

Minutes:

Block 18 Operational Planning Meeting

Location - Tembec Office Downstairs Boardroom

April 6, 2006, 8:00 - 4:00?

Attendance: Lino Morandin, Ken Durst, John Pineau, Annie Morin, Al Stinson, Mark Hall, Mark Joron, Mac Kilgour, Jamie Muka, Jeff Leach, Dan Simis, Doug Pitt, Chad Yurich, Jeff Morris, Sarah Sullivan, Scott McPherson, Don Buck, Marcel Lacasse.

Agenda

1. FSC CAR - update (Lino)
 - a. Last year FSC audit, disturbed auditors, weren't entirely comfortable with what was happening, risk to certification.
 - b. Letter of explanation sent in by Sue Pickering last Friday. Targeted rectification by April 10 – hopefully get response soon.
 - c. Partners report now in place that provides a comprehensive discussion on what B18 is all about, this report is downloadable off of the FRP website.
 - d.

2. Review last years operations
 - a. Planned vs actuals (leave patches, cruise info etc.) (M. Joron/D. Pitt)
 - i. Review of planned harvest, aggregate retention areas, capacity of gps to help navigate around the leave blocks, very successful, questions around whether to harvest the north east corner of the block (potential to harvest in winter, very low volume, do we want to go in here – need to discuss further, typically an area that would be left behind in fire and therefore part of aggregate retention to be left in the area, if there are productive sites there could consider – but it has to be operational and cost effective (would need winter road or water crossing – again cost). Ce5La2 – this is not operational. Will check again in spring.
 - ii. Machines all have multidats with gps, and have a Garmin Map76 unit, sits in window and operator can use to help navigate, becomes difficult to cut along a line given that the window is so small and the gps has a hard time tracking to line following (lots of turning). Would like a gps unit that is half way between the large screen (mounted above the operator) and the small screen garmins, but needs to be mounted at below eye level.
 - iii. Centre leave block was larger due to a cliff that runs through the area.
 - iv. No rutting done on the site, but we need to be thinking about and looking at soil compaction – there was a lot of traveling on the site as is evidenced by the GPS data.
 - v. Discussion around the FERIC, Mark Pardington work (Desbastos was involved as well as Millson).
 - vi. Aggregate retention went in well, a little bit shy in terms of what was planned/does not look the same. Ce in the uplands was very nice material (400 year old) very calcareous site (lots of limestone, very unusual) so left a large leave area, blue area is a 50% harvest area in the cedar. Some of the 50% - southmost edge, has blown over. Clean up the blow down area? Approx two loads – can it be sold? In process of being peddled. Mix of overstory and understory.... Discussion around windthrow. If market and no cost then clean up.
 - vii. Part of plan was to leave small conifer clumps where they were come across in field, Bit of a learning curve to teach the guys what was being looked for – hoping the cut this year will better emulate the plan. Tried some stubbing in addition to the groups. Idea around the stubbing and

leaving so many was to keep skidder op from pushing them over – typically for snag management MNR has recommended that you stub the odd tree out there – expect some blow down but the stubs would be standing snags. Need input and ideas, what is like and not, have to be aware of the MOL and their concerns etc... are there avenues that will help to satisfy MOL safety concerns. Number of snags being left is very high in regular harvest blocks– 100 per ha, in that range. Need to look at harder and take out the stuff that needs to be taken out. Erring on the side of caution at this point – which is overboard. Need to look more at aggregate retention – engineer it a bit more in terms of what is left then harvest the remainder of the block. Stonehenge area ... not likely to repeat this. Tufts are different from the retention area – very small ‘dots’ on the landscape ½ to 1 dozen trees 2 to 3 meter tall. Helping to provide diversity and structure – but not impede sip and planting. Tufts desired outcome is advance regen of Sb but in a lot of cases in this area its Bf (what was there). Compliment the aggregate structure being left with the tufts. Concept is to have 10% area left in retention islands. Want to focus the silviculture, tending as an example where 100 metre buffer on riparian zone will be considerably less in this approach. Have about 10% of this site back into deciduous, likely be 80% conifer. Decid left want to ensure that this is healthy and vigorous. Given harvest approach feeling is that it can be very safely tended by air without impacting on riparian areas. Will consider islands or shelterwood type harvest for the By retention areas. Cruising is on a 200 meter grid so will only hit Ab by chance. Will overspray conifer clumps but not the decide.

- viii. 500 meter long road – leave it or plant it.... Sip right up to the road – traditionally do this anyway. Might be future access for thinning – idea is that the roads may be permanent infrastructure for this type of block. Likely want to implement more stringent schedule and resolve issues, like the Birch issue, so that we can get the harvest completed asap.
- ix. Bw was the biggest issue for operations (was a water crossing approval problem as well). Everything 10 cm and above was cut and put beside road. Cut birch 2-3 years ago and find that whatever fri says we cut half of it. Mills can take down to 4” top, anything less can’t deal with. Smooth Rock was in need of chips, made a deal with Grant to take the birch and chip. Took a while to get straightened out, cut on ground waiting to be skid – but it was into fall. Grant allowed to do with Bw last year, cause in return we provided Po to Engleheart mill.
- x. Bw apparently worked out well, SR was reasonably pleased with outcome, would have rather had done in summer to save sanding & road costs. Part of help was fact that this block was so close to town. Part of definition of prime sites is proximity to mill. 86 Loads of Ce came out, poles 6 loads were marketed, 45 loads was the big stuff for shingle wood – going at the rate of about 1 load per week to shingle mill. Sawlogs have 6 loads that no home has been found for. Discussion around whether there is a profit associated with the Ce. Tembec want to profit from this in the future, Millson not sure if its break even or not – they did all the work to get it to a market.
- xi. Actual volumes vs cruise volumes. Numbers worked up in the report – the plots actually harvested the numbers a pretty close. 139.7 m³ per ha actual vs 139.2 cruised. Ce and Bw added to this significantly – take Bw out of the picture and loose 1/3 of the volume.
- xii. Bw and Ce estimates where way off using local volume tables – Ce was so unique that est’s were way off (Honers pulled back to reality) and Bw was underestimated (by about ½).

- xiii. Stars cruising program (FRP) uses Honers – has some potential. Downside for Honers is the regressions relationship – need to measure heights through the range within the plot to tighten up.
- xiv. Need to look at minimizing costs across all treatments not just a single phase (ie: just look at harvest costs but disregard impacts on silviculture end up costing you more)
- xv. Was volume taken out of this area within last 40 to 50 years.
- xvi. SIP areas missed were sitting underneath birch, so timing was the big issue.
- xvii. All trees felled, birch left in bush, but poplar and conifer had to be skidded through it. Sorting with skidder results in lots of additional skid trails. Need to think about how to do the birch chipping if we're to do more of it – has to be a better way to do it.
- xviii. Need to keep in mind didn't lose any money doing it, but can become much more efficient. Need to check with SRF, did we lose money with the chips (this was the third cheapest chips – which is not bad if he has to go get chips). Need to get the mills involved in discussions around efficiencies. Can use the undersize Po and conifer here as well – which will provide cleaner silviculture ground and help to reduce costs. Chipping has left debris piles that need to be dealt with.
- xix. Pseudo stream pictures – may be some benefits in the predicted drainage – increasing number of situations where they are proving to be correct (mapped stream location changes, flow direction lakes, smaller streams (unmapped) that are showing up on roads.

3. Silviculture Spring 2006

- a. SIP ha to complete (Mark J./Lino)
 - i. 30 ha done with about 20 to 25 to do.
- b. Treeplant
 - i. 55 ha of planting this year
 - ii. Density 2800 stems per ha, largely Sb 100k with some Sw 30k and 15 k Pw.
 - iii. Northern ½ is higher ground so suggest a larger percentage of Pw seed. Problem is the Pw seed is exhausted. Need to hope for a good seed year this year have 'Gird' area. Superior plus trees, Rand Ford has agreed that the seeds collected can be applied to this zone. Critical issue, area for planting next year was to be Pw.
 - iv. Grow Pj instead, quality and value we're trying to get here Pj wouldn't really meet need. Move to Sw and Pr instead? Pj long term wood quality and value is questionable, can thin Pj but long term value is not there. Trying to build longer term value into this forest – unless there are pockets of Pj (then yes). If can't get Pw and Pr then favour Sw. Irving has stopped growing Pj in their managed stands as they find that they are not getting the lumber value from it. If we've got sand pockets then yes grow Pj. This effort is targeted toward Prime Site. Discussion around what will markets be in future – Pw grows twice as fast – so from volume perspective it's a better buy, studies show its maintained or grown its value, therefore from business perspective also more 'value'. Need to listen to the site as well.
 - v. One of the sites we may want to look at could be 80% Aspen – hope to bring Grant on board with the concept. Harvest at 30 years.
 - vi. Discussions with Denis Joyce has concerns about Pw being put back on the landscape. Poor genetics?
 - vii. Do we want to put some permanent growth plots in this area? Have another 20 plots in NE to put in. Plan is that every cruise plot on 20 m grid would be re-established through gps and monitored and cruised

- every 5 years. Potential to do a more complex pgg on subsample of the cruise plots.
- viii. Front two sections growing poplar on now, need to examine quality of the deciduous and if not good will bring in nokamic and move to mixed site. North chunk is slated for pure conifer, let sit for two growing seasons and chemically sip – see 30% increase in growth in this situation, which is better than genetically improved stock. Upland cedar 50% cut, want to chemically treat, ground spray, as an experiment to maintain this unique site.
 - ix. Collected some seeds from this area (Ce) but have not had any success as yet in growing it. Michigan field trip – expect slow refill sometimes take 10 to 20 years to seed in. Don't have a lot of experience managing cedar, but MNR is promoting harvesting it – need to learn.
 - x. Big concern is the Bw piles of birch slash. Skidder is currently trying to push up and out of way, small stuff and very compacted, not likely there is any way that we'll burn it. (note: currently appears that we may have a bottleneck with burning – in terms of timing, burning plan, getting approval in Cochrane area prior to snow fall was a problem, not sure that the same problem exists in Timmins, etc...). Noted that there was a problem with mine company. Takes up quite a bit of area across 24 to 26 landings. Originally was supposed to go to hog, but this did not happen. Cant just leave these piles have to at very least spread out to prevent combustion. Skidder won't be able to deal with them, Is there a measure of volume? Likely looking at 2 to 3 truckloads per landing so 40 truckloads? Use for roadway to access soft spot on north west side of block, **Action Item:** Lino to check with Smooth Rock to see if they have plans for hog fuel. Mark to look into capacity to use for road. Consider mixing with slash pile for burning.
 - xi. **Action Item:** Gird (or otherwise) Pw seed, need to get some (AI to report). Lino to check and see if he can find some seedlings.
 - xii.
- c. Timing of surveys (cruise etc.) Doug
- i. what is plan, where start so that cruise can move ahead of the cut.
 - ii. CFS doing the cruising. Can put in 5 plots per day (soils, fec, measuring trees).
 - iii. Have about 50 plots to do (10 days). Want to identify block #2 and start cruising that.
 - iv. Millson sees' b18 as second block first week June, with one buncher potential cutting roadline a bit earlier.
 - v. **Action Item:** need some recommendations from Tembec as to format for the cruise data, butt diameter, etc... need to get Kevin and Mike involved in assisting here. Need for different data from what is being collected (dbh, d15 butt, age dominant co-dom, heights, want to collect data so that we can apply Honers equation). Part of work group to look at pgg's etc... to validate inventory (involve AI, Mike, Kevin, Doug, etc..)
 - vi. Bird Monitoring (cavity nesters, but all birds) tie? Need blocks harvested so that plots can be set up in the left retention blocks. Who/what/how are the retention patches are being used by birds. Need to have the plots set up in the patches and in the control areas that are in more contig forest in similar ecosites. Looking for some typical cutovers that are not part of this project. Compare to what is done typically to what is being done in this project is there a difference. Transects looking for birds, nesting, listening etc... Future look at spiders and beetles if funding available.

- vii. Preferred option find area in the RMF. Could think about going to superior or gcf if cant find what we need (have to discuss with FFTF re: funding). Would not have the same level of monitoring. If we're going to change sites need to pick quickly.
- viii. Optional block off of chesterville creek, McArthur lake is mixed wood.
- ix.

d. Bw issues (Lino)

- i. Smooth Rock is full of chips right now, may be able to take chips in the fall or winter, which does not line up with when we want to harvest block
- ii. Temiskaming may need chips, Richard Pitt is looking into whether Ville Marie can take tree length Bw to get chipped to send to Temang.
- iii. Cutright (fuel wood seller) he is willing to pick it up if we put the small bw roadside. The stuff not going to Grant (10, 12, 14 some 16). He's kind of keen on it – cash flow issue but will pay as selling it.
- iv. Or is Millson interested in fuel wood market.
- v. Likely pretty pure slash piles so does not burn exceedingly well, where we can mix it do so.
- vi. Grant is taking the osb (less than 4" top, but small end 16" have trouble getting material). Cruise data could tell us what wood is under size and therefore free of crown dues and trust fund. Accord item #11 applies to Bw. **Action Item:** Lino to check into it.
- vii.

e. Timing (Mark J.)- harvest June.

4. Potential Future Blocks

a. Locations

- i. Block 16 (190ha)? Looks good from a location perspective. Is about 60% Bw. If using a processor could look at pulling out some veneer logs. Potential to shift some contingency plan blocks – would need to quickly run patchworks. Needs to be done in next couple of weeks (at least decision around 16 or 37). Should be doing post analysis with patchworks, why is model not picking same blocks as we are or is it? Potentials B16 (June/July block) likely no access for at least two to four weeks, should be accessible by May 1st when up doing cruise. Two new blocks in that area in contingency then a third one.
- ii. Other forests? Would be wise for each forest to keep working on this initiative. R&D project RMF is in title, but can't imagine that FFTF would be upset if we moved some to other forests but intent was for 1000 ha on the RMF. Don't really want to change to another contractor at this point – start from square one, loose the learning curve. Need to find tune the results to take best advantage of practical operational implementation. Good opportunities on the GCF with the existing IFM block. Superior/Martel is a prime tree growing area.
- iii. Action Items: Look at contingency plan (Lino) and 16 and see if something is there. Doug, want to be cruising and road into next block – may not be able to happen as there is no link between plan and contingency. 16 is ok, but new block would be difficult. Need to cruise 16 before mid June if go ahead with it.
- iv.

b. Timing

- i. Blocks from this year and first year of contingency plan. New project funding allows for up to 1000 ha.

5. R&D Tax Credits

- a. All of this should be eligible for an R&D tax credit. Need to pull our numbers together and submit everything. Silviculture etc... 28% refund. Work with Charles Contant.
- b. Millson to submit their in kind contributions to Doug for claims of tax credit.
- c.

6. Other

- a. Discussion around moose guidelines, ndpeg, etc... Tembec committed to working within the guidelines, is there an opportunity to line up R&D on Moose etc... in future – dependant on funding.
- b. Block 18 did not have NDPEG in it (plan vintage, 6 trees per ha).
- c. Want to have a better paper trail around snag trees, email would be fine. Need to review the partners report and discuss required changes if needed.