

**Prince Albert FMA
Forest Management Planning Process**

Core Planning Team Meeting Minutes for Oct 15, 2014

Location: Forest Service – Birch Room

Time: 9:30 – 1200

Pat Mackasey, Forest Service	Michelle Young, MLOSB
Dave Knight, Carrier	Doug Braybrook, Edgewood
Shawn Meisner, Carrier	Narayan Dhital, Forest Service
Dave West, MLOSB	Cam Brown, Forsite (Minutes Author)

Minutes:

1. Review of Past Action Items:
 - a. Approval of development report (Pat) – still outstanding.
 - b. Cam to update workplan after discussing timelines with Bob/Pat – still outstanding. Expect for November after NFP finalization.
 - c. Technical modeling assumptions still without agreement (MHAs, small patches)
 - d. Forsite to spatialize old/very old requirement for use in AOP (still outstanding)
 - e. All other action items were addressed.
2. Development report – Pulp proportion still under review by Forest Service. Dave provided documentation showing Weyerhaeuser determined the 661,000 m³ of pulp based on information available at the last plan and specifically identified stand types that would provide some of that volume (provided after meeting – attached to these minutes). The 1997 yield curves clearly had more softwood volume in general and a lot of that additional volume was pulp. There is no expectation that Sakâw will be changing yield curves from what is currently in place.
3. Timelines – No change from last meeting – FMP timeline will be extended and then the plan will be approved retroactively to April 1, 2015.

NFP outcomes were discussed relative to the meeting held with FS staff, Dave Anderson, and select industry representatives (Mistik and Weyco). [Sakâw wishes to have a similar meeting – **Cam** to request]. It would appear we are headed toward an NFP document that continues to use 15/5 old/very old, 9% in-block, event sizes consistent with natural patterns, and a temporary interior old target in the 20-25% range (by species). This interior target is assumed to have minimal to no impact on HVS with the intent to do further work on what an appropriate target would be during term of the new FMP.

Pat indicated that NFP discussions are expected to continue with all industry after a revised standard is provided in Nov (meeting expected with industry for later Nov, NFP finalized in Dec). This is part of a larger FMP standard revision being completed by Nadine Penny to look at VOITs, harvest flow regimes, tactical plan requirements, etc. It was requested that Nadine address the previously submitted comments on NFP at that time.

4. Tactical Plan - Discussion continued around tactical plan options with focus on using a model generated plan to illustrate the feasibility of harvest – but not being used to directly guide harvest (in favour of planners proving that AOP's are consistent with sustainability objectives/VOITS from the FMP. A key challenge with this approach is achieving clarity on how caribou habitat will be protected /addressed as we don't have a clear indicator/target (one is under development by govt) Cam proposed that Sakâw spatially identify stands/areas where harvest will be deferred for the term of the plan as a means to address this issue. **Cam** to develop a map showing caribou habitat ratings, actual caribou population use, and old/very old stand retention areas so that planners can assess where these deferral areas might be located.

Cam to formulate an example of how FMP objectives could be used to guide AOP development instead of a spatial tactical plan.

5. Caribou – Meeting with industry/stakeholders in Saskatoon on Oct 16th to provide an update on range planning for Caribou. **Cam** to contact Gigi to discuss habitat modeling approach for FMP VOITs.
6. Forest Estate Modeling - nothing is occurring currently.
 - a. Discussed the feasibility of the 4% net impact assumption for inblock retention (9% gross, come back for half, another .5% overlap with other netdowns). There were mixed feelings on the likelihood of coming back for small retention patches but a strong agreement around assuming a portion (half?) of the 9% could come from non-representative stands that would be left otherwise in the area. These areas are expected to provide biological value in the area.
 - b. Discussed the use of currently proposed MHAs which are younger than what the ministry would prefer. Key idea here is that the current age class structure is older than what we are aiming for in the future so we should expect the average harvest age (and piece size) to decline relative to today.
7. PAG meeting on Friday – field trip to the Snowfield road. Meeting with Candle Lake residents also happening this evening to discuss the FMP process and hear their issues (Cam, Shawn, Michelle going).
8. VOITS – Discussion on the use of C&E inspections to look at soil and water protection outcomes occurred. The use of the C&E approach is likely the least expensive but less likely to deliver a clear indication of what is going because of the way these issues are tracked and the fact that some are disputed or are simple voluntary compliance notices. **Cam** to request Compliance Summary for PA FMA and share with group. The proposed alternative was to do a sampling approach that audits blocks specifically looking at soil and water management related issues. Drawback of that option is higher costs. Shawn suggested the use of yearly road inspections as a water related VOIT (e.g. % of maintenance issues found in yearly inspections addressed within 60 days).

Cam to start looking at which approval conditions from old plan (detailed in Volume 1 doc) need to be moved into current VOITs.

Subsequent meetings:

Wed Nov 19, 2014 (930am at Forest Service)

Wed Dec 17, 2014 (930am Conf Call / Web Meeting)

Wed Jan 21, 2015 (930am at Forest Service)

Wed Feb 25, 2015 (930am at Forest Service)

Wed Mar 18, 2015 (930am at Forest Service)