

**Prince Albert FMA  
Forest Management Planning Process**

**Core Planning Team Meeting Minutes for March 18, 2015**

**Location:** Forest Service – Birch Room

**Time:** 9:30-2pm

Mark Doyle, Forest Service	Robert Follett, NorSask
Kerry McIntyre, MLOSB	Cam Brown, Forsite (Minutes Author)
Doug Braybrook, Edgewood	
Darryl Sande, Forsite	
Narayan Dhital, Forest Service	

**Minutes:**

1. Review of Past Action Items:
  - **Cam** to adjust SGR's so they are consistent with the modeling assumption that all stands revert to the same stand type (no erosion of SWD occurring at regeneration).
  - All other past action items were addressed.
  - Cam noted that Sakaw is working on a Caribou strategy based on previously completed mapping products.
  
2. Preplanning Threshold
  - a. Nararyan raised the issue of the replanning threshold and asked whether it was necessary to do an assessment of the area in past disturbances that was salvage logged. Cam indicated that it was not needed – but the proposed threshold (10%) would be actively tracked under the new FMP using the assumption that if area was disturbed and salvaged logged, it would not count toward the 'impacted' area tally. The rationale behind this is that the threshold is meant to address the risk of losing timber volume from the landbase above and beyond what is accounted for in the model (ie annual harvest of the HVS). If impacted timber can still be salvaged under the approved HVS, there is no incremental loss.
  - b. The Forest Service will take this position under consideration when developing the definition of a stand replacing disturbance.
  
3. Timelines
  - a. No new information. Forsite aiming to submit the Forest Estate Modeling report by end of March.
  
4. Public Consultation Summary Document
  - a. Mark has provided gov'ts comments on the document and **Darryl** will provide a response to those comments by the end of the week. It was agreed that the

full dataset of names/addresses for those contacted by Sakaw would not be published in this document because it was going to be posted publicly.

#### 5. Timber Supply Sensitivity Analyses (Forsite to Complete)

- a. CTL vs Treelength utilization – intent it to keep this simple and apply a conservatively large impact (4.5% of small sawlog volume shifted to pulp) because it not going to change the forecasted harvest level for SWD sawlogs in the first 20-30 years. The 4.5% is taken from a Forest Service analysis completed in 2011 using the provincial stand/stock tables compiled to different utilization standards.
- b. Increased Pulp (Degrade factors from 1999 analysis) – intent is to approximate the % pulp used in the 1999 analysis for information only. It is not believed to be reflective of reality on the landbase but will provide an extreme upper bound.
- c. Exclusion of High Pulp Stands From The Net Landbase – there is a set of stands on the landbase that may not be viable if there is no meaningful outlet for pulp from the FMA (Edgewood is moving small amounts of pulp now but only on east side). There was debated over how to define these stands and it was agreed that its not likely to be possible within the starta using in the model – however it could be approximated by selecting JP stands with low site index and high densities (approx. 110,000 ha or 7% of net landbase) that are less than 18m tall.
- d. Less SWD Regen – the SWD component of regenerating H stands will be cut in half and HS stands will have SWD reduced by a quarter. This in meant to reflect a scenario were planting is less aggressive / effective in these types that what is assumed in the base case.
- e. More SWD Regen – the SWD component of all H and HS stands will be increased by 25% to reflect a more aggressive planting program and/or protection of existing SWD regen in these stands.
- f. Regeneration Delays (increase and decrease delays by 2 years).
- g. Volume Estimates (increase and decrease volume estimates by 10%, plus increase only managed stand yields by 10%)
- h. Minimum Harvest Ages – increase minimum harvest ages by 10 years.

#### 6. Old Seral Retention

- a. Forsite is spatializing the old/very old seral retention areas for inclusion in the tactical plan. When determining the amount of area to locate spatially as reserves, the area of inblock retention associated with old/very old stands logged during the first 20 years of the plan was subtracted from the 15% gross target. This will typically reduce the amount of reserve area by 2-3%. There is also the possibility to look for unmapped old patches inside historic fires.
- b. The approach to allocating area spatially is to select old/very old areas that are least attractive for timber harvest first (non-net landbase, low site index, far from roads, linked to high value caribou habitat, etc). Once all old stands are exhausted, then recruiting in mature stands occurs on an oldest first basis.

## 7. Tactical Plan Issues

- a. Cam showed an example using model 20 year plan blocks buffered in/out to create more generalized 'blobs' that could be used in a tactical plan – they still will need planner expertise to refine them.
- b. There is a need to strike a balance between the tolerance allowed for harvesting outside the tactical plan areas and how generalized these areas are. Mark indicated that a 20% tolerance is unlikely if they become very generalized.

## 8. VOITS/FMP Registry

- a. All 1999 FMP commitments and approval conditions were reviewed and categorized as follows:
  - i. Condition met and no longer relevant (will be ignored in new FMP)
  - ii. Condition still relevant but now addressed under provincial legislation/regulations or existing standards/guidelines applicable to the FMA (adherence to these sources of guidance will be stated in the FMP)
  - iii. Condition still relevant and needs to be addressed in new FMP. (e.g. public access to documents, Mgmt Implementation Team, reporting to PAG, participate in gov't's Caribou and SAR work, reporting on road closures/plans)
- b. Narayan is producing an FMP Registry documenting these issues.
- c. The current FMP VOITs were compared to the Draft Standard VOITS to look for discrepancies. They were largely consistent but the following exceptions existed:
  - i. Standard requires an age class distribution is to be provided annually. [There was discussion around the value of this because it doesn't change much each year and takes effort to compile].
  - ii. Standard requires a comparison of logged vs regenerated stand types annually [There was discussion that this also does not make sense to do annually and would only be reflecting on practices completed under the old FMP because the first opportunity to assess would be 7 years after harvest.]
  - iii. Standard requires reporting on Event Duration. [ This was not well understood by anyone so **Mark** was going to report back to the group on what was trying to be monitored and why / how.]
  - iv. Standard seems to require reporting on Extent of Engagement with public and aboriginal groups (e.g. attendance at meetings). [Sakaw intends to measure opportunities for engagement, not the uptake of those opportunities]
- d. Sakaw would like to see monitoring effort /costs carefully considered relative to the value of the information that would be provided.

**Subsequent meetings:**

Thurs April 16, 2015 (1 pm at Forest Service)

Thurs May 14, 2015 (9 am at Forest Service)

Wed June 17, 2015 (9 am at Forest Service)