

**Prince Albert FMA
Forest Management Planning Process**

Core Planning Team Meeting Minutes for September 17, 2014

Location: Forest Service – Birch Room

Time: 9:30 – 1230

Pat Mackasey, Forest Service	Michelle Young, MLOSB
Xianhua Kong, Forest Service	Doug Braybrook, Edgewood
Dave Knight, Carrier	Narayan Dhital – Forest Service
Shawn Meisner, Carrier	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. All other action items were addressed.
2. Volume 1 – Now approved and posted to Sakaw.ca.
3. Development report – Pulp proportion still under review by Forest Service. No specific issues have been raised by the Forest Service around the input assumptions used to generate the product breakdown.

Dave to send info on how the 661,000 m3/yr was arrived at previously (e.g. not based on mensuration data). He also made the point that what was assessed as pulp in 1999 could be very different today based on management assumptions and milling technology.

A long discussion occurred around what a tactical plan would/could look like. Two fundamentally different options exist:

- a. Model generated tactical plan (supported by AOP blocks and other company planning) that is used to guide future AOP blocks. Would need to work out tolerances around deviation outside tactical plan blocks. Assumption is that being consistent with the model will maintain alignment with all strategic objectives (including caribou which is evaluated using the tactical plan)
- b. Use reporting at the AOP stage to show that planned harvest is consistent with all strategic objectives (as captured in the VOITs). This allows the planners to adjust the tactical plan over time as needed to address changing markets or operational realities not reflected in the model data.

More discussion is needed as Nadine works on the FMP standard for tactical plans.

4. Timelines – Pat indicated that Forsite is preparing material for the Forest Service to help with the NFP issue and that would be ready at end of Oct. Thus, Nov will likely have a revised NFP draft which Nadine will then coordinate an industry meeting to discuss.

Expectation for resolution to the NFP issue is for early December but Pat will not be sending a letter with updated timelines until there is more certainty (e.g. Nov). Cam will update the workplan when the letter is sent.

Pat indicated that the FMP approval, whenever it occurs, will be backdated to April 1, 2015 so the preparation of the next AOP (2015-16, just getting underway) will need to be consistent with the FMP. This presents a challenge because the preparation of the AOP will be occurring before the completion of the NFP standard. There was an agreement that **Forsite** should spatialize the old/very old stands now in support of the AOP prep.

5. Caribou – Meeting with industry/stakeholders in Saskatoon on Oct 16th to provide an update on range planning for Caribou. **Cam** should contact Gigi to discuss habitat modeling approach for FMP VOITs.
6. Forest Estate Modeling
 - a. Nothing is occurring currently. Forsite waiting for further response on their response to the technical review comments on the data package.
 - b. Group decided not to move ahead
7. PAG meeting was cancelled for September and they have been invited on a field trip to the Snowfield road on Oct 17 (Friday). **Susan** is coordinating with MLOSB and Carrier presenting information. Candle Lake has requested an evening meeting with some members of the planning team on October 15.
8. VOITS – Cam presented information on potential approaches to VOITs for distribution of harvest both spatially and by species across the FMA.
 - a. Spatial – need to define spatial zones and max harvest volumes for each zone within a specific time period. For example, within each SWD operating zone, a maximum logged volume over 5 or 10 years could be established. This appeared workable for the SWD shareholders (most had 2-4 zones to manage) but forced MLOSB to manage 12 zones. MLOSB was not supportive of this.
 - b. Species – need to define the species groups to track, the spatial zones over which to manage proportions, the type of proportion (vol or area) and the timeframe over which targets must be met. For example, within the FMA as a whole, maximum harvest area from H, HS/SH, S_WS, S_BS, S_JP types could be set over a 5 year period.

It was recognized that these rules will reduce business flexibility and should be applied carefully, while still ensuring sustainability objectives are delivered. The group was to think about alternatives and bring proposals to next meeting.

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

Subsequent meetings:

Wed Oct 15, 2014 (930am at Forest Service)

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)