

**Sustainable Forest Management Committee  
“Ensuring the CSA Standard”**

**SFM Committee Meeting**

**May 26, 2010 (evening)**

**May 27, 2010**

**Tolko Woodlands Meeting Room**

---

**May 26, 2010**

A. Introduction Meeting:

1. The meeting began at 5:30 p.m., with a supper hosted by Tolko.
2. Chairman Ron Black welcomed members attending the meeting.
3. The agenda was reviewed and approved.

Chris Smith from Ducks Unlimited, in attendance for a short time because of other commitments, provided a brief but interesting observation about the forest in relation to the watershed. The presentation suggested that forest management and harvesting should include consideration of the influence of the affected watershed. Noted for example is the difference of the type of watershed in the Shield, where the watershed may be varied and confined more to distinct waterways (lake, streams, confined by rock) and the boreal forest which contains water in a more disbursed area including fens and bogs. Drainage or water flow was noted as being an important characteristic of a watershed. Watershed and forest activity were noted to have an effect upon each other.

Presentation on Canadian Boreal Forest Agreement by Paul Chapman

Paul provided a PowerPoint presentation to the group along with discussion. Most people in attendance requested a copy of the presentation. Paul said he would e-mail copies.

Discussion included:

- Forest conservation and protection of species at risk (e.g. Caribou) are benchmark goals, regarding which Tolko will participate with provincial planning.
- Large areas noted for deferral from harvesting as caribou habitat noted as a matter of concern to Tolko.
- Agreement provides for deferral of harvesting in about 30 million hectares of woodland Caribou habitat.
- Agreement provides for efforts for recovery of species at risk, e.g. Caribou, by addressing harvesting operations.
- Comment was made wondering about consultation with aboriginal people concerning the agreement.
- Issue of public relations concerning the Agreement with specific reference to roadside harvesting was noted.
- Discussed some of the areas delineated for Caribou Habitat, e.g. areas in Alberta and in particular Sturgeon Landing area.

## B. Carbon and the Forest

An archived web seminar from the CIF web site was presented to the committee. *Facts and Fantasy about Forest Carbon* by Dr. Ter-Mikaelian et al and a copy of an article in the Forestry Chronicle was provided.

Participants really enjoyed the presentation. Take away message was that the net impact of forest management operations, taking into account the fate of all products throughout their life cycle, was to be a net sink of carbon. It was also discussed that over half the carbon stored in the boreal forest was actually in peat bogs or fens. Data showed that there is no change in soil carbon following harvest. Canada's managed forest model shows slight increases in above ground forest carbon over the next 100 years. (changes are minor but positive). Author indicated that poor simulations were based on taking inferences from such long lived ecosystems as costal BC and trying to apply it to the rest of the country, or extrapolate maximum storage volume of a single stand to an entire landscape. A suitable model must recognize that long term storage of carbon in lumber and panel products occurs. Kyoto accord does not recognize that (because of global transfer of products couldn't agree who gets credit for storing carbon in a board and who should accept consequence when it gets to the end of it's product life). All wood burned for energy (in primary production or when wood products are repurposed as fire wood) offsets non renewable fossil fuels. Only 23% of wood products that are land filled eventually decompose and release the stored carbon.

Net storage of carbon is even more profound if calculations take into account the additions co2 emissions that would be released by using the next best alternative material such as stone, concrete or steel.

### Discussion:

Not a surprise but nice to see some empirical data. There is a lot of peat on the DFA. Peat lands can store much more carbon than the forest portion. This should be acknowledged in the plan. Minimize disturbance through avoidance of peat land. Fens are slow moving water systems and blocking them can have a great effect in terms of drainage. They are also possibly a safety issue. Winter roads would have minor effect compared to all season roads. Comment that Tolko does not cross many fens, most winter roads actually on swamp lands due to the type of forest that is found in those locations. Swamps are less important as carbon sinks? Winter road packing is becoming less of an impact by practices such as using very low ground pressure packers early in the year.

DU suggested that they can assist with best practices for ensuring drainage across fens. Such things as multiple culverts of appropriate size, appropriate use of geo textiles. Comment that using geotextile on undisturbed stump mat will keep fill material from interfering with the cross drainage. Geotextile created an advantage when it is time to decommission a roadway.

Watersheds: LP and Tembec were mandated to maximum disturbance levels of 30% (harvest or natural disturbance up to age 7 as a percent of total productive forest land). Some discussion that this was applies on administrative boundaries rather than true watersheds. Comment that the boreal plains have more of the precipitation that is transpired. Due to the lack of topography water just sits around in a lot of places or soaks into the ground. Highrock gets more runoff due to less permeable rock and more topography.

## C. Indicator Review:

Agenda items Core Indicator 3.2.1 and Target 3.2.1.2.1 deferred until next day.

## D. Adjournment:

1. Wednesday evening meeting adjourned at approximately 9:00 p.m.

**May 27, 2010**

A. General Business

Chairman Ron Black called the meeting to order.

1. The minutes from the April 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> meetings were reviewed and passed (Gibbons/Enright).
2. Business arising from the minutes:

Concern was expressed re 3.1.1.1.3 road de-commissioning on lack of provision for definite closure. Discussion ensued on length of time non active roads sit dormant. The government should be forced to comply with the terms of the decommissioning plan that the company was required to develop. Committee was surprised that MC could hold up decommissioning. Thought they should allow the decommissioning or assume the liability. Suggestion made of possible usefulness of expressing an industry opinion to government regarding road closure policy. Richard Gibbons suggested he may propose a target on best efforts to close roads promptly recognizing that the government policy prevails.
3. New Business: none
4. Public Concerns Report

B. Indicators

Discussion of indicators held over from the last meeting:

3.1.1.1.1 (B)

Target: Monitor for one year with best efforts and use information to develop target following year, for only class 3 roads

Paul Chapman was to come back to the committee with a target for a minimum percentage of in block roads actively reforested each year. There can be a number of factors that effect that percentage such as percentage of summer logging where roads are often too compacted to plant in, portion of pine sites which are suitable to anchor chain material across the roadbed, requirement to re use roads in future years and success in hauling all wood from the block prior to break up. Paul proposed taking a year to collect some statistics on the actual road treatments that are applied and use that to shape a measurable target in future years. Blocking access is a central concept to increasing the regeneration on a road or reducing the length of time until it occurs. Discussed stockpiling overburden and re-distributing it on roads when they are deactivated, ripping roads to make them undriveable.

The committee recommends:

- Scarify across the roadbed in blocks where scarification occurs
- Pre determine the best location to close off access in planting blocks by spreading debris or ripping
- Operational standard should be to restrict access by 4x4 trucks

The committee recommends the option of restricting access of in block and secondary roads to enhance the success and speed of regeneration on blocks roads. Discussed applying this to class 2 roads instead of class 3 roads which would effectively restrict the access to all the class 3 roads behind the restriction.

We are looking for an indicator 3.1.1.1.1 (C) Intent is to help cut blocks regenerate in block roads by ... traffic through effectively restricting access on class 2 roads that access them.

Next meeting Paul to bring wording for 3.1.1.1.1 (B) on including an assessment of renewal activities on in block roads that will be used to identify a target % the following year.

3.1.1.1.5 Report about coarse woody debris adjourned at Fiona Donald's request to next evening meeting on July 7th.

Watershed discussion: target 3.2.1

- LP and Tembec have been legislated to a max of 30% of the productive forest land with stand replacing event. After age 7 the blocks are put back in production so the target is to have less than 30 % of productive forest land base less that 7 years old. Tolko has a watershed map in the FMP that is at an appropriate scale for watersheds.
- Suggestion that we get a map with the sub-sub divisions from the FMP and produce a report showing the % of disturbance within. Fiona has a report from Tembec on the topic of disturbance in watersheds.
- Need to determine the appropriate scale for watersheds,
- Identify communities that draw from the watersheds
- Should FMU 57 be included in the calculation of disturbance since water likely crosses the boundary.
- Find out why Tembec/LP use 30% limit
- Do all watersheds require the same limit? Differences in topography, water use, etc.
- Lots of discussions on the advisability of sampling waterbodies before and after logging. Troy suggested that hydro flooding is the main effect on watersheds, not logging.
- Paul to research variance.
- Adjourned for discussion at next meeting.

3.2.1.2.1: Replaced by new target 3.2.1.1.3. Objective will remain as is.

4.1.2.1 Objective: Minimize the amount of greenhouse gases produced to transport wood to the mills

Discussion:

- Removal of reference to train transportation from text as the train is not being used for transport.
- Address vehicle idling as a management strategy rather than a target.

C. Adjournment:

1. Next meetings are July 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup>.

| Attendance           |                      |
|----------------------|----------------------|
| May 26 <sup>th</sup> | May 27 <sup>th</sup> |
| Paul Chapman         | Paul Chapman         |
| Ron Black            | Will Trowell         |
| Chris Smith          | Fiona Donald         |
| Richard G. Gibbons   | Angela Enright       |
| Lori Lathlin         | Brad Wyatt           |
| Brad Wyatt           | Troy Werstroh        |
| Fiona Donald         | Richard G. Gibbons   |
| Troy Werstroh        | Ron Black            |
| Will Trowel          |                      |
|                      |                      |