

# TGIRT-EIJB Valcanton Villebois FMU 85-51

## Minutes of the **FOURTEENTH MEETING**

Held on February 14, 2019 in the conference room of the Municipal Building,  
2709 Curé-McDuff Blvd. in Beaucanton



Gouvernement régional  
d'Eeyou Istchee Baie-James  
Eeyou Istchee James Bay  
Regional Government

**APPROVED ON: JUNE 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2019**

# TGIRT-EIBJ Valcanton Villebois

Présences à la rencontre du 14 février 2019



Gouvernement régional  
d'Eeyou Istchee Baie-James  
Eeyou Istchee James Bay  
Regional Government

## Délégués et substituts

Groupe d'utilisateurs	Délégué	Présence	Substitut	Présence
Chef de la communauté et/ou maire et/ou président de localité	Nelson Tremblay		Claudine Desgagné	
	André Elliott			
BGA	Guy Lamoureux	x		
	Félix Guay	x		
PRAU	Sylvie Grenier			
	Manon Luneau			
Pouvoirie	Stéphanie Créte			
Locataire à des fins agricoles	Jean-Christophe Picard			
Maître de trappe/Titulaire de permis de piégeage/Associations locales de trappeurs	James Cananasso			
	Thomas Stevens			
Environnement et Eau	Barbara Hester			
Entreprises sylvicoles	Johnny Dubé	x		
Travailleurs forestiers (usine)	Frédéric Audet			
Travailleurs forestiers (forêt)				
Groupe de travail conjoint	Wayne Cheezo			
Développement économique local	Sylvie Mailhot			
Produits forestiers non ligneux				
Véhicule hors route	Raymonde Tremblay			
Villégiateurs	Michel Jégou	x		
Industrie minière exploitation	Lucienne Anctil			
Industrie minière exploration				
Tourisme/récréation en forêt/culture				
Chasseurs/pêcheurs/observateurs faunique				
Énergie/biomasse	Alain Brodeur			
Groupes jeunesse	Jennifer Boucher			
Groupes de femmes	Manon Tremblay			
Goupes aînés	Claudine Desgagné			

## Observateurs, invités

Organisme	Observateur, invité	Présence
GREIBJ	Martin Fillion (animateur)	x
	Johanne Morasse	x
MFFP-Forêt	Isabelle Fortin	x
MFFP-Faune	Julien Second	
Gouvernement de la Nation Crie	Stéphane Ouellet	
Administration régionale Baie-James		
MFFP-Planificatrice	Elaine Cyr	x
MFFP-Invitée	Virginie Cayer	x
RYAM-Invitée (jusqu'à 11h15)	Marie-Eve Sigouin	x

### Confirmation de présence ou d'absence

Présence	
Présence par téléphone	
Absence	

## TGIRT-EIJB VILLEBOIS-VALCANTON FOURTEENTH MEETING

ITEMS	RESULTS OR DISCUSSION SUMMARY	DECISIONS
1. Call to order, introductions	The meeting begins at 10:00 AM. The animator asks the participants to introduce themselves.	
2. Reading and approval of the agenda	<p>The animator reads the agenda. The agenda remains open. The delegates ask to add two items to the miscellaneous item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Alternate delegate (RYAM)</li> <li>b. Amendment to the PRAN (FMU 85-51 –RYAM worksite, Norbord)</li> </ul> <p>It was also asked to remove item 6 from the agenda. This item is replaced by another item: Road management on the Category III lands (Isabelle Fortin)</p>	On a motion by Mr. Guy Lamoureux, duly seconded by Mr. Michel Jégou, it is unanimously agreed to approve the agenda with the requested amendments.
3. Reading, follow-up and approval of the minutes of the meeting held on November 15, 2018	<p>The participants present at the meeting on November 15, 2018 take a few moments to review the minutes. A special attention is given to the follow-up elements.</p> <p>The animator takes a moment to explain the logistics of the documents and the members section on the website. He also explains the operation of the interactive map of the roads.</p> <p>Regarding the follow-up of the public safety issue, the MFFP observer mentions that Mr. Julien Second, as part of his follow-up with the other ministries, also contacted the Abitibi-Jamésie OBV but we do not know what happened afterward. He still did all he was supposed to do. The animator will contact the OBV to know if they plan on taking any actions on this issue.</p> <p>The animator shares the action follow-up chart with the members.</p>	On a motion by Mr. Johnny Dubé, duly seconded by Mr. Guy Lamoureux, it is unanimously agreed to approve the minutes as proposed.
4. Correspondence	A correspondence was sent to the EIJB RG by RYAM. It is brought to the table at the request of the RYAM delegate. This correspondence mentions the satisfaction of the Locality of Villebois regarding the result of the Villebois work site at Turgeon Lake. The delegate mentions a good cooperation with the two localities and their satisfaction regarding the use of the roads for the transportation of wood and their maintenance.	

	<p>Another delegate from the BGA group mentions that they also receive a good cooperation from the two localities. A delegate from the localities reminds a request to reduce the speed of logging trucks. The delegates from the BGA group often send reminders to the truck drivers and will do it again. They also take measures to control and follow the speed of the truck drivers.</p>	
<p>5. Follow-up on the issues</p>		
<p>a) Aesthetic quality of the landscape – Mapping of sensitive sites</p>	<p>As an introduction, the animator displays an interactive map of the sensitive zones on screen. It shows the zones deemed sensitive, including bodies of water and watercourses. It also shows a buffer zone of 500 metres and another buffer zone of 3 km. Each zone includes terms, which can be displayed on screen. The members of the panel notice that the terms included in the form files that can be displayed on screen do not correspond to what was presented and agreed upon at the TGIRT. The MFFP observer is concerned that we are not sending the right message to the population. A delegate suggests replacing the term inscribed in the database visible on screen with a reference to the terms of the agreement, in the document. He asks if the document is available. An MFFP observer mentions that it is a VOIC, that the technical committee brought it to the panel who then approved it. She adds that in the PAFIT, it is indicated that this element is being developed. Some delegates ask to review the document, and they consider it unclear. Another delegate mentions that it is probably a copy of what was done in Rouyn-Noranda. The members go back to the portrait that was established by the MFFP. The planner indicates that it is probably the worst portrait since the vegetation coverage is not taken into consideration. The animator asks if, from the start, the zone division is correct on the mapping side. A guest from RYAM indicates that the 3 km for the communications is correct and that what is left to do is to establish the communications with the economic development corporation. The animator insists on confirming the zone division before going further. There is an ambiguity regarding the 3 km. The RYAM guest indicates that it is what was agreed with the</p>	<p>The animator will call upon the technical committee to clarify the terms for the previously agreed zones in regards to the aesthetic quality of the landscapes. The technical committee must propose a map of the sensitive areas and a documents with the terms for each zone. The technical committee is made up of Mrs. Elaine Cyr, Mrs. Marie-Ève Sigouin, Mr. Michel Jégou and the animator.</p>

localities regarding the FHVC. The MFFP observer adds however that it is a specific element to RYAM as part of its certification, which has nothing to do with the TGIRT. This is confirmed by a delegate. The FHVC are not part of the elements discussed around the table. The RYAM guest explains that it is not in the context of the FHVC but it is still suggested to the panel. An MFFP guest adds that it is nevertheless confusing to see it appear on the TGIRT mapping. The animator reassures the members that the map is in the "members" section and is only visible for the members of the TGIRT. The MFFP guest states that she has a writing of what was proposed at the table. She can bring it back. The RYAM guest asks if the form file is with the text. The MFFP guest mentions that no, but the work was presented several times. The animator asks the MFFP guest to send him what was presented at the table. The MFFP guest hesitates and mentions that it is some internal planning. A delegate adds however that if the members want to express an opinion, it must be presented to them. The MFFP guest makes a distinction between two things. There the VOIC proposal which must first be confirmed and afterward to see how the MFFP will handle it. This does not clarify the situation. The animator asks first to clarify the mapping situation and to do so he will need the mapping elements from the MFFP. The MFFP guest agrees to provide them. For this part that is the mapping, the animator indicates that we will possibly hold several meetings to clarify and approve it. Afterward, it will be necessary to clarify the terms in each zone. The MFFP guest replies that this has already been done. She refers them to her text sheet that was presented at the panel on several occasions, which corresponds to the VOIC proposal. She asks that it is clear once and for all that the panel has confirmed it. For the animator, it is not entirely clear. In his opinion, the document has already been brought to the panel but was not confirmed. For a delegate, it is also not clear that it was confirmed. The MFFP observers insist that it was done and, in addition, a RYAM delegate mentions that he has already started applying the terms. For another delegate who has been

participating in the meetings for several years and who was there for the meetings where it was discussed, it was not entirely clear and there remained some unclear areas. A RYAM guest adds that the VO part was approved but not the IC, which was still worked in the technical committee made up of herself (Marie-Ève Sigouin), Michel Jégou and Elaine Cyr. The animator mentions that it is a major handicap that we are not part of this committee, and that elements are dropped. A delegate mentions that it is not necessary as long as the report is brought back to the TGIRT. The MFFP guest reacts by mentioning that the previous animator was invited but could never attend. She has the correspondences to support her claims. A delegate wishes to conclude the discussions by mentioning that everything needs to be clarified. Another member of the technical committee mentions that all the documents were forwarded to the EIJBRC. The MFFP guest mentions that the technical committee was established two years ago. A delegate mentions that there are two issues. We must first clarify the agreement and that all confirm that it is a reflection of what was agreed, rectify the mapping on the website so that it includes what was established in the TGIRT agreement and not FHVC elements. The MFFP guest adds that it is not an agreement but a proposed VOIC. She still provides a follow-up as the planning level. The animator mentions that we have the VOIC wording and its elements are listed in the issues grid. But it is not a large document, since it fit in one page and did not include the terms among other things. A delegate deduces that the terms were not approved. The MFFP observer mentions that the terms are the responsibility of the MFFP, that it is not the TGIRT's responsibility to approve them. The animator disagrees. In his opinion, the terms are also the responsibility of the TGIRT. The two MFFP observers maintain their point, adding that the indicators and targets part of the VOIC belong to the MFFP and that this was mentioned at four TGIRTs. The disagreement remains on this item. The MFFP guest mentions having presented the results of her planning considering the terms

	<p>agreed at the MFFP and she will apply them.</p> <p>The EIJBRG observer refers them to the minutes of the meeting held on December 5, 2016 and mentions that it includes a proposal to conserve the aesthetic quality of the landscape, in reference to the document that was tabled, but she cannot say where the document is. She mentions some form items. Meanwhile, the animator shows the excerpt from the minutes on the screen from the public section of the EIJBRG website. It includes some objectives, including one related to the forest atmosphere along the canoe-camping courses. However there are not indicators or targets. A delegate confirms that the values and objectives were approved but not the means. Therefore there are not indicators and targets yet. The MFFP guest mentions that there are terms that were proposed by the technical committee and this is what is being applied. Some things have been done but they need to be put in writing to officialise them. The animator asks the MFFP observer if the targets and indicators are approved by the TGIRT or if they are imposed on it. The MFFP observer mentions that there is a distinction between the general conditions in the planning and the way they are applied concretely, which is the responsibility of the MFFP. According to her, when we propose terms at the panel to meet the values and objectives, we explain and show how we will meet them. The MFFP guest adds that the terms were proposed by the technical committee and that she was on the technical committee. Therefore, according to the MFFP observer, these terms must be discussed at the panel. In her opinion, the question is to determine if the panel approves the work of the technical committee. The animator states that the work of the technical committee is to propose terms with which everyone will be comfortable and agree to. He adds that this is the primary objective of the technical committee. He adds that if the technical committee does not pursue this objective, it has no use. It's as simple as that! The MFFP guest would like to discuss the targets and indicators again. The animator tries to explain that if the delegates do not know ahead what could be</p>	
--	---	--

applied as indicators and targets, they will be rather hesitant to approve the values. To this, the MFFP guest reminds that the terms that were established in the technical committee have already been presented to the TGIRT. Still, for he animator, there is nothing written to this effect. The delegates agree that the work is incomplete, while the MFFP guest mentions again that she has already done the presentations, which should be in the minutes of the last meeting. But everything is incomplete and still confused, which most members of the TGIRT agree. The MFFP guest mentions that she does not believe that the TGIRT must approve the terms, indicators and targets. However, for the MFFP observer, there is a nuance. She states that it is a work with the panel. The RYAM guest mentions that the TGIRT can be informed of the terms without having to confirm them and, if they desire, give their opinions, but nothing more. The observer mentions that, among the members of the panel on the technical committee, there is the MFFP observer, Elaine, a member of the panel representing RYAM and a member of the panel who is Michel Jégou. Therefore, members of the panel are involved in the process. The animator sees the necessity to remind of the objective of the technical committee and adds that the panel must not only be informed but consulted. A delegate asks if the population of Turgeon Lake is informed. She asked the delegate of the vacationers group if he informed the members of his group, if he produced a press release, which seems important to him. On this, the MFFP observer mentions that there are always public consultations. The MFFP guest agrees to look at all reports available to this day, reminding that it was presented on several occasions. In summary, the animator proposes to first complete the map and then to assemble all terms that were agreed and all documents to this effect. A delegate mentions that this was already sent when Mrs. Morasse was the animator. The animator collects the latest reports in order to assemble all the pieces of the puzzle. The MFFP observer mentions that all elements were brought but admits that nothing is official. A guest suggests

	<p>holding another meeting of the technical committee to clear everything. A delegate agrees. The animator reminds the role of the technical committee and mentions that at all times the TGIRT must be consulted on the elements of targets and indicators, and not only informed. A delegate disagrees and the discussion gets stuck when the MFFP observer adds her intervention. It is however an element linked to the operation of the TGIRTs and not a content element and it does not need to be debated at the TGIRTs. This question will be discussed outside the TGIRT meeting.</p> <p>The animator asks to confirm the need to hold a new meeting of the technical committee and the animator asks if the EIJBRG is part of it. The members of the technical committee and the MFFP observer do not agree on the need to hold such a meeting. They agree to hold another meeting. The EIJBRG observer intervenes to state that, according to the operational guidelines, it is the EIJBRG who is responsible for scheduling the technical committee meetings and it is the EIJBRG that animates them. She mentions that, in the past, she could not attend since she was attending other TGIRT meetings. The MFFP guest says she has no issue and that the animator just needs to send a Doodle survey to the members to know their availability.</p> <p>The animator summarizes that the technical committee will meet again and that the mandate is to clarify the terms for the zones already agreed upon, to bring back the map and link the terms already agreed to the various zones. Afterward, we get back to the TGIRT with a map and a document of terms. The technical committee is made up of Mrs. Elaine Cyr, Mrs. Marie-Ève Sigouin, Mr. Michel Jégou and the animator. A Doodle survey will be sent to the members of the technical committee for a meeting held in April.</p>	
<p>b) Public health – Periodical follow-ups on the contaminant levels for some lakes</p>	<p>The animator sent to the members of the TGIRT the website address to access the study completed for Turgeon Lake in 2012. A delegate mentions that studies have also been completed for other lakes in the region, at the request of cottage owners' associations. In addition, there was also a</p>	<p>The animator will do a follow-up on the resolutions approved by the EIJBRG when there are developments.</p>

	<p>study for Pajegasque Lake. The delegate for the vacationers group mentions that there would also be the mining exploration surveys completed at Turgeon Lake. A mining professional prepared a file of mining exploration activities completed to this day in the region. A mapping was established in the area to list all mining exploration activities completed. These activities may not have contributed to the contamination of the meat of the fish but can provide some clarifications on the nature of the soils. The abnormally high contamination rates may also be caused by wood chips, from former sawmills, that were buried in the ground.</p>	
6. Technical committee on the access management on the Category II lands – Linkage with the Category III lands	This item is removed from the agenda	
7. Road management of the Category III lands (Isabelle Fortin)	<p>Mrs. Isabelle Fortin starts her presentation by explaining the context of the initiative started by Mrs. Sonia Légaré. The objective of the initiative is to obtain the most representative reading of the needs of the various users of the region in order to propose a prioritisation framework for road management. Concretely, the exercise is to develop a “values map” in order to produce an access road management plan.</p> <p>Mrs. Fortin explains the initiative planned for the development of a road management plan that is based on a 4-step decision assistance tool.</p> <p>The initial need is based on the implementation of a caribou plan. We are proposing this procedure proactively toward a long-term vision. The work is not simple. There are several users with variable expectations; the territory is vast and the resources are limited. The bases for a plan are to find common values for all users and to establish a common understanding of the various issues. With the TGIRTs, it is proposed to complete a 4-step process and, at each one, Mrs. Légaré would come do a follow-up by presenting the results obtained and by collecting the comments of the people. Therefore, this is an interactive process. The first step today is to clarify the values and issues and then identify a base network where the values will apply. We already know the base road</p>	

	<p>network for the TGIRT that is part of FMU 085-51. The second step is establishing the values in the territory, in regards to the base network. Third, identify the various zones and associate them with values and vocations, associate development objectives. Mrs. Fortin develops a fictional scenario to demonstrate the possible result. The fourth step is the identification of avenues for the road closure and other projects related to the access. We must not forget that there is a major issue behind this process but, in all cases where it would be a question of closing a road, all users and stakeholders would be consulted according to the terms and process currently in effect.</p> <p>In regards to this exercise, the MFFP stakeholders have a need to re-establish the woodland caribou habitat. The other need is to restore some portions of the territory for the return of the woodland caribou. Mrs. Fortin mentions a list of values identified by various interest groups. At this stage, Mrs. Légaré wishes to know if these various values are similar to those of the TGIRT delegates and if there are other values to add to this list. Eventually, Mrs. Légaré will come meet the users directly as the TGIRT. Regarding this access road management plan, the animator asks if it will be a work performed by the MFFP or by the TGIRT. The MFFP observer mentions that there are already pre-identified values and that other values from the users could be added. For the time being, there is no timeline and it is a reflection that is started for the moment. It could potentially become an initiative that lasts several months and even several years. She will do it jointly with several organisations, transportation, tourism, etc. The members are invited to send their comments to Mrs. Légaré, if any. Mrs. Fortin asks to send a copy of the comments to her and to the animator if they are sent directly to Mrs. Légaré.</p>	
<p>8. Wood production intensification area (AIPL) (Virginie Cayer)</p>	<p>Mrs. Virginie Cayer gives her presentation by telephone conference. A Power Point presentation is shown on screen. She quickly indicates the content of her presentation and mentions the objective which is to better understand the silviculture intensity gradients and the notion of wood production intensification area (AIPL). The</p>	

MFFP also wishes to collect the concerns and comments of the members of the TGIRT, if any.

The classification of the silviculture response strategy or the AIPL designation is established at the stand level and is essentially based on three criteria, i.e. the productivity, the forest dynamics and the restrictions to management. The silviculture intensity can be expressed according to three gradients: intensive, basic and extensive. The presenter provides a brief explanation of each of the three gradients and their context of application. With the help of illustrations, she demonstrates the planned management scenarios for each of the three gradients.

To understand the context of application of the AIPLs as part of the public forest management, it is necessary to refer to Section 36 of the Sustainable Forest Development Act which identifies the criteria for the designation of AIPLs and the national wood production strategy in which the AIPL are one of the proposed avenues. Mrs. Cayer explains where the AIPLs are likely to be found, considering the dominant vegetation, the accessibility conditions and the current uses of the territory. The proximity of mills and labour, the condition of the road network and the silviculture investments made to this day are part of the criteria for the prioritisation of AIPLs. Following the AIPL designation, it is planned namely to do some reforestation with the help of improved plants and with a density of 2,000 plants/ha. It is also anticipated to do some pre-commercial clearing. More frequent follow-ups are planned to ensure that we reach the silviculture objectives. A map was prepared so that the members of the TGIRT can see where the proposed AIPLs are located. The MFFP guest has the map on her laptop and displays it on screen. Mrs. Cayer explains the objective of the consultation and the types of comments expected. The guest described where the proposed AIPLs were located. She described the conditions targeted. There is a concentration of proposed AIPLs in the south of FMU 085-51. She provides a more in-depth description of the stands retained. She reviews the various sectors. A delegate asks Mrs. Cayer if the AIPL strategy

	<p>includes hardwood. She replies that the strategy is targeting softwood since no conversion is done. But, in her opinion, this will not have any impact on the hardwood users since the mixed stands with a hardwood dominance and the hardwood stands are not part of the targeted stands. However, the delegate from the BGA group considers that there would be an interest to increase the production of hardwood species. Mrs. Cayer admits that this was not part of the reflection but could be considered in the second aspect. The MFFP guests mention that we will not necessarily increase the silviculture efforts globally but will prioritise some areas in order to apply silviculture scenarios that are already being used. The delegate from the BGA group considers that the AIPLs could be an interesting tool in a wood production strategy.</p> <p>A delegate takes advantage of this item to inform the members of the panel that the AFAT is organising a conference on May 16 where the AIPLs will be discussed.</p> <p>The animator agrees to forward the link to the interactive map and to inform the members as soon as it is online. Afterward, the members of the TGIRT will have a month to issue their comments. The animator reviews the procedure to send and process the comments so that they appear as comments from the TGIRT. Mrs. Cayer mentions to the animator that the comments that arrive at the MFFP will be sent to him as they arrive.</p>	
<p>9. Follow-up on the 2018-2023 PAFIT modification (Isabelle Fortin)</p>	<p>Mrs. Isabelle Fortin reviews the results of the PAFIT consultation. There was a pre-consultation of the TGIRTs that ended on November 30, 2018. Then an additional period was granted until the end of December. Only one comment was received from the Waskaganish TGIRT. This comment was that the medium and long-term impacts from the forestry operations were not sufficiently taken into consideration. The public consultations could be held toward the end of summer 2019 as anticipated.</p>	
<p>10. Public consultation on the PAFIO(Elaine Cyr)</p>	<p>The MFFP guest speaks on this item.</p> <p>Mrs. Elaine Cyr mentions that the public consultations are currently taking place, from January 28 to February 22, 2019. The mapping</p>	

has already been sent but she wishes to take this opportunity to only show the changes related to the discussion that took place earlier in this meeting regarding landscapes. These amendments were made following what she showed in November. We can see Turgeon Lake on screen. Following a site visit, Mrs. Cyr found that the logging came too close to the cottages. In addition, the statistics regarding the wharf exceed what was proposed regarding the terms. Therefore, what was done was that a harvest block near the cottages was removed and put further in the residual forest. To compensate, logging was granted at two other locations deemed less sensitive. She did not have the time to recalculate the statistics but the change represents about 25 hectares. Another small change was made in the Bacon area following a native request.

The animator asks Mrs. Cyr to send him a PDF map and the explanations since it will all be difficult to list in the minutes. Mrs. Cyr hesitates because she doesn't know if she still has the initial documents and that we are in a consultation period. A delegate from the BGA group mentions that the important part is that this change is positive for the TGIRT. Without going back to the earlier discussion, Mrs. Cyr mentions that this modification follows what was agreed at the technical committee. For the delegate of the BGA group, it was predictable that the block would be moved. A delegate asks for some clarifications, namely if there will be reforestation after the harvest. She adds that the new harvest block includes snowmobile trails.

Mrs. Fortin continues the point she was presenting by mentioning that an information meeting was held Monday evening in the same hall. The animator confirms that we are at this item in the agenda and that Mrs. Cyr's explanations fit into this item.

Mrs. Cyr wishes to move to item 11. b) since she has the map of the modification that Mr. Guy Lamoureux wishes to discuss as part of the PRAN. For item 10, it remains to present the interactive map but the animator agrees to go

	<p>directly to item 11. B) and come back afterward.</p> <p>Following item 11. a), the animator displays the interactive map produced by the MFFP as part of the public consultations on the PAFIO. He explains its operation.</p>	
11. Miscellaneous		
a. Alternate delegate (RYAM)	<p>This item is discussed after item 11. b).</p> <p>At the beginning of the meeting, the delegate asked if there was a form to fill for the designation of Mrs. Marie-Ève Sigouin, as alternate to a delegate. The animator showed to all the location of the form in the public section of the TGIRT on the EIJBRG website.</p> <p>Mr. Lamoureux mentions that Mrs. Marie-Ève Sigouin will act as alternate for RYAM at the TGIRT. The animator reminds the location of the designation form. He proposes to immediately indicate Mrs. Sigouin as alternate for this panel in replacement of Mr. Patrick Paiement. The animator will make the change until the form arrives.</p>	<p>Mrs. Marie-Ève Sigouin will be listed in the composition of the TGIRT as alternate, in replacement of Mr. Patrick Paiement.</p>
b. Modification to the PRAN (UA 85-51 – RYAM work site, Norbord)	<p>This item is discussed after item 10.</p> <p>Mr. Guy Lamoureux hands out a map. He submits to the TGIRT an operational change that was presented to the MFFP early in the week. It is a winter work site located north of Villebois on the portion of the Selbaie Road located between Km 28 and 30, which must cross a watercourse, and where it is planned to use a removable bridge of 40 feet. Following a recent visit on site, it was discovered that the brook is more than 60 feet wide and the surface is open. However, there is another possibility to reach the work site by building a 680-metre road at Km 28. This is a major change according to the variation management grid, which requires a consultation of the TGIRT.</p> <p>Therefore, Mr. Lamoureux wishes to know if the members of the TGIRT agree with the modification proposed to the PRAN. The applicant wishes to operate the worksite very soon. The animator mentions that, unfortunately, the TGIRT cannot express its position during this meeting since this request was not listed on the agenda at least 10</p>	

	<p>business days before the meeting but was instead brought up at the beginning of the meeting to be added to the miscellaneous item. The animator explains the implications of this situation in regards to the absence of several delegates and certain conditions required to allow the delegates to properly fulfill their role. Some participants of the TGIRT express their disagreement that the TGIRT cannot be consulted during this meeting while some delegates ask for clarifications to the applicant regarding the operational aspect, the moment he is supposed to be operating this worksite, the users who were really consulted and if it was possible to consult the TGIRT earlier. Some responses are provided to these questions. In this case, the applicant suggests to make it an information item and to clarify that the affected hunter and the community of Pikogan have given their assent. A delegate asks if this means that when a request is sent to the TGIRT, it will be the absentees who will have an influence on all decisions. He asks if we have a quorum or not. The quorum is present but that is not the issue. The animator provides some clarification regarding some operational procedures.</p> <p>A position of the TGIRT cannot be obtained during this meeting but the animator proposes to the applicant to forward him his request with the mapping by email. The animator can then forward the application to all delegates and give them a month to express themselves. The applicant rejects this proposal, deeming the delay too short to respond. He still wishes to maintain his item under the miscellaneous item as an information item.</p>	
12. Adjournment	The meeting ends at 12:40 PM. The next meeting will be held on June 6, 2019.	On a motion by Mr. Félix Guay, duly seconded by Mr. Michel Jégou, it is unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting.

## ACRONYMS

AIPL	Wood production intensification area
AFAT	Association forestière de l'Abitibi-Témiscamingue
BGA	Beneficiaries of a supply guarantee
FHVC	Forest with a high conservation value
TGIRT	Integrated Land and Resources Management Panel
EIJBRG	Eeyou Istchee James Bay Regional Government
MFFP	Ministère des Forêts, de la Faune et des Parcs
OBV	Watershed organisation
PAFIO	Operational Plan for Integrated Forest Management
PAFIT	Tactical Plan for Integrated Forest Management
PRAN	Annual schedule of Forest Management Operations
RYAM	Rayonier Advance Materials
FMU	Forest Management Unit
VOIC	Value, Objective, Indicator, Target