

# Prince Albert FMA Forest Management Planning Process

## Core Planning Team Meeting Minutes for Mar 19, 2014

**Location:** Forest Service – Birch Room and Conf Call

**Time:** 9:30 – 3:30pm

Chris Brown, Forest Service

Xianhua Kong, Forest Service

Michelle Young, Tolko

Shawn Miesner, Carrier Forest Products

Pat Mackasey, Forest Service

Doug Braybrook, Edgewood

Naomi Carriere, La Ronge IB

Cam Brown, Forsite (Minutes Author)

Brad Dahl, Sask Wildlife Federation

Garnet Mierau, Forsite

### Minutes:

1. Review of Past Action Items
  - a. All past action times were addressed.
2. PAG
  - a. At last PAG meeting a concern was raised around riparian standards (noted from around Big River). **Dave** committed to organize a discussion group on the topic.
3. Volume 1
  - a. Pat has started the consultation process using Ver 3 on website and it will be concluded around Easter.
  - b. Pat has pointed out that a few edits still need to be made prior to final signoff. **Cam** to address these issues.
4. Planning File / Assumptions Document
  - a. All planning file issues to date have been resolved by Forsite. **Xianhua** to provide final comments on file by Monday Mar 24. He will also provide comments on the full modeling assumptions document by mid April. He agreed to provide any “red flags” ASAP to facilitate the modeling phase of the work (due in June).
  - b. Public input/ review scheduled for July but it will be a tough timeline to hit.
5. Growth and Yield report
  - a. All edits stemming from the review have been submitted to Phil.
6. Baseline Modeling Review / Planned Scenarios
  - a. Pat pointed out that the Standards committee would like to see only one set of MU's vs what is currently being proposed (ecological and administrative MU's).
  - b. Some control over spatial distribution of harvest is desired by Forest Service (i.e. shareholder op area zones?). Concerns were raised over the use of these zones because they are not mean to be static over time. While they will work to help distribute the harvest around the FMA, there may be better ways to put direct controls on the spatial distribution of harvest (i.e. approved tactical plan).

- c. Caribou. A tactical plan that is acceptable to fish and wildlife is required. Intent is to focus on retaining intact areas and harvest areas that are already “disturbed”. Habitat direction is around wetland and muskeg – not 'water'.
- d. Discussion around modeling patch size: need to use patch target distributions as background influence in the model because rigid adherence will impact timber supply.
- e. Discussed need to use patch size target on old growth (interior habitat)
- f. Potential scenarios to model;
  - i. Base Case (as documented in the Assumptions document)
  - ii. Alternative Management Scenarios
    - 1. Alternative flow regimes (LRSY, etc)
    - 2. Caribou.... (different disturbance defn or buffer)
    - 3. Alternative interior forest requirements
    - 4. Different ecological MU's
    - 5. Alternative in-block retention levels
    - 6. Alternative event size distributions
    - 7. Minimize road activity in each period (apply constraints to road costs)
    - 8. Improve managed stand yields by 10%
    - 9. Increase regen delay by 2 years
    - 10. Rigid enforcement of patch distribution
    - 11. Strict patch size targets for old growth
    - 12. Old growth under different MU's

## 7. VOITS

The group spent the last half of the meeting actively discussing and reviewing a working DRAFT of the Values, Objectives, Indicators and Targets (VOITs). The following are highlights from the discussion. Attached is revised DRAFT of the VOITs based on the discussion.

- a. THE CCFM structure is being maintained. The FMP Standards group was to put out draft set of VOITS at April 1 meeting (note – meeting now to be rescheduled).
- b. The KEY behind each VOIT is a tangible, measurable indicator. Concern expressed that these become hard rules from a compliance perspective. In some cases it makes sense to have variances to the VOIT. The group felt it is a good idea to have the “intent” captured in the document for future reference
- c. Island Forests VOITs may have some good examples. **Pat** to send to Cam.
- d. Some of the reporting will have a delay because of timing, such as regen surveys completed 5-7 years post harvest. Many indicators set reporting to 5 years.
- e. Event size distribution is dependent numerous factors and should be viewed more as a soft target with companies doing their best to achieve this across the landbase.
- f. Reporting on cumulative impacts on the land base is not in the groups control. An example is wildfire where Fire Management Branch supplies the data based on quick fly overs. No control over the timing of this.
- g. Xianhua would like to see an indicator that compares harvested yields to predicted ones.
- h. When meeting with stakeholders it is about managing expectations. Numerous opportunities are made throughout the year to meet. Let the PAG come up with some wording on how to best measure/ report on this aspect
- i. Concern about reporting/mapping of non-timber values. Not wanting to lose the intent of this plan and end up reporting on values that forest companies do not have control over (eg. Mushroom areas). A clear definition is important.

### **Subsequent meetings (to be sent out as outlook meeting requests):**

Wed Apr 15, 2014 (1pm at Forest Service)  
 Wed May 14, 2014 (930am at Forest Service)  
 Wed June 18, 2014 (930am at Forest Service)