



**Meeting Notes**  
**Public Advisory Group (PAG), Prince Albert Timber Supply Area (PA TSA)**  
**March 27, 2024**  
 Hosted: TEAMS Meeting

**Participants**

Interest Category	Organization	Name
Facilitator	BBNR Management Solutions	Carl Negggers
1_Environment & Wildlife	Ducks Unlimited Canada	Mark Kornder
1_Environment & Wildlife	Prince Albert Model Forest	Peter Friedrichsen
2_Indigenous Interests	LLRIB Land & Resources Management Board	Sam Roberts Leah Fitch-Halkett
3_Municipalities and Communities	District of Lakeland no. 521	John Stauffer
3_Municipalities and Communities	City of Prince Albert	Don Cody
4_Community Associations	Provincial Association of Resort Communities of SK	Doug Allan
6_Recreation & Tourism	Saskatchewan Snowmobilers	Leah Switzer
8_Outfitting	Saskatchewan Commission of Professional Outfitters	Jaime Johnson
12_Government. Advisors & Resource People	Ministry of Environment, Forest Service Branch	Sarah Schmid Emily Poloni Bryan Fraser Nadine Penny Marlowe Rouault
12_Government. Advisors & Resource People	Carrier Forest Products (Sakaw Shareholder)	Andy Goodson
12_Government. Advisors & Resource People	Dunkley Lumber, Edgewood Operations (Sakaw Shareholder)	Matthew Eckert
12_Government. Advisors & Resource People	Tolko Industries Ltd. (Sakaw Shareholder)	Rod Pshebnicki
12_Government. Advisors & Resource People	Sakaw Askiy	James Fischer Michelle Thompson

Meeting Convened: 1:32 pm

**Introductions:**

James introduced Session Facilitator and conducted a round table where everyone on the call introduced themselves.

## **Review Agenda:**

Agenda was reviewed and approved as presented.

## **PAG Purpose (from Terms of Reference):**

James Fischer, Sakaw, outlined the general responsibilities of PAG members:

To provide input on the development and implementation of the FMP and to act as a forum for information exchange between Sakaw & Regional organizations who share interest in the forest.

## **Previous Notes and Action Items:**

December 14, 2022 Meeting

- No outstanding concerns

## **Updates:**

Development of 2024/25 Operating Plan

- Anticipating approval for the end of the month \*Update - approval received March 28.

PATSA Forest Inventory Project

- Work towards improving overall inventory data. New inventory will lead to improvements in overall operational planning.
- Initiated last spring but due to wildfires is behind schedule.

2024 field tour

- No field tour was conducted in 2023 but plan to do a tour in late summer or early fall.

## **FMP 2023 Annual Report (on the 2021-22 Operating Year):**

Overview of the 33 indicators forming the basis of the Annual Report were reviewed and no specific concerns were expressed by participants. Five of the indicators were identified for discussion.

### Harvest Event Retention (Indicator 4)

Results for 21/22 show that we are “off track”. This is due somewhat to high incidence of forest fires. Some impact could be human error and knowledge of retention rules. Some harvest activity is moving to “ribbon” insular retention which will help in achieving targets.

Bryan Fraser – If you miss a target on one event, does it affect or impact the overall indicator or target result?

- James Fischer – Yes it does.

Mark Kornder – Clarification on event insular proximal retention. Is one block a significant impact on overall target?

- James Fischer – Many blocks can create an event, so one block may not have a major impact – can balance over the event.

### Caribou Habitat within the PA TSA (Indicator 7c)

Target 1 (Tier 1 Areas) – In 2021-22 there was no harvesting in Tier 1 areas, as shown in Table 12. Some 2020/21 blocks in Tier 1 areas, where harvesting had started before the final range plan was published, were approved to be finished with the timber hauled and the roads reclaimed.

Target 2 (Tier 2 Areas) - There was harvesting in Tier 2 areas, as planned for in the FMP. Harvesting in

the first 10 years of this FMP is focused in disturbed areas close to existing road or young stands, to the extent that the tactical plan allows for this, and on completing harvest so road systems can be reclaimed.

Target 3 (Tier 3 Areas) - There was 33.2% disturbed area in the portion of the TSA that overlaps with the SK2 Central caribou range (See Table 12)

Mark Kordner – Do the maps in the report show the Tier 1 area? How long are Tier 1 areas protected?

- James Fischer – No they do not and not sure of their availability. Currently Tier 1 is 40 years.
- Emily Poloni posted link <https://gisappl.saskatchewan.ca/Html5Ext/?viewer=habisask>  
Note: Under the layers tab, you can click on the Woodland Caribou layer. Here, you can access final Woodland Caribou Tiers for SK2 Central and West, and then the draft for SK2 East

Peter Friedrichsen – How will the disturbance be reported to ECCC (Environment and Climate Change Canada) using the variable buffer system when they still adhere to a 500m standard buffer system?

- Nadine Penny – The province will report to ECCC and the federal government as per the range plans. Sakaw reports to the approved plan.
  - Peter - More information needed on discrepancy between variable buffer system calculations and ECCC standard as part of the Section 10/11 agreements on species at risk.
  - Nadine - Have not seen what caribou team reports. Sakaw reporting on the plan approved. Could have a response from Shawn Francis, Gigi Pitoello (Ministry of Environment staff working on Woodland Caribou file).

#### Harvest Blocks Comply with Provincial Standards of Soil Disturbance (Indicator 16)

There were 15 harvest areas or roads with non-compliances in 2021-22.

- 8 were related to the management of slash (which is the treetops, branches and other woody material left behind after the harvest of timber) - no remedy required (per Forest Service) in order to protect regenerating forest.
- 5 were related to not keeping to approved harvest boundaries or deviating too far from the approved location of a road – no remedy required (per Forest Service) as the trees cannot be stood back up; road deviation is remedied by reclamation.
- 1 was related to a fluid spill - this instance was remedied by cleaning it up.
- 1 was related to not sanitizing an area (cutting all infected trees) to control dwarf mistletoe - this was remedied by completing the sanitation.

Non-compliances are remedied or mitigated wherever possible, as agreed to with the Forest Service, working towards less disturbance or impact to the environment.

Mark Kornder – What is the definition of “No Action”?

- James Fischer – “No Action” is that there is generally an agreement with the Ministry that further action is not required. A good example is ruts. If remedial action has the potential for causing more harm, then no action is best.

#### Harvest Blocks Comply with Provincial Standards for Road Reclamation (Indicator 17)

The target is that 100% of inspected harvest blocks comply with provincial standards for road reclamation. Where non-compliance occurs and is addressed within the timeline identified in a Ministry approved action plan, it will not be counted against this target. Monitoring is undertaken each year. Sakâw shareholders consider road reclamation to be part of harvesting as opposed to a separate phase of operations. This approach generally means that required road reclamation is kept up to date.

Ministry of Environment compliance reports were used for reporting under this Indicator (see Table 24). Those reports summarize non-compliances found and enforcement actions taken as a result of field inspections carried out in 2021-22. The inspections were primarily on roads reclaimed in 2021-22, but also included roads reclaimed in previous years. There were 2 block non-compliance and action for both were agreed upon between the shareholder and Forest Service.

#### Watercourse Crossings Comply with Provincial and Federal Legislation (Indicator 18)

The target is that 100% of inspected watercourse crossings comply with applicable provincial and federal acts and regulations. Where non-compliance occurs and is addressed within the timeline identified in a Ministry approved action plan, it will not be counted against this target. Monitoring is undertaken each year.

Sakâw shareholders inspect roads and the watercourse crossings along them in the spring and fall, spot problems when driving the roads, notify the Forest Service about issues, and work to rectify problems. Ministry of Environment compliance reports were used for reporting under this Indicator (see Table 25). These reports summarize non-compliances found and enforcement actions taken as a result of field inspections carried out in 2021-22. The inspections were primarily on crossings constructed, maintained, or reclaimed in 2021-22, but also included crossings where those activities occurred in previous years. There were 5 watercourse crossings with non-compliances in 2021-22. All were related to the construction or reclamation of a crossing and a problem at one site caused 2 of the non-compliances. 4 of the 5 issues were remedied. Actions taken for 60% of the non-compliances were aimed at educating, informing and communicating with people to improve compliance.

Mark Kornder – When you require a Wetland Permit, does this indicator capture this?

- James Fischer – Yes, they are captured in this indicator.

Mark Kornder – Can this indicator be expanded to include “Wetland habitat” for clarification?

- James Fischer – Yes that can be considered.
- Nadine Penny will investigate if this fits.

#### Harvest Blocks Comply with the Riparian Management Standard (Indicator 19)

The target is that 100% of inspected harvest blocks comply with provincial and FMA standards for riparian area management. Where non-compliance occurs and is addressed within the timeline identified in a Ministry approved action plan, it will not be counted against this target. Monitoring is undertaken each year.

Sakâw shareholders use GPS or ribboning to identify the boundaries of riparian areas and reduce the risk of noncompliance occurring.

Ministry of Environment compliance reports were used for reporting under this Indicator (see Table 26). These reports summarize non-compliances found and enforcement actions taken as a result of field inspections carried out in 2021-22. The inspections were primarily on areas harvested in 2021-22, but also included areas harvested in previous years.

Mark Kornder asked if the Forest Inventory Project would help improve identification of these areas and feels a presentation on the project to the PAG group would be a benefit.

- Peter Friedrichsen would certainly be interested in what has been calculated and the new numbers in terms of area/volume harvested. Along with other disturbance areas.
- James Fischer confirmed that the information and data retrieved from the Lidar and Infra-Red scanning will improve our ability to identify these areas thus improving the harvest planning and also assist Forest Management Planning.

## **General Meeting Observations**

Sam Roberts asked if there were required buffer zones along the highways and who makes those decisions citing cutting along and across the road towards the lake in the Montreal Lake/Wapawekka area.

- James Fischer – Some areas do not require or qualify for buffer zones as they do not have a visibility concern. Others with visual quality considerations will have buffer zones.
- Rod Pshebnicki – Visually sensitive areas are identified with the Ministry and they determine if a buffer is required. Stakeholders' communications with the Planners are important.
- Nadine Penny – No requirement in the current standards about leaving buffers along roads; strategy for that is to engage with stakeholders during Operating Plan/Forest Management Plan development to identify areas of visual sensitivity; industry has flexibility in placing retention along visually sensitive zones to achieve stakeholders' concerns.
- Peter Friedrichsen - Although the strips along the highway do not look great, they have little ecological value and retention of contiguous stands would be of greater value than cutting right up to the highway. Buffers along riparian areas are more important.
- Leah Fitch-Halkett - Buffer zones are helpful when considering wildlife movement adjacent to roadways and crossing of them.

## **Meeting Summary and General Comments:**

Field Tour for 2024 is being considered and updates will be provided.

Meeting Notes have been recorded including member concerns and follow up.

A Meeting Brief will also be developed and shared with members.

Meeting Adjourned 2:55 pm