

# Prince Albert FMA Forest Management Planning Process

## Core Planning Team Meeting Minutes for Oct 16, 2013

**Location:** Forest Service – Birch Room

**Time:** 9:30 – 4:00pm

Pat Mackasey, Forest Service

Doug Braybrook, Edgewood

Xianhua Kong, Forest Service

Dave Knight, Sakâw

Vickie Gauthier, Forest Service

Mark Doyle, Forest Service

Rod Pshebnicki, Tolko

Cam Brown, Forsite (Minutes Author)

### Minutes:

1. Review of Past Action Items
  - a. All past action times were addressed except for the following:
    - i. **Pat** going to provide Vol 1 comments on Oct 22
    - ii. **Dave** to send letter on riparian practice intentions to Bob Wynes
    - iii. **Gigi** to send Forsite the species and habitat definitions to track in FMP (**Pat** coordinating)
2. Tactical Plan
  - a. Discussion around subjective netdowns and whether they could/could not be harvested lead to a discussion around what the tactical plan would look like. Subjective netdowns are meant to capture issues that prevent harvesting from an operational perspective. The representation of these issues (ie steep slopes, non merch types) in the model (strategic scale) may not be fully accurate at the operational scale and/or circumstances may allow some limited performance in these areas. The model will use best available information and provide strategic wood supply levels and approximate locations/sizes of harvest events consistent with the rules put in place in the model (timber and non-timber). Operationally, harvesting can occur in subjective netdown areas but it is not expected and if a significant amount occurs it will raise concerns with the Forest Service.
  - b. Pat/Xianhua indicated that they are expecting a tactical plan map showing harvest event locations/sizes in four 5 yr periods and that any harvesting outside of these areas would be considered a deviation from the plan (lack of harvest is ok). Up to 20% deviation is allowed in a 5yr time period. The FMPD (sec 4.8.1) provides flexibility to licensees by allowing harvest from the next period's events as well (ie. Yr 6-10 if you are in year 1-5). This ensures there are always >5 years of blocks to choose from at any given time. Mistik is currently working under 2 ten year periods with a limited to ability to use up to 30% of planned events from years 11-20 (T2) in the current period (T1). They are 5 years into the plan and are well within the 20% tolerance due in part to the fact they are only at year 5 of 10 (lots of options still), have put extensive planning effort into the creation of the 'events', are not harvesting their full HVS, and their mill destination have been static.
  - c. Sakaw has concerns that forecasted blocks from this FMP will not remain relevant for 10 years because of differences in which mills are running, changes in mill consumption levels, and general market conditions. Even if these things did remain static, there is still concern that the accuracy of the model inputs/results will not be sufficient enough to drive a detailed spatial sequence (even with the extra 5 years of blocks to draw from) without

- an investment in preplanning of blocks that would be fed into the model. At a minimum, it will be necessary to carefully setup harvest profiles by stand type and geographic areas in the model to ensure the sequence is workable for each of the shareholders in the FMA.
- d. The use of a model's spatial harvest pattern to feed operational plans is one (simple) way to ensure consistency with strategic objectives/assumptions but the same outcomes could be achieved through a VOITs reporting system and would allowing greater flexibility to deviate from the spatial tactical plan. The spatial plan would still be the easiest way to feed blocks into the operational plans but it would be ok to deviate.
  - e. No action items resulted – more discussion/brainstorming is required.
3. Volume 1 Document
    - a. Pat indicated that he was not going to supply any new wording for the FMP commitments section to capture old modeling assumptions – but comments on this may come in the review package Oct 22.
    - b. Cam submitted a new version of the Vol 1 document (dated Sept 25) to Pat that contained a map of past harvesting (1999-2012) and some misplaced edits provided earlier by Pat (FMP commitments section).
    - c. This draft is now posted on Sakaw website with DRAFT stamp on it.
    - d. Pat flagged an issue with the current presentation of management units in the Vol1 (several options presented). The old Weyco FMZ/FMU may not be needed if the ecoregion/ecodistrict units are used along with the operating zones. It was agreed that one set of boundaries are not going to be appropriate for all management purposes (e.g. harvest allocations, old forest retention, patch size distributions, etc) and these still need to be finalized.
    - e. **Dave is going to let people know what is needed for the Nov roadshow.**
    - f. **Cam to prepare poster size maps and 30 min presentation on Volume 1.**
  4. PAG meeting update
    - a. Oct 7 meeting held in PA but attendance was poor. Doug Turner presented NFP information and Susan Carr took minutes. Dave presented Vol1 information.
    - b. Group looking for a facilitator – potentially Susan Carr.
    - c. Naomi was nominated to attend planning team meetings but was unable to make today's meeting. **Cam to make sure future invites to Planning Team meetings includes Naomi Carrier (La Ronge First Nation).**
    - d. Next Meeting is Dec 7, 2013.
  5. Timber Supply Modeling Assumptions
    - a. SFVI Inventory
      - i. Pasture fire – The areas mapped as unproductive will be changed to reflect productive attributes where the UTM inventory indicates this is appropriate.
      - ii. Low density stands - Xianhau responded to Cam's suggestion to include low density stands under 40 years of age with a proposal to get sph (density) numbers from the WFVI dataset for these stands and then 1) project what crown closure category (A,B,C,D) they would expect to achieve at rotation, and 2) assign them to current yield curves based on this projected density class. Cam suggested that stands with less than 800 sph (at any age <40) should be out of the landbase, while other are in and would fall into the lowest density yield curve available unless there were obviously sufficient stems to warrant a higher density class. **Forsite to prepare a summary of the proposed approach and submit to Mark/Xianhua.**
    - b. Operability Window: Minimum harvest age to be based on the age at which both 60m<sup>3</sup>/ha and >90% of CMAI are achieved. Maximum harvest age to be defined by the year when stand volume has declined to 60m<sup>3</sup>/ha. Stands will be assumed to undergo succession (age reset to young condition) when stand is just past maximum harvest age. The young age that stands are sent to will need to be proposed by Forsite (based on PP

FMP numbers?). Forsite to include this information in its modeling assumptions document.

- c. Non Merchantable types – Sakaw reviewed definitions in FMA agreement. Xianhua indicated that there are no licensing issues associated with changing these definitions with supporting rationale. The only type Sakaw proposes to change is the ‘bS stands with B density and <7.5m tall’ by adding an age definition “established prior to 1950”. The intent is to ensure young plantations of B density bS are not removed, but stands that are still B density and <7.5 yrs after 65 years do get removed from the landbase.
  - d. Tamarack Stands – Sakaw intends to include these stands in the working landbase and will develop a proposal to harvest and renew these stands. **Cam to identify how the G&Y work will accommodate the inclusion of these stands and how SGR’s can be developed.**
  - e. Steep Slopes – Sakaw will be using a 30% slope cutoff in the landbase netdown process.
  - f. Expired exclusions – Sakaw will be removing these areas as subjective netdowns (Smoothstone, Dore, Swan, Big River/Marina Point).
  - g. Blowdown stands regen assumptions for unsalvaged areas need to be developed. Pat offered Island Forest assumptions as a starting point and suggested that productivity would be better in the PA FMA. **Forsite to develop assumptions for blowdown regen.** Vicki’s review of several blowdown areas in the PA FMA suggest extended regeneration delays are expected if advanced regen was not present at the time of the event.
6. Approach to Addressing Catastrophic Disturbance Events
- a. Agreement exists that a reanalysis commitment/threshold is preferred over a fire factor applied to the modeling results. Predicting the timing and size of fires is simply too difficult and leaving volume on the landbase in anticipation of fire is a not a prudent strategy to minimize fire impacts.
  - b. Discussion on how to establish a reanalysis threshold was focused estimating what might be an acceptable overestimation of timber supply after a fire occurs. Mistik is currently working under a 10% (of net landbase) threshold. This was correlated with a 5-10% timber supply impact using sensitivity analysis at the time of FMP development. Xianhua indicated that the PA FMA should likely have a lower threshold because fire cycles are longer on this landbase. The Mistik value was correlated with the 30 year average annual burn % converted to a 10 yr cumulative value. It was suggested that a similar number be calculated for the PA FMA. **Forsite to do this calculation and propose a threshold value with a rationale.**
7. SGR’s and VOITs
- a. Sample SGR ‘one-page-summaries’ were developed by Forsite for each development type that captures relevant information for practitioners to develop prescriptions while also supplying information for modeling assumptions/VOIT assessments. Feedback was marked up on the document during the meeting – attached here in raw draft form. **Forsite to make further edits** and add consistency of edits to all development types. General guidance was provided to:
    - i. Ensure language does not prevent innovation in term of treatment options.
    - ii. Add definitions to allow possibility of chemical treatment of HWD vs mechanical stand tending in development types where this may be relevant.
    - iii. Check why volume yields appear to be lower for the better site yield group (bS,jP, jPbS).
    - iv. Check FMZ numbering

- b. It was felt that designing specific VOITs from the SGR tables was valuable vs leaving the table to be interpreted later by Forest Service staff for compliance. Targets and acceptable tolerances for the following metrics were desired:
  - i. % of all harvested area from a given operating year that becomes stocked (800 sph) within the establishment window.
  - ii. % of all harvested area from a given operating year that meet or exceed regeneration target densities within the free-to-grow window.
  - iii. % of harvested area by species association (H, HS, SH, S) relative to the species association predicted for rotation based on stocking present at 14 years (and 7 years for early assessment that could guide treatments).
    - 1. Need to consider that some stand types are not correct in the inventory (SH in SFVI but HS on the ground). No solution to this proposed.

8. Timeline Update

- a. Pat indicated that guidance on Caribou, NFP, and VOITs will be provided by the end of October. Cam to review this information and seek clarification as needed (no group discussion/review planned for early Nov).
- b. FMP Standard and code chapter meeting to begin again soon (perhaps Nov).

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

Week of Nov 18-22, 2013 – Public Meetings on Vol 1 (In conjunction with AOP meetings)  
Wednesday Dec 18, 2013 (1pm @ Forest Service – Cam to call in)  
Wednesday Jan 15<sup>th</sup>, 2014 (930am at Forest Service)  
Thursday Feb 27, 2014 (930am at Forest Service)