should be left to grow until

| |
|---|
| maturity then harvested. |
| 2014 MONITORING UPDATE |
| A GIS overlay using completed harvest treatment data from 2014 shows that approximately 220 hectares of natural red spruce stands were managed using PHP's work instruction for red spruce management. There was one stand that was treated using clearcut since it was infected with sirococcus shoot blight. |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES |
| N/A |

## HCV – Protected Areas

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Protected Area** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Establish protected areas (legal, pending, and/or administrative) in PHP's management area |
| INDICATOR | Establishment of legal, pending, and/or administrative protected areas |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Continue to monitor provincial government's protected lands process for the establishment and legal protection of new wilderness areas and/or other decisions made regarding areas. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM); NSDNR; NSDOE | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low |

FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION

- All identified forest lands for legal or pending protection by the provincial government have been delineated in TFM and are clearly marked as legal or pending protected areas.
- All identified forest lands for administrative protection by PHP have been delineated in TFM and are clearly marked as administrative protected areas.
- PHP staff is aware that no forest management activities are allowed to occur in these areas.

| **Protected Area Category** | **# of Sites** | **Total Hectares** |
|---|---|---|
| New Provincial Protected Area (pending legal status) | 89 | 98,184 |
| Provincial Parks and Reserves | 21 | 1,492 |
| Provincial Nature Reserves | 7 | 1,868 |
| Provincial Wilderness Areas | 19 | 106,526 |
| National Migratory Bird Sanctuaries | 1 | 392 |
| National Parks | 1 | 94,870 |
| **TOTAL HECTARES** | | **303,332** |

| Administratively Protected Area Category | # of Sites | Total Hectares |
|---|---|---|
| Old Forest Areas | N/A | 84,717 |
| PHP Protected Area | 8 | 6,147 |
| IBP Sites & Sites of Ecological Significance | 12 | 3,107 |
| **TOTAL HECTARES** | | **93,971** |

2014 MONITORING UPDATE

A GIS overlay using completed harvest treatment data from 2014 shows that there has been no forest management activities conducted in legal, pending, or administrative protected areas.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES

Our Parks and Protected Areas: A Plan for Nova Scotia, 2013; TFM Data

## HCV – Special Management Zone Adjacent to Protected Area Boundaries

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Limit Protected Area Access** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Minimize road construction |
| INDICATOR | Minimize road construction to reduce access points into protected areas by implementing a 200 meter wide special management zone. |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Assess whether new roads have been built in the special management zone using GIS overlay. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM) | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low – PHP currently monitors the special management zone and road construction using TFM. |

FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION

- Minimize road construction to reduce access points into the protected area. If roads are needed, they are to build parallel to the protected area boundary to minimize access points.

2014 MONITORING UPDATE

A GIS overlay using completed road construction data from 2014 shows that there have been no new roads built in the special management zone adjacent to protected area boundaries.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES

N/A

## HCVF Category 2 – Large Landscape Level Forests

### HCV – Large Landscape Level Forests

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Biodiversity and Intactness** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | To maintain biodiversity values and intactness in large landscape level forests |
| INDICATOR | Manage large landscape level forests with special practices in protected areas, core roadless areas, and special management areas |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Assess management activities within large landscape level forests to ensure practices comply with requirements outlined for protected areas, core roadless areas, and special management areas. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM) | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low – PHP currently monitors large landscape level forests using TFM. |
| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION | |
| - No new roads in Core Roadless areas<br>- For HCV area outside core roadless, follow road design objectives as shown below. Road Index value at HCV level not to exceed 0.58 km/km2. If feasible and where necessary, block off access to reduce road travel. | |
|  | |
| - Use the provincial Forest Ecosystem Classification Guide to identify ecosite level prescriptions that:<br>o Promote ecosite patches by combining stands through treatment<br>o Employ 'extensive' management practices that support:<br>- natural regeneration<br>- longer rotations with consideration of natural disturbance processes<br>- tree species diversity consistent with the vegetation type, while promoting those that support long-term resilience (i.e. best options for future) | |

- No full-tree logging
- Reduce road length by increasing average forwarding distance targets by 20% (from 250 m to 300 m)
- Bridge construction may be temporary and removed as practical
- Retain minimum 60% area in non-clearcut condition (at the HCV level). Non-clearcut defined as forest stand greater than 10 years of age.
- No FSC plantations / Intensive management
- No planting of exotic species
- Acadian Forest Restoration (considering N.S. Forest Code; FSC)
- Management will align with natural disturbance regimes
- Application of Forest Ecosystem Classification to identify appropriate treatments
- Appropriate forest covertype management: Use of hardwood management keys
- Appropriate forest covertype management: Use of mixedwood management keys
- Natural regeneration where appropriate
- Appropriate use of PHP's 12 different harvest techniques (CC, PC, SW, ST, Single, Group, Patch, CT, OR, CTR, RS, SC)
- Species at Risk Recovery Strategy/SMP Implementation
- No herbicides
- Steep Slope Exclusion
- Leave patches (e.g. active eagle/hawk nest sites, inoperable areas, vernal pools, DNR requests during approval process)

## 2014 MONITORING UPDATE

Since the large landscape level forests analysis was revised and completed in March 2015, there are no data to report on for the year 2014. However, the below table summarizes the current status of each large landscape level forest with respect to road index and minimum non-clearcut condition. There will be a more comprehensive monitoring review and summary for these areas in the 2015 monitoring report.

| | | Road Index Maximum Allowed = 0.58 km/km2 | | Minimum Non-clearcut Condition = 60% |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **HCVF LLLF Name** | **Total HA** | **Current Road Index** | **Future Road Index** | **Non-clearcut Condition** |
| Barren Hill | 1,318 | 0.08 km/km2 | 0.20 km/km2 | 88% |
| Boisdale Hills | 5,630 | 0.36 km/km2 | 0.52 km/km2 | 99% |
| Bornish Hill | 2,106 | 0 km/km2 | 0 km/km2 | 100% |
| Country Harbour | 8,202 | 0.03 km/km2 | 0.03 km/km2 | 99.7% |
| East Bay Hills | 1,865 | 0.23 km/km2 | 0.31 km/km2 | 78% |
| French River | 25,226 | 0 km/km2 | 0 km/km2 | 100% |
| Hill Lake | 877 | 0.55 km/km2 | 0.65 km/km2 | 93% |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ingonish River | 15,210 | 0.01 km/km2 | 0.01 km/km2 | 100% |
| Isaacs Harbour River | 6,157 | 0.30 km/km2 | 0.42 km/km2 | 94% |
| Jim Campbells Barren | 4,586 | 0.21 km/km2 | 0.21 km/km2 | 100% |
| Masons Mountain | 1,022 | 0.06 km/km2 | 0.06 km/km2 | 100% |
| North River | 6,328 | 0.20 km/km2 | 0.20 km/km2 | 100% |
| Oban | 1,618 | 0.57 km/km2 | 0.78 km/km2 | 92% |
| Petit Lake Ruiss Noir | 1,612 | 0 km/km2 | 0 km/km2 | 100% |
| Salmon Gaspereaux | 2,357 | 0.30 km/km2 | 0.61 km/km2 | 94% |
| Upper Liscomb River | 7,398 | 0.07 km/km2 | 0.07 km/km2 | 98% |
| **TOTAL HECTARES** | **91,512** | | | |

Fully protected HCVF's in orange

Future road index could exceed maximum allowed of 0.58 km/km2. Will need to manage road index to meet target.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES

N/A

# HCVF Category 3 – Rare, Threatened or Endangered Ecosystems

## HCV – Significant Ecosites

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Maintain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems |
| INDICATOR | Rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems administratively protected from forest management activities |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Monitor rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems to ensure they are administratively protected from forest management activities. Exception applies if the mapped ecosystem type does not match on-the-ground characteristics. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM); NSDOE | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low |
| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION | |
| - All significant ecosites are administratively protected from forest management activities with the following exceptions:<br>- Karst conifer forest, karst hardwood forest, calcareous forest, and hemlock forest that have been previously managed will continue to be managed to maintain and restore mature climax conditions.<br>- Significant ecosites are identified using the provincial forest inventory data and there has been limited field verification, so there is a certain amount of ambiguity within the dataset. Since there may be data inaccuracies between the digital information versus on-the-ground characteristics, stands that do not match the inventory data are exempt from special management activities as outlined here. | |
| 2014 MONITORING UPDATE | |
| A GIS overlay using completed harvest treatment data from 2014 and significant ecosite data shows that there were six harvests (total 20 hectares). The significant ecosite database shows these stands to be inland barrens, however, they were predominately balsam fir/black spruce stands. Therefore, no special management practices or protection was implemented. | |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES | |
| Significant Ecosite data layer, NSDOE | |

# HCV – Significant, Old or Unique Forests

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Maintain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems |
| INDICATOR | Rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems administratively protected from forest management activities |

| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY | MONITORING STRATEGY |
|---|---|
| Annual | Monitor rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems to ensure they are administratively protected from forest management activities. Exception applies if the mapped ecosystem type does not match on-the-ground characteristics. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM); NSDOE | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low |

## FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION

- All significant, old or unique forests (SOUF) are administratively protected from forest management activities that meet the following species composition. Exception applies if the mapped ecosystem type does not match on-the-ground characteristics.

| Species composition | Stand height |
|---|---|
| 70% or more spruce or red spruce | ≥17m |
| 50% or more eastern hemlock | ≥15m |
| 50% or more white pine | ≥18m |
| 70% or more climax coniferous species with the most common | ≥17m |
| 50% or more sugar maple | ≥17m |
| 50% or more yellow birch | ≥17m |
| 70% or more climax deciduous species (tolerant hardwood) | ≥17m |
| 70% or more climax coniferous or deciduous species with neither | ≥17m |
| 30% or more red pine | ≥12m |
| 10% or more red oak | Any height |
| 10% or more eastern white cedar | Any height |

## 2014 MONITORING UPDATE

A GIS overlay using completed harvest treatment data from 2014 shows that there was one red spruce stand managed using a thinning/overstory treatment (4 hectares). However, the stand did not meet the SOUF criteria of >= 17 m height and 70% red spruce. The stand was an over-mature mixed wood stand with hardwood throughout, and the red spruce was less than 17m in height and was well below 70% of the overstory.

## SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES

Significant, old or unique data layer, NSDOE

## HCV – Old Forest

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Old Forest Protected Area** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Establish old forest protected areas on land-base |
| INDICATOR | Establishment and legal protection of old forest protected areas |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Monitor old forest protected areas TFM to ensure no forest management activities are conducted. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM); NSDNR; NSDOE | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low |
| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION | |
| - All identified old forest areas are legally protected by the provincial government.<br>- PHP staff is aware that no forest management activities are allowed to occur in these areas. | |
| 2014 MONITORING UPDATE | |
| A GIS overlay using completed harvest treatment data from 2014 shows that there has been no forest management activities conducted in the old forest areas identified by the provincial government. | |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES | |
| Old forest GIS layer, NSDNR | |

## HCV – Poorly Represented Ecosystems

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Protection of Poorly Represented Ecosystems** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Establish protection of poorly represented ecosystems on land-base |
| INDICATOR | Establishment and administrative protection of poorly represented ecosystems |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Monitor poorly represented ecosystems in TFM to ensure no forest management activities are conducted. |

| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM) | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low |
|---|---|

FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION

- All identified poorly represented ecosystems are administratively protected by PHP.
- PHP staff is aware that no forest management activities are allowed to occur in these areas.

| Poorly Represented Ecosystem | Total Hectares |
|---|---|
| Masons Mountain | 197 |
| Jim Cambells Barren | 2,844 |
| Boisdale Hills | 1,727 |
| Country Harbour | 829 |
| North River | 27 |
| Oban | 170 |
| Hill Lake | 113 |
| Salmon Gaspereaux | 240 |
| **TOTAL HECTARES** | **6,147** |

2014 MONITORING UPDATE

Since the poorly represented ecosystems analysis was revised and completed in March 2015, there are no data to report on for the year 2014. There will be a more comprehensive monitoring review and summary for these areas in the 2015 monitoring report.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES

PHP Gap Analysis Report

## HCV – Connectivity Management Zones

HCV ATTRIBUTE **Continuous Canopy cover**

OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM

| | |
|---|---|
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Maintain continuous canopy cover between protected areas and old forest areas |
| INDICATOR | Maintain a 100 meter wide continuous canopy cover (minimum 30%) corridor within the 500 meter wide Connectivity Management Zone (CMZ) |

| | |
|---|---|
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Monitor 100 meters within the CMZ to ensure a continuous canopy cover and CMZ's are not severed across their width. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM) | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low |

| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION |
|---|
| - The Connectivity Management Zones will be managed to provide continuous canopy cover (minimum 30%) within the 500 meter wide corridors, which will include a solid 100 meter wide core zone. Although harvesting can occur within the CMZ's, these corridors will not be severed across their width.<br>- The 500 meter wide CMZ's are static on the landscape, but the 100 meter wide core zone can 'move' within the CMZ. |
| 2014 MONITORING UPDATE |
| The Connectivity Management Zones continue to maintain a continuous canopy cover within the 100 meter wide core zone. |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES |
| The Forest Manager |




| | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % Compliance | 100 | 93 | 100 | 98 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Indicator Target | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## HCV – Margaree & St. Mary's River Watershed

| HIGH CONSERVATION VALUE – MARGAREE & ST. MARY'S RIVER WATERSHED | |
|---|---|
| HCV ATTRIBUTE | Non-clearcut Condition |
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | To maintain a high level of non-clearcut condition in St. Mary's and Margaree Watersheds, and restoration management |
| INDICATOR | Each watershed shall have minimum 80% of its area (that is managed by PHP) in a non-clearcut condition, and 90% of each watershed shall be managed for restoration (i.e. no more than 10% of each watershed will be established as a FSC plantation). |

| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Monitor non-clearcut condition in each watershed to ensure target of minimum 80% is met. |
|---|---|
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM) | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low |

## FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION

- The St. Mary's and Margaree watersheds will be managed to maintain 80% or more of all lands managed by PHP in the watershed in a closed forest condition (> 12 years of age).
- Additionally, PHP will maintain at least 90% of the St. Mary's and Margaree watersheds in a natural condition for restoration, and will establish 200 m forest restoration zones (i.e. non-intensive management) along all main watercourses.

## 2014 MONITORING UPDATE

PHP has been monitoring the non-clearcut condition in these watersheds for several years. The below graph shows that since 2008 each watershed has maintained 80% or more of its forest area under management by PHP in a non-clearcut condition. Additionally, PHP has not yet identified areas on the land base that will be established as an FSC defined plantation (up to 10% of the total forest lands), therefore, all forest areas are currently being managed for restoration and/or maintenance of existing Acadian forest characteristics.




## SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES

The Forest Manager

## HCVF Category 4 – Basic Services of Nature

### HCV – Legally Protected Municipal Water Supply Areas

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Water Health** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Maintain water health for communities |
| INDICATOR | Implement water protection measures in legally protected municipal water supply areas |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Monitor implementation of water protection measures. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM); NSDOE | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low |
| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION | |
| - There is no land managed by PHP within the water supply areas, since they are legally protected and therefore excluded from forest management activities. | |
| 2014 MONITORING UPDATE | |
| A GIS overlay using completed harvest treatment data from 2014 shows that there have been no forest management activities within the water supply areas. | |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES | |
| Nova Scotia Department of Environment | |

## HCV – Water Supply Intake Areas

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Water Health** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Maintain water health for communities |
| INDICATOR | Implement water protection measures around water supply intake areas. |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Monitor implementation of water protection measures. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM); NSDOE | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low |
| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION | |
| - Water protection measures include the Wildlife and Habitat Watercourse Protection Regulations, monitoring of % closed forest condition, steep slope management, HCVF aquatic watershed management, and rutting and ground disturbance guidelines. | |
| 2014 MONITORING UPDATE | |
| A GIS overlay of completed harvest treatments and water supply intake areas shows 220 hectares were managed within the intake areas. | |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES | |
| Nova Scotia Department of Environment | |

## HCV – Steep Slopes

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Soil Health; Community Health** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Maintain soil health and community health |
| INDICATOR | No conventional harvesting in steep slope areas (30% average slope or greater) |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Monitor steep slope areas and conventional harvesting activities. |

| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM) | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low |
|---|---|
| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION | |
| - Conventional harvesting is not permitted in areas with 30% average slope or greater. Non-conventional harvesting such as cable logging is permitted, however, PHP is currently not using this practice. | |
| 2014 MONITORING UPDATE | |
| A GIS overlay using completed harvest treatment data from 2014 shows that there was 12 hectares of forest management activities within steep slope areas.<br><br>NOTE: This indicator is based on spatial data that identifies slopes > than 30% average using contour data. It is not based on the actual % slope for any given area as could be determined on-the-ground. Therefore, to calculate the results for the indicator, a GIS exercise is done which overlaps the steep slope data with completed harvest jobs to determine non-conformances. Most often, the areas showing as harvested are slivers due to inaccuracies in the data. | |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES | |
| The Forest Manager | |

## HCVF Category 5 – Basic Needs of Local Communities

### HCV – Cattle Grazing on Cape Breton Highlands

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Local communities** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Support needs of local communities |
| INDICATOR | Cattle grazing on the Cape Breton Highlands is allowed |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Monitor any issues arising from cattle grazing on Cape Breton Highlands |
| DATA SOURCES<br>N/A | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low |

| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION |
|---|
| - Local farmers have let their cattle graze on the Cape Breton Highlands for several years during the summer/fall months.<br>- PHP does not restrict this use. |
| 2014 MONITORING UPDATE |
| No issues have arisen in 2014 regarding cattle grazing in the Cape Breton Highlands. |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES |
| N/A |

## HCV – Viewshed Areas

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **Local Communities** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Minimize visual impacts to local communities from harvest activities |
| INDICATOR | Implement work instruction 'Harvest View from Roadside' |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Monitor any issues in identified viewshed areas arising from harvest activities. |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM); Harvest View from Roadside Work Instruction | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low |
| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION | |
| - District staff is responsible for determining the visibility rating using the TFM layer 'Viewsheds'. A harvest area determined to be within the **low category** will not require any specific landscape planning beyond regular housekeeping measures and removal of unsightly damaged residual trees.<br>- Cut blocks falling in **the medium category** on the visibility grid should be designed using the "Landscape Level" instructions in the Harvest View from Roadside Work Instruction. Blocks falling into the high visibility category will follow the "Landscape level", "Stand level" and "Road design" practices as applicable. | |
| 2014 MONITORING UPDATE | |

Below is a list of hectares treated within the Viewshed area. Forest stands with a visability rating of 'low' do not require any specific landscape planning beyond regular housekeeping measures. Forest stands rated as moderate or high were managed by implementing the 'Harvest View from Roadside' Work Instruction. These areas are automatically flagged in TFM during planning and are included in forest management plans that are provided operations staff.

| Visibility by Treatment | Total Hectares |
|---|---|
| **CLEARCUT** | |
| High | 20 |
| Low | 158 |
| Moderate | 55 |
| **PARTIALCUT** | |
| Low | 21 |
| Moderate | 17 |
| **SHELTER** | |
| Moderate | 21 |
| **SINGLE** | |
| Low | 23 |
| Moderate | 4 |
| **Grand Total** | **322** |

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES

Viewshed layer in TFM; Harvest View from Roadside Work Instruction

## HCVF Category 6 – Traditional Cultural Identity

### HCV – Forest Values and Uses

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **First Nations Forest Values and Uses** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Minimize impacts to First Nations Forest Values and Uses |
| INDICATOR | Implement work instruction 'Aboriginal Value – Suspending Operations' |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Monitor any issues identified during annual review of operations plans with First Nations communities. PHP also maintains a public inquiry database, which captures concerns or questions the general public may have regarding planned operations. |

| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM); Public Inquiry Database | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Low |
|---|---|
| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION | |
| - If operations plans are known to affect First Nations forest values or uses through a review of annual operating plans or public inquiries, PHP will suspend all activities until a resolution is found. | |
| 2014 MONITORING UPDATE | |
| - A review of PHP's public inquiry database shows that there were no issues or concerned by First Nations communities or individuals. | |
| SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS/REFERENCES | |
| PHP Work Instruction 'Aboriginal Values – Suspending Operations' | |

## HCV – Traditional Cultural Identity

| HCV ATTRIBUTE | **First Nations Traditional Cultural Identity** |
|---|---|
| OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM | |
| MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE | Minimize impacts to First Nations Traditional Cultural Identity |
| INDICATOR | Successful implementation of Impact Benefit Agreement and Environmental Agreement with The Assembly of Nova Scotia Mi'kmaq Chiefs |
| MONITORING/REPORTING FREQUENCY<br>Annual | MONITORING STRATEGY<br>Monitor successful completion and implementation of Impact Benefit Agreement and Environmental Agreement with The Assembly of Nova Scotia Mi'kmaq Chiefs |
| DATA SOURCES<br>The Forest Manager (TFM); Public Inquiry Database | COST AND DIFFICULTY<br>Moderate |
| FOREST MANAGEMENT PRESCRIPTION | |
| Once the Impact Benefit Agreement and Environmental Agreement are finalized, forest management prescriptions will be developed in collaboration with Nova Scotia Mi'kmaq. | |
| 2014 MONITORING UPDATE | |
| - PHP is currently working with the The Assembly of Nova Scotia Mi'kmaq Chiefs to finalize an Impact Benefits Agreement and Environmental Agreement, which will include provisions for the protection of Mi'kmaq Aboriginal and Treaty Rights and Archaeological and Cultural Resources. This work is ongoing and will continue to be developed over the coming months. | |