

Prince Albert FMA Forest Management Planning Process

Meeting Minutes for July 10, 2013

Location: Forest Service – Birch Room

Time: 9:30 – 230pm

Pat Mackasey, Forest Service

Doug Braybrook, Edgewood

Chris Brown, Forest Service

Dave Knight, Sakâw

Ed Kwiatkowski, Carrier Forest Products

Cam Brown, Forsite

Michelle Young, Tolko

Luke Gubbels, Forsite (Minutes Author)

Minutes:

1. Dave Knight Presentation on differences from 2006 to today
 - a. Weyerhaeuser closed all their mills in 2006
 - b. 2006-2010 – What to do with the PA FMA
 - c. Contributing factors
 - i. CAN-USD exchange rate \$0.85 in 2006, near parity in 2013
 - ii. Collapse in housing market
 - iii. US recession
 - d. Today the number of people employed in woodlands management (per m³ harvested is much lower (more efficient operations). Currently around 1 person per 190,000m³ of harvest while in 2006 range was 1:50,000 (Weyco/Mistik) to 1:200,000(MLOS)
 - e. Pulp mill picked up the slack wood that did not have a destination until it went down. Now there are real challenges finding place to send incidental species, co-products, residual chips.
 - f. Ability to harvest across FMA and across all stand types will remain challenging until all facilities are in operation.
 - g. Everyone agreed that the pulp mill (or other CoProduct using facility) is key to a fully functioning industry
2. Review of Past Action Items (Cam)
 - a. Review highlighted text in FMP/EA commitments table
 - i. Pat to review text and add updates (**Cam to send** to him)
 - b. Historical Silviculture activities – Forest Renewal
 - i. Volume 1 is a historical perspective
 - ii. Have NSR data up to 2008 surveys; and getting information from KBM for 2011-2012. Significant gaps still exist. **Cam to check with Vickie Gauthier for more info.**
 - c. Monitoring section
 - i. John provided text and is in Vol 1 doc. **Cam to add a statement** that there is no expectation for the industry to fund scientific monitoring going forward.
 - d. Natural Disturbance impact data
 - i. Information shown in current Vol 2 seems adequate. Ideally would **add in some anecdotal information on insect/blowdown** disturbances not captured with data (**Doug, Michelle, Chris...**). For example, natural disturbance on west side of national park is not mapped and not inventoried. Salvage ranges from (10-50%)

- ii. Spruce Budworm – **Forsite to connect with Rory McIntosh** (Spraying program)
 - e. Internal Retention in Fire
 - i. Information obtained from David Andison’s work.
- 3. Review Inventory Update process
 - a. New inventory does not have data inside exclusions but we intend to allow forest in some exclusion to count toward non timber objectives such as ‘late seral targets’. Michelle asked about Prince Albert National park. No conclusive answer but it was discussed that it would be easier and logical to only use areas within the mapped FMA boundary.
 - b. Cam circulated a document describing the update process (**Cam to send digital to Pat**). Intent is to fill in any areas that were not typed with the old (UTM) inventory. Then use harvested blocks, fire, and blowdown to update the inventory for disturbance, and fill in ‘Open Productive’ areas with silviculture survey information.
- 4. Landbase Net down process
 - a. Current gross FMA area from GIS boundary is larger than what is shown in Schedule E of the assignment agreement (~200k). Not felt to be a concern by the group.
 - b. Cam laid out a general methodology where the gross landbase will be reduced to a FMA Productive Forest landbase that will contribute to wildlife/biodiversity goals, and then a subset of this would be the Net Landbase where timber harvesting is expected to occur.
 - c. Expired exclusion areas (some will be turned into subjective deletions (e.g. Dore/Smoothstone cabin areas) and some will now be in the net landbase (e.g. old jail).
 - d. Patent lands = Private lands
 - e. Dave thought that Riparian buffers should be put on long rotations instead of being landbase removals. Cam indicated that the Sakâw group would be putting forward a plan that would be similar to Weyco’s variable width buffers.
 - f. One of the problem forest types discussed with low (A) density stands. It was mentioned that not all of them should be thrown out because they can sometimes have some very nice (big) trees on them and there are limited issues with reforesting them.
- 5. PAG meeting update
 - a. Last meeting 11 people in attendance, discussion on visual buffers, Volume 1.
 - b. Future meetings should have meeting request sent using outlook so people can indicate attendance.
 - c. Some minor revision required on ToR – PAG to approve (are these material discrepancies or not relative to the signed off public consultation plan? Pat suggested that changes to the PAG ToR would not likely be an issue.
 - d. No engagement from ENGO’s at last meeting.
- 6. Review Previous FMP Commitments Table
 - a. Distribution of harvest by age and geography is known issue that will have to be addressed in Volume 2. It is expected to be too complicated to maintain harvest %’s by both species and geographic areas. Monitoring of geographic harvest volumes is preferred and is likely to help with species controls as well.
 - b. See edited table for details.
 - c. **Cam and Pat to work on this table** to get it into a format suitable for the Volume 1 doc.
- 7. G&Y / Utilization Standards
 - a. Brief discussion occurred around processing of trees: CTL vs. tree length. CTL could potentially give lower volumes when portions of logs > min top diameter are left in the bush because they are too short to make a specific log length. Chris indicated that he was seeing this on the ground in the FMA.
 - b. Sakâw will select a utilization for the FMP and then will be held to that standard going forward. They indicate that tree length processing assumptions will be used.
- 8. Volume 1 Document

- a. Reviewed text provided my MoE (Section 2.8 Summary of Ministry of Environment Resource Issues)
 - i. It's clear that more clarity is required around how to handle the harvesting of Tamarack. It is a commercial tree species in the province but is not part of the HVS in the FMA. Chris says if it is harvested, it should be utilized and paid for (even if left in landing piles).
 - ii. Several sections of this text were taken from Nadine Penny's draft report evaluating Sakâw against commitments in the 1999 FMP. Licensees took exception with several of the 'commitments' that were being evaluated as not being commitments at all (i.e. harvest by FMZ, Utilization, etc.). **Pat and Chris to relook at this section** to make it less about compliance with old FMP and more about issues the MOE has and would like to see addressed in the current plan.
 - b. **Forsite was asked to include a map of harvest history** in last 10 years in document.
 - c. **Forsite was asked to provide the renewal statistics presented in table 27 in graph form.**
9. Review Timeline and Meeting Schedule
- a. Volume 1 timing – Plan to get draft document to Sakâw by end of July and then to gov't by mid Aug.
 - b. Public Meetings on Volume 1 to be combined with operational plan meetings during week of Nov 18-22.
 - c. Future Planning Team Meetings (set as shown below)
 - d. Pat mentioned that the Caribou ecotype mapping was having issues with predictability but suggested that initial results still targeted for September 30, 2013.

Subsequent meetings (to be set out as outlook meeting requests):

Wednesday Sept 18, 2013 (930am @ Forest Service)
 Wednesday Oct 16, 2013 (930am @ Forest Service)
 Week of Nov 18-22, 2013 – Public Meetings on Vol 1 (In conjunction with AOP meetings)
 Wednesday Jan 15th, 2014 (930am at Forest Service)
 Thursday Feb 27, 2014 (930am at Forest Service)