

CLUAH PROJECT

Steering Committee and Working Group

Description of Options A to D.

Developed - April 2011. Revised, May 19, 2011, Finalized July 14, 2008.

- MPT=Motorized Public Travel
- EMA – Enhanced Management Area

Details	Option A (New Option)	Option B (2010 Original Version)	Option C (New Option)	Option D (New Option)
Group Participants (Not all participants identified for each option could support the option they developed)	<p>This option developed by participants from Local Citizens Committees, First Nations, Regional Mayors Group, Forest Industry, Bait Association of Ontario, EDC Dubreuilville, and MNDMF.</p> <p>NOTE: There were other user groups (mining, kayaking, road based tourism and prospectors) not represented or participated. There was concern or considerations of these other user groups even though they were not present on a regular basis.</p>	<p>This option developed by the steering committee, working group and MNR but not formally supported by any one group. Originally supported by remote tourism industry (NOTO).</p>	<p>This option developed by participants from NOTO, First Nations, Remote and Water Access Tourism , Parks Canada, Local Citizens Committee, Economic Development Agency, Regional Mayors Group, and Non-motorized recreation.</p>	<p>This option developed by participants from NOTO, First Nations, Remote and Water Access Tourism, Local Citizens Committee, Economic Development Agency, Regional Mayors Group, and Non-motorized recreation.</p>
Overall Principles				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We believe we have achieved “a balance” in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policy level recognition of both road-based recreation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Both options C and D recognize the land use zones already 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Both options C and D recognize the land use zones already

Details	Option A (New Option)	Option B (2010 Original Version)	Option C (New Option)	Option D (New Option)
	<p>addressing needs of local communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Captures what the local people want and need ○ Supports sustainable future community development ○ Continues to provide tourism protection through a CLUAH Management Strategy to be developed with amendments listed below ○ We believe in equal sharing to resources with all user groups to reduce conflict amongst all users, in a sustainable and equitable way ○ Sustainable economic development/benefit ○ Want options to diversify the economy i.e. recreational and road based tourism 	<p>and remote access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recreational use of Crown land is affirmed; principle of no net loss of Crown land access moving forward and MNR commitment to invest and improve road based access and recreational opportunities annually in road-based recreational zones. ○ Greater clarity, future certainty, reduced costs and higher potential for economic development specific to forest industry and tourism. ○ Simplified Land Use Designations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reduced number of land use designations; size of reduction dependant on which Option is selected ○ Adjacent district compatibility 	<p>presented to the Minister as the original option in 2010.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Both options will reduce the level of land use and resource management conflict. 3. Both options will enhance the quality and quantity of road based recreation opportunities in the Recreational EMAs. 4. Option C maintains the current level of road based and remote access recreation within the REMOTE EMA. (This option actually <u>enhances</u> road based recreation and resource gathering by replacing an equal amount of access on new roads and formally close an equal section of old road as existing roads open for public use become unusable plus by allowing use of roads in remote EMAs for berry picking and fuel wood gathering) 5. Under Option C - lake by lake prescriptions are replaced with zonal management. It simplifies access road planning while enhancing opportunities to access industrial resources. 	<p>presented to the Minister as the original option in 2010.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Both options will reduce the level of land use and resource management conflict. 3. Both options will enhance the quality and quantity of road based recreation opportunities in the Recreational EMAs. 4. Option C maintains the current level of road based and remote access recreation within the REMOTE EMA. (this option actually <u>reduces</u> the level of MPT in Remote EMAs by eliminated use of existing roads). 5. Under Option D- lake by lake prescriptions are replaced with zonal management. It simplifies access road planning while enhancing opportunities to access industrial resources. Commercial and industrial access to resources remains unchanged.

Details	Option A (New Option)	Option B (2010 Original Version)	Option C (New Option)	Option D (New Option)
			Commercial and industrial access to resources remains unchanged.	
Maps				
Map and/or maps of the Option(s) outlining the areas which each breakout groups determine as new land use designations	<p>Map with Land Use Designations as presented <u>without</u> Remote Access Enhanced Management Areas (EMA)s</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 37% Recreational EMAs • 63% General Use Areas • This option proposes district land base occupied by remote tourism buffers reduced from 20% (currently) to 14% • 61% by area of inland lakes over 300 ha in size that are currently remote tourism lakes in Wawa District <p>The GUAs that surround Pukaskwa National Park should carry forward the wording that was proposed in the Policy i.e. Zone of Cooperation</p>	<p>Map with Land Use Designations as presented in March 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 22% Remote Access EMAs • 27% Recreational Access EMAs • 51% General Use Areas 	<p>Map with Land Use Designations as presented</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dubreuilville / Hornepayne access corridor with connection via a single lane bridge suitable for ATV or snowmobile only. • Make allowance for the creation of additional connection corridors through ‘a process’, plus clear language regarding use/creation of such corridors. • Additional consideration should be given to identified stocked lakes with pre-existing routes of motorized access, in consultation with affected tourism operators and users (maintenance of access to these particular lakes) 	Same as Option C

Details	Option A (New Option)	Option B (2010 Original Version)	Option C (New Option)	Option D (New Option)
Mapping display details				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maps should indicate 1 or 2 km buffers on the active remote tourism lakes with year round structures for the list from Phase II • Make 1 -2 KM Zones all “Red” to stand out on maps • For the whole Wawa District Map display the following info on maps and in supporting text: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Total lakes that are greater than 300 ha ○ % of designated lakes greater than 300 ha 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zones should be NUMBERED (EMA # 1, GUA # 1, REC EMA # 2, etc.) but not named; • more neutral presentation, use of hatching etc. • no difference in the tourism lakes colours 	Same as option C

Details	Option A (New Option)	Option B (2010 Original Version)	Option C (New Option)	Option D (New Option)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Not including lakes within parks, private lands, lake superior or large rivers 			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Names need changing i.e. no Wildland areas, should be General Use Area. ○ More neutral colors on the map 		<p>Overall mapping considerations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Map should include a paragraph regarding the history of Wawa District leading to this process and product- just for explanation about why this was done. 2. Avoid acronyms and abbreviations completely and at all times. 3. Add 'comment boxes' to explain the overall intent for each different management area type, to map. Highlight positives on the map; e.g. what uses are permitted, open to non-motorized travel, etc. 	Same as option C
How will new and existing road access be addressed within the Remote EMAs, Recreation EMA or General Use Areas?				
Remote EMAs	Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing roads will have access - open for all existing uses subject to present restrictions. • Established to maintain and promote the area's remote wilderness character and 	Existing roads- open for all existing uses subject to present restrictions.	Existing roads- closed to motorized public travel (MPT)

Details	Option A (New Option)	Option B (2010 Original Version)	Option C (New Option)	Option D (New Option)
		<p>backcountry recreational values.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use direction and resource management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Compatible with enhancing and supporting the remote recreational values and ecological integrity of the area. ○ Priority to be given to activities that are compatible with the remote character of the area. • Road development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • special considerations will be given to promote remote recreational opportunities and mitigate designated tourism operations and concerns. 		
		New Primary and Branch Roads will be closed to motorized travel	New roads - closed to motorized public travel (MPT)	New roads - closed to motorized public travel
			<p>Km for km exchange, but not within the 3 km buffers, where possible</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ as existing roads open for public use become unusable, replace with equal amount of access on new roads and formally close an equal section of old road 	Not applicable

Details	Option A (New Option)	Option B (2010 Original Version)	Option C (New Option)	Option D (New Option)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ make allowance for this to happen earlier if requested by users/outfitters. 	
			<p>New roads open for MPT for <u>personal fuel wood collection</u> during the period in which forest harvest and hauling operations are being conducted only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ except in remote tourism lake access buffers 	Same as option C
			<p>New roads available for MPT during month of <u>August ONLY</u> for <u>berry picking ONLY</u> for a period of five years after cut.</p> <p>except in remote tourism lake access buffer</p>	Same as option C
			<p>Gradually plan to locate new roads further away from tourism lakes and values</p>	Not applicable
REC EMAs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottaging to be permitted use in Enhanced Recreational Areas, if Provincial Policy changes • No restrictions for motorized use • Minimal restrictions re: harvest or other operations 	<p>Promotion of road-based accessible, recreational opportunities</p> <p>Further enhancements of recreational opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • stocking lakes • campground development • boat launches, water 	<p>Same as in Option B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • but in order to assist in making lakes MORE accessible, plan to construct new roads closer to lakes; • permit the consideration of proposals to develop new lake access points 	Same as option C

Details	Option A (New Option)	Option B (2010 Original Version)	Option C (New Option)	Option D (New Option)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotion of road-based accessible, recreational opportunities <p>Further enhancements of recreational opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • stocking lakes • campground development • boat launches, water crossings • repair and maintenance • roadway and trail upgrades and maintenance, etc. • gathering (berries/mushrooms) <p>Creation or improvement of access points to valued recreational destinations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • roads would be developed to a good quality to allow for recreational opportunities to be enhanced • Roads to be constructed and maintained to the safe standards required by the MNR and FMP guidelines for primary and branch roads 	<p>crossings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • repair and maintenance • roadway and trail upgrades and maintenance, etc. <p>Creation or improvement of access points to valued recreational destinations</p>	<p>Promotion of road-based accessible, recreational opportunities</p> <p>Further enhancements of recreational opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • stocking lakes • campground development • boat launches, water crossings • repair and maintenance • roadway and trail upgrades and maintenance, etc. <p>Creation or improvement of access points to valued recreational destinations</p>	

Details	Option A (New Option)	Option B (2010 Original Version)	Option C (New Option)	Option D (New Option)
	<p>New Roads</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ability to access lakes • no restrictions • need to consider tourism lakes and the buffer restrictions that apply to tourism lakes • plan roads to allow for new access/boat launches or recreation in general • regular maintenance by MNR/3rd Party/Roads boards/communities and users • Roads left for natural abandonment 			
General Use Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • roads would be developed to a good quality to allow for recreational and other opportunities to be enhanced • Cottaging to be permitted on a case-by-case basis with environmental assessment if Provincial Policy changes • A wide range of resource and recreational uses are 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These areas include lands without specific designation or enhancement management area designations. • A wide range of resource and recreational uses are permitted to occur. • The intent of these areas is to allow for multiple resource and recreational uses to occur. 	<p>GUAs-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • same as Option B 	<p>Same as option C and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ existing tourism amendment buffers to remain on designated tourism lakes

Details	Option A (New Option)	Option B (2010 Original Version)	Option C (New Option)	Option D (New Option)
	<p>permitted to occur.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intent of these areas is to allow for multiple resource and recreational uses to occur. 			
	<p>Signage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • existing roads leading directly to a remote tourism lake <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ signs at buffer distance ○ 2KM for remote Lodge Lakes ○ 1 Km for Remote Outpost Lakes • Wording on signs should allow for the 'other' uses. • All uses allowed other than accessing ACTIVE, remote tourism lakes by road and a motorized vehicle from June 1 to August 31 in any year. • There should be flexibility to the operator to decide if he wants a road/trail to the lake – some may want this on a case by case basis. 			

Details	Option A (New Option)	Option B (2010 Original Version)	Option C (New Option)	Option D (New Option)
<p>How will the Designated Remote Tourism Lakes be protected in each zone? i.e. existing Tourism Strategy, CLUAH Management Strategy as proposed in Option A or some other version of this. If in Remote EMA – how far of an Access buffer – 3 KM or 2 KM?</p>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ existing roads leading directly to a remote tourism lake ● 2 KM roads access restriction on Remote Lodge Lakes ● 1 KM roads access restriction on remote Outpost Lakes ● Will only apply to remote tourism lakes with current active LUP and infrastructure ● Protections will be seasonal and will apply only when facility is in use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 1 – August 31 in any year ● Roads near tourism lakes will be built according to MNR and FMP Guidelines ● Any road leading directly to an tourism lake will have signage on road 2KM or 1 KM from the lakes and have wording such as: “use of this road to access remote tourism 	<p>Tourism Amendment as it provides direction to Area of Concern prescriptions for Forestry operations will remain as is</p>	<p>Forest Operations Area of Concern Prescription for Remote Tourism Lakes proposed as follow:</p> <p>Amendments to this proposed Area of Concern Prescription may be made prior to the approval of project after detailed consultation with local forest industry operators.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● First 120 m – no cut reserve. ● From 120 m - 400 m – no all season roads will be established. Harvesting may occur. ● Within viewshed of lake – Partial/modified cutting techniques will apply to harvesting operations. Operations must provide a forested appearance. ● Outside of viewshed of lake – Alternate harvesting techniques may apply, while following the stand and site requirements provided under the Crown Forest Sustainability Act (1994) and its applicable manuals and guides. 	<p>Not applicable</p> <p>Forestry Operations prescriptions would be negotiated through an RSA Process on a case by case basis.</p>

Details	Option A (New Option)	Option B (2010 Original Version)	Option C (New Option)	Option D (New Option)
	<p>lake __name__ is restricted from June 1 – August 31</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traditional use is allowed all year. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This includes by air, water, land, foot, train, motorized boat • Statutory exemptions still apply • The number of LUPs and infrastructures allowed on remote tourism lakes according to MNR Guidelines • Harvesting, timing and regeneration, etc. restrictions of 2KM and 1 KM apply around the lodge and outpost LUPs only. • during the summer season – can be negotiated between the company and the operator 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ From 400 m – 2000 m – Harvesting may occur. ○ Within viewshed of lake ○ Partial/modified cutting techniques will apply to harvesting operations. Operations must provide a forested appearance. ○ Outside of viewshed of lake – Alternate harvesting techniques may apply, while following the stand and site requirements provided under the Crown Forest Sustainability Act (1994) and its applicable manuals and guides. ○ Operational roads only are to be established and will be decommissioned upon completion of use. During operations, these roads will be restricted from unauthorized use. Access restrictions will be implemented using Public Lands Act sign restrictions. Access signage will consider strategic wording and placement to achieve optimal compliance rates. ○ Specific plans for decommissioning will be established in conjunction with the MNR. 	

Details	Option A (New Option)	Option B (2010 Original Version)	Option C (New Option)	Option D (New Option)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From 2 KM – 3 KM – access restrictions on all roads. Access restrictions will be implemented using Public Lands Act sign restrictions. Access signage will consider strategic wording and placement to achieve optimal compliance rates. Location of access signage may vary depending on operational consideration e.g. location of adjoining roads, watercrossings, designated road connectivity corridors etc. • From the beginning of walleye season – after the second week of moose hunt, site preparation may be permitted in this area during the frost free season but will normally be limited to the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. ○ Outpost/Lodge – A 300 m no cut reserve will be established around each designate outpost or lodge. A minimum of 2 km timing restriction (beginning of walleye season – after the second week of moose hunt), restricting the use of heavy equipment (> a ½ ton), will be applied to protect high valued recreational angling destinations 	

Details	Option A (New Option)	Option B (2010 Original Version)	Option C (New Option)	Option D (New Option)
			from visual and auditory pollutions.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest changing naming of the existing Wawa District Tourism Strategy to “Wawa District CLUAH Strategy” 			
Will there be any access corridors through any of the zones that may need an enhanced access strategy developed for the road? Where will this be?				
	Consideration of Connection Corridors between Roads, trails and communities and ‘loops’ during all seasons throughout all Land Use Designations – GUA and Rec. EMA	None were identified to be specifically identified or to be included for consideration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dubreuilville / Hornepayne access corridor with connection via a single lane bridge suitable for ATV or snowmobile only. Make allowance for the potential creation of additional connection corridors through ‘a process’, plus clear language regarding use/creation of such corridors. Process might include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timing restrictions Exclusion to a particular area/road that is mapped 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dubreuilville / Hornepayne access corridor with connection via a single lane bridge suitable for ATV or snowmobile only. Make allowance for the creation of additional connection corridors through ‘a process’, plus clear language regarding use/creation of such corridors.

Details	Option A (New Option)	Option B (2010 Original Version)	Option C (New Option)	Option D (New Option)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Agreement from all outfitters affected within their 3 KM buffer 	
	<p>The consideration of Roads/Trails/Loops will not be impacted by any remote tourism restrictions or remote tourism lake buffers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Current FMPs need to be amended and future FMPs have to have regard for revised remote tourism lake buffers and road/trail access 			
<p>Will the existing Tourism Strategy apply to all the Designated Remote Tourism Lakes across the district, or just where it applies now?</p>				
	<p>No, a new Wawa CLUAH Strategy will be developed.</p>	<p>Just applies to the lakes within the Nagagami, White River, Wawa and Magpie Forest Management Units</p>	<p>No change from Option B; existing access decisions are recognized</p>	<p>In just the General Use Area/Recreational EMA Areas; the lakes currently covered by the Wawa District 1992 tourism amendment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Keep same protections on lakes in the list, but also apply the revised forestry area of concern prescriptions for remote lakes, along with the 3 km access restrictions.

Details	Option A (New Option)	Option B (2010 Original Version)	Option C (New Option)	Option D (New Option)
Can the list of Designated Lakes remain as presented at Phase II of Consultation?				
List of Designated Lakes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No, list of Designated Tourism Lakes needs a review Lakes with no existing use should be reverted back to being a 'non' designated lake Cannot tie up a lake by only having a Land Use Permit (LUP) List of active remote tourism lakes needs a review of activity every 5 years 	As presented at Phase II	Designated remote tourism lakes list remains unchanged from Phase II	Same as option C
List of Opportunity Lakes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request these lakes going back to the being 'non' designated 	Lakes on list have designation removed	Opportunity Lakes on list - in remote access EMAs - adopts the tourism policy for the area	Same as option C
			Within Recreational EMAs – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action item for MNR – confirm that all the lakes on the small list should be there; looks like some should be on the big list.(e.g. 	Same as option C

Details	Option A (New Option)	Option B (2010 Original Version)	Option C (New Option)	Option D (New Option)
			East Nameigos)	
			<p>Within REC EMAs- all lakes to be called “road based tourism lakes”- take on management direction for the overall area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ These are not ‘fly-in’ lakes 	Same as option C
			<p>Within GUAs- keep calling all lakes “tourism opportunity lakes” and apply Tourism Lake Option 2 harvesting controls to these lakes. This will keep these lakes as viable tourism opportunity lakes. Beyond this, all ZONAL provisions for GUAs apply. No additional access controls.</p> <p>IF a TOURISM LUP is issued for a site on one of these lakes, then the lake\takes on the management direction appropriate for the new LUP- e.g. Remote or Road-based recreation. Forest management still continues in line with new business type.</p>	Same as option C
Pilot Projects Proposals	<p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Roads Boards/Committees ○ Enhancing canoe routes and Trails ○ Establishing Cottage area if Provincial 		<p>PILOT PROJECTS:</p> <p>Yes - should be considered/provided for/ encouraged in the plan.</p> <p>Subject to:</p>	Same as option C

Details	Option A (New Option)	Option B (2010 Original Version)	Option C (New Option)	Option D (New Option)
	policy changes		1. Consultation with interested and affected stakeholders during development and prior to implementation. 2. Intense monitoring during pilot to ensure that information is obtained. 3. Time limitation for pilot project. 4. Formal evaluation and report of results of pilot. E.g. Canoe Routes	
Other considerations/comments/rationale:				
	In addition: MNR should look into where it should insert an “Aboriginal and Treaty Rights Recognized” clause. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final strategy or option needs to have consideration and wording in regard to respect for Aboriginal and Treaty Rights • Consider Primary User Groups in Land Use 		Notwithstanding legal requirements under MNR’s Class EA for Resource Stewardship and Facility Development, the group recommends that local interested and/or affected stakeholders be consulted regarding any new disposition regardless of its categorization under the Class EA across the entire district. In addition: MNR should look into where it should insert an “Aboriginal and Treaty Rights Recognized” clause. Maybe put a preamble into	Same as option C

Details	Option A (New Option)	Option B (2010 Original Version)	Option C (New Option)	Option D (New Option)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standardization of signs i.e. no vehicular travel to 'x' lake and timings – that's it and wording • Access to remote lakes and lands surrounding them in the OFF Season • Other commercial wants and needs inside of Rec. EMAs and GUAs • Cottaging to be permitted use in Enhanced Recreational Areas and General Use Areas, if Provincial Policy changes. <p>Roads</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roads to be constructed and maintained to the safe standards required by the MNR and FMP guidelines for primary and branch roads • Roads to be monitored when not in use as per guidelines • Roads preferably left to natural abandonment (policy guidelines) <p>Traditional means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add motorized vehicles 		<p>entire document.</p> <p>Canoe Routes:</p> <p>Recommend: All canoe routes in the entire district should be evaluated to confirm which ones remain viable canoe routes. Establish criteria evaluating canoe routes such as inherent natural (environmental) value, potential economic value of route. When road crossings of canoe routes are proposed, the values of the canoe route and the effect of the crossing on it (positive or negative) should be considered.</p>	

Details	Option A (New Option)	Option B (2010 Original Version)	Option C (New Option)	Option D (New Option)
	<p>to the definition of traditional means and includes snowmobile, ATV, motorized boat, bicycle.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All year use <p>Moose Hunt Closures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restricted signage to be placed, at request, only during the 1st week of the open gun season for moose at 1 KM only, on roads leading directly to a remote tourism lake with an ACTIVE LUP, infrastructure and a valid moose tag for moose hunting • Sign to read: Motorized vehicular use restricted for hunting moose Oct. ___ to Oct___ 7 days only • No restrictions on roads for fishing, hunting small game and other uses • Remote lakes with no valid tag and not being used – open to the public • Forest Harvest Operations – timing, etc. can be negotiated 			

Details	Option A (New Option)	Option B (2010 Original Version)	Option C (New Option)	Option D (New Option)
	<p>between the company and the operator</p> <p>Remote and Opportunity Lakes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity Lakes to be changed back to general use area • Remote lakes with no LUP and lakes with no active LUP or infrastructure to be changed to general use • MNR and FMP Guidelines apply for harvest and other uses • Lake trout policies apply <p>Cottaging Policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottaging to be permitted on a case-by-case basis with environmental assessment if Provincial Policy changes • Negotiated on a case by case basis and through an environmental assessment <p>Agriculture</p>			

Details	Option A (New Option)	Option B (2010 Original Version)	Option C (New Option)	Option D (New Option)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – e.g. Blueberry farm. <p>Other Working Groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are other working groups with interest e.g. First Nation, Pukaskwa Zone of Cooperation, etc. ○ May be issues around the Park Boundaries <p>Other comments/Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1 - 2 KM Buffers need to be June 1 to August 31 ○ Decision makers do not understand the culture of northerners ○ Make 1 -2 KM Zones all “Red” to stand out on maps ○ Percentages do not show true picture ○ % of land base that provides protection to tourism shown – must be noted on maps ○ Of the 54 lakes that exist in Wawa District that are greater than 300 ha in size each which have a combined area of 71,570 ha, 29 lakes are remote 			

Details	Option A (New Option)	Option B (2010 Original Version)	Option C (New Option)	Option D (New Option)
	<p>tourism which represents _61%_ percent by area (43, 584 hectares) of the total number of 71, 570 hectares.</p>			