

Notes – KNPS Meeting with Tembec – April 12, 2007

Attendees: Tembec - Joe Gnucci, Brian Dureski; KNPS – Kent Goodwin, Pam Chenery, Cliff Ervin, Laura Duncan, Chris Ferguson, Kathi Chorneyko

1. Joe Gnucci has done some site walking with Nick McCrae through KNP this winter looking at timber types, boundaries, reserves. He plans to do more cruising once the snow pack has receded some more.
2. Logging plan is heavily influenced by economic guidelines from Tembec
3. Three areas of discussion:
  - a. Harvest Area
  - b. Cut specifications within Harvest Area
  - c. Access - Roads and Landings
4. Harvest Area – Joe Gnucci started with Russ Hawkins' plan and presented a new map
  - a. Deletions from plan (cross-hatched areas on map). Proposed harvest area now 240 ha appears a little different from Russ's proposed plan from 03/01/06 which included Nordic and KNP as 415 less 185 for Nordic gives 230 ha.
    - i. WISA WHA – three larger areas added to WISA WHA and therefore deleted from the harvest area as advised by MOE. Several small areas adjoining WISA WHA also deleted by Tembec as too small and dislocated from their harvest area. Joe Gnucci noted that deletions did not affect cut levels in other areas.
    - ii. Eimer's Lake – Tembec deleted cross-hatched area around Eimer's Lake as not harvestable due to economic issues of timber types and inaccessibility due to adverse skidding.
    - iii. Wildlife tree patches – about  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the MOE recommended add-ons to existing wildlife tree patches were added. Those not added were mainly lodgepole pine.
  - b. Additions – no additional harvest areas. KNPS asked if cut levels could be decreased if harvest area was increased. Brian Dureski noted that there is no place to expand to – constrained by WISA WHA area, and NP boundaries.
  - c. Changes – Area south of 'open forest' (vertical lined on map) are changed from 'open forest' to 'managed forest'
  - d. Marking – flagging and boundary marking to be reviewed and redone as necessary. *KNPS to give input on non-permanent marking of boundaries.*
  - e. Knapweed & other noxious plants – currently in north gravel pit and sunflower hill. Very little knap weed in the heart of the park. Logger to mitigate spread of noxious plants.
5. Access
  - a. Road Access –
    - i. East harvest area –access through Forest Crowne – may not have access for hogfuel trucks through Forest Crowne
    - ii. Central/North – access through Army Rd then either out through Mathew Creek or winding through NP through Jimmy Russell Rd. Brian Dureski feels that use of the Mathew Cr. Option would result in additional vehicle intrusion into the KNP.

- iii. South – access through Mathew Creek or off of private property and St. Mary’s Lake Rd or small direct spur under power lines.
- b. Road Specifications
- i. Tembec roads are 4 – 5 meters wide.
  - ii. Hogfuel equipment – B-trains for transporting ground-up hogfuel are highway trucks (some with higher clearance) so getting into upper areas of the NP may be difficult. May require better grades, gentler switchbacks, and smoother roads for hogfuel equipment access. Brian Dueresk and Joe Gnucci will assess access options with B-train driver. If roads are not accessible by B-trains then slash will be burned on the landings.
  - iii. Fire access roads – City requires fire access road (big enough for a fire truck) to remain after logging in the NP. City to give input in which roads to leave.
  - iv. Minimal roads are not necessarily the best – some ditches & crowning needed to allow for proper drainage in case of weather event (rain, melting) to avoid big mud puddles covering the entire width of the road.
  - v. Tembec is responsible for post-logging reclamation of roads & landings that aren’t required by for Fire Department access.
  - vi. 3 km. new and 7 km upgrade of old roads – *KNPS can give recommendations*
- c. Landings
- i. Need enough landings to keep length of skid trails to average no more than approx 250 m. Current plan allows some up to a max of 350-400 m. Current plan shows 3 in Forest Crowne and ~~11~~14 in Nature Park.
  - ii. Tembec not in favour of roadside loading instead of landings – says that it results in a wide swath of clear-cut and debris on either side of the road for the entire road.
  - iii. Size of landings will be smaller than Sunflower Hill landing as there are more landings which will handle less logged area.
  - iv. Tembec recommends that reclamation of landings consist of leaving flat (not ripped) and planted with grass seed.
  - v. *KNPS should document practical requests for landings and number of accesses (skid trails) to landings and how KNPS wishes for them to be left.*
- d. Skid Trails
- i. Tembec prefers no skid trails and prefers random skidding (especially with winter logging) in addition to skid trails
  - ii. Machine free zones on existing trails – Tembec will mark designated crossings - # of crossings dependant upon terrain. *KNPS can be involved with skid trail layout. Tembec indicated that trails are very hard for harvesters to recognize during operations, so KNPS, Tembec, logging contractor will need to come up with a method that will be clear. Trail markers may be needed.*

- iii. Tembec will work with logging contractor to communicate skid crossings, etc.
6. Cut within Harvest Area
- a. Definitions –
    - i. Stump height – 30 cm. from ground
    - ii. Merch timber > 15 cm diameter @ stump height for lodgepole pine, > 20 cm. for other species
    - iii. Non-merch – smaller diameter than merch. Also, some very large trees which are too big for processor.
    - iv. 75 sph – equates to 11 m spacing (by Tembec) and to 13 m spacing (by KNPS) (and 12.4 m from Russ's notes.) However, we should note that these are average spacings, e.g the average of 2 ha clearcut and 2 ha with 150 sph is 75 sph!
  - b. Harvest volumes
    - i. Merch – based upon old map (prior to deletions). Net volume of timber before harvest

Species	Net Volume (m3)
Larch	15536
Cedar	145
Douglas fir	20924
Lodgepole pine	25904
Spruce	812
Yellow pine	7460
Aspen	88
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>70869</b>

Total volume of merch from harvest area, based on new map (ie. minus deletions), is approx 60,000 m<sup>3</sup>. Harvest amount will be 40,000 m<sup>3</sup> or about ~~33~~66% of the merchantable volume. Lodgepole pine is approximately 20,000m<sup>3</sup> of this. Also noted by Tembec that the 75 large stems left would amount to 20-25% of the merchantable volume.

- ii. Non-merch - No volume figure for the non merch stuff that would be removed was noted. However, this would include any pole and fencepost material and/or pulpwood. Apart from large stems no volume figure on the non merch, non removed stuff.
  - iii. Tembec can't do less harvest and still cover costs (planning, road, silvaculture, reclamation, profit).
  - iv. Tembec indicated that one way of leaving more trees standing was to leave fewer larger trees and substitute more trees of a variety of sizes. Tembec indicated a willingness to discuss ways to modify the prescription in ways which didn't change the volume of wood taken. They're not willing to entertain taking less wood.
- c. Harvest types –
- i. Merch timber – defined above

- ii. Pulp chips – smaller lodgepole pine & yellow pine (no fir or larch or cedar) in hay rack truck
  - iii. Some of the unmerch. could also be used for fence posts which would actually be merchantable (sellable), but not as sawlogs.
  - iv. Hog fuel or slash burn – residual wood can be ground at landing and taken via B-trains to pulp mill co-gen plant. Preference to residual wood that has dried for one year at landing before grinding (dry hog fuel). May have trouble getting pulp mill to take green hog fuel (not dried for one year before grinding). Needs better roads for b-trains and bigger landing. Otherwise, if no hog fuel, then residual wood is burned (likely the following winter) – smoke management issues. *KNPS to decide between hog fuel or slash burn. Brian Dureski indicated the decision of whether to leave piles to dry for a year or to burn would need to be a 3-way decision with KNPS, City and Tembec.*
  - v. Cedar to be worked into reserve trees
  - d. Standard Units – Tembec and KNPS would like more & smaller standard units. *KNPS can help with determining these.*
  - e. Snags (wildlife trees) may be left according to Safe Work Procedure documents. Evaluated by person with Dangerous Tree Certification.
  - f. Restocking – must restock – stocking standards target 1000 sph, but can go as low as 500 sph. Tembec didn't think MOF (Tony Wideski) would approve a variance so they haven't asked for one. Tembec feels 500 is probably low enough.
7. Tembec Preliminary Schedule
- a. Flagging, marking, GPSing – 1-2 weeks
  - b. Road building – 2 months – July, August, September. Working Monday to Friday
  - c. Logging start – Nov, Dec after freezeup. Working 7 days/wk.
  - d. Logging finish – mid to end Feb 2008
  - e. Hog fuel – 1 month the following winter. (7 loads/day -140 ton/day)
8. Other notes
- a. Tembec waiting for fire assessment back from Bob Gray.
  - b. Tembec still willing to talk with KNPS regarding logging contractor selection but didn't necessarily agree to take KNPS' advice. Brian Dureski favours either Prairie Holdings or Mallard as they have vested interest in taking the small diameter wood. Mallard apparently has a contract with Prairie Hldg. To take small wood for fence posts. The topic of why other contractors could or couldn't make negotiate a similar contract wasn't discussed. There is another fencepost operation in the Lumberton area (Idaho-owned) but Brian Dureski said it's too small to take all the small wood from the KNPS.
  - c. Waiting for results from Technical sub-committee
  - d. Joe and Brian agree that if we need changes to the economic parameters that Tembec has set, we will need to speak to people at a higher level within the corporation such as Troy Hromadnik.

- e. Possibility that no agreement can be reached – sounds like they would expect Tony Wideski the MOF District Manager to make a ruling if no agreement. It sounded like Tony *could* decide to order Tembec to log the KNPS even if uneconomical.
  - i. Tembec must still meet economic guidelines for harvesting (this must be economically viable for them)
  - ii. Logging must still fit into a plan to reduce fire risk to an acceptable level (ie. Cannot increase fire risk).
  - iii. KNPS still wants an acceptable nature park.
- f. May 1 field trip with Joe Gnucci, Brian Dureski, and KNPS reps. Other field trips to follow.
- g. Tembec will supply KNPS with an updated logging proposal map (paper and electronic) including trails by early next week. Tembec to contact Kent when it's ready.
- h. *During road building and logging, KNPS can help the process by broadcasting work site areas to keep people out of them for public safety and have people on the trails bordering areas where machinery is working.*