|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Current FMPM Requirements (2020)** | **Current**  **Part / Section** | **Proposed Revision and Rationale** | **New**  **Part / Section** | **DFMC comments** |
| 11 | **Progress Checkpoints**  Progress checkpoints are key steps in the development and preliminary endorsement of the management direction of a FMP | A / 1.1.6 | Add who confirms progress towards completion of checkpoints, when progress checkpoints can be revisited, and that the support for progress checkpoints is to be documented in the analysis package. | N/A | There didn’t seem to be any mention of project management for FMPs. The Project Manager is a critical role in FMP prep and needs a clear definition of responsibilities. This role should be responsible for contribution towards progress check points, not necessarily the approver. It is also important to have a project manager that is suitable for the role. If the project manager (or co-project manager) is a MNRF staff person, they should be tasked with confirming check points. The project manager needs to be a person, or persons, who will see the project through from start to finish, can be authoritative to keep the project moving along the timeline appropriately. |
| 14/19/30 | **Management Unit Annual Reports /**  **Social and Economic Description and Assessment /**  **Development of the Proposed Long-Term Management Direction** | A / 1.1.8.4;  A / 1.1.8.11  A / 1.2.5.2  A / 3.6.2  B / 2.2  Appendix I;  A / 1.2.5.2  B / 3.0  B / 4.0 | Add that additional information including the conclusions and recommendations in the year six management unit annual report (e.g., the review of renewal and tending activities, review of assumptions in modelling) will provide information for confirming or  changing the management direction for the FMP. |  | There is great value and importance in the review of previous (long term) management direction in planning for the next FMP. Continuity of management direction is essential to sustainability objectives. there should be more emphasis placed on continuing the progression from previous plans management direction in sequential FMPs where adjustments to short term indicators are used to achieve targets of the long term instead of replacing a longer-term management direction each planning cycle. |
| 16 | **Values Information** | A / 1.1.8.9  B / 2.1.4.3 | Add example of value information which would not be portrayed in a FMP (i.e., classified values) and reference the section of the FIM where the requirement exists.  Clarify that only confirmed old growth forest communities as defined in the glossary will be required to be identified. The reference to identification of old growth red and white pines forest communities being “consistent with the forest management guides related to landscape pattern and structure” to be removed due to the inconsistency and uncertainty with information contained in forest resource inventories, guide indicators, and actual site conditions. Also, clarify that this requirement will not only apply to red and white pine but all confirmed old growth forest stands (i.e., other species).  Add that the most up-to-date values information will also be available for First Nation and Métis community viewing, as well as to the public. | A / 1.1.8.10 | Much of the values information in the boreal region for current red pine and white pine communities are being lost in management decision for the inventory calls to manage lower tiers in a multitier inventory. This gives a false perception that red pine and white pine presence on the landbase is lower that actual.  Will this change correct that issue/eliminate it or should there be a method of splitting data for the multitiered stands to allow for tracking of overstory/understory separately? |
| 17 | **Roads and Water Crossings Inventory** Requirements for existing roads and water crossing inventory for the management unit. | A / 1.1.8.10 | Revise FMPM to distinguish between roads and water crossings inventories within Section 1.1.8.10 to support information exchange.  Revise the definition of a road for clarity and enable the use of old roadbeds to reduce footprint on landscape (i.e., limit loss of productive land by anthropogenetic disturbances).  For the purposes of the FMP roads inventory, road and/or road networks will include those which:   * fall within the *Public Lands Act*, 1990 (PLA), Section 48 definition of a road; * support or supported the haul of timber as defined under the Scaling Manual; * are not impassable to licensed highway vehicular traffic due to vegetation ingress; deterioration of the roadbed;   or decommissioning activities that have returned the road to productive forest (i.e., established regeneration).  Add that the existing roads inventory will be prepared by the sustainable forest licensee and confirmed by the Ministry and that road use management strategies will be required for existing roads and/or road networks that are:   * planned to be used for forest management purposes during the period of the FMP; * the responsibility of the sustainable forest licensee (e.g., maintenance and monitoring activities); **except** for any roads and/or road networks that have been reported as decommissioned and are not scheduled for use during the period of the FMP; and   a shared responsibility between the sustainable forest licensee and another resource user or party | A / 1.1.8.11 | The comment below more aligns with FIM data requirements. It would be greatly beneficial to have dataset alignment between FMP and AWS to eliminate duplication of data sets. The FMP data, roads is a good example, does not need to be different data sets with the AWS. Managing multiple data sets for the FMP and sequential AWS’s is extremely burdensome. The FMPM and FIM need to align data requirements to allow FMP datasets to be used in the AWS without creating separate datasets for harvest, operational road boundaries, roads, AOC’s, road corridors, etc. AOC specific data sets can still be submitted annually but FMP data sets that are used in annual operations should simply have additional fields to indicate an AWS year. Further enhancements should consider how revisions of data and amendments of data are managed. If a FMP data set is amended, such as harvest to add a salvage opportunity mid plan, the data should then automatically be revised through a single update. Similarly, data sets that are updated annually through the AWS, such as roads, water crossing, etc., should automatically be considered amended. |
| 20 | **Modified Fire Response**  Modified fire response may be identified as a management consideration in the preparation of a forest management plan. | A / 1.2.3  A / 1.2.5.1  A / 1.2.7  A / 1.2.2  A / 1.3.3.1  B / 3.2  B / 4.8  D / 3.2.4 | Remove requirements associated with modified fire response areas as the approach is outdated and is no longer required to enable the ecological benefits of wildland fire.  Update and modernize FMPM to reflect current wildland fire policy terminology (i.e., wildland fire opportunities, assets, and resources). Wildland fire opportunities will be provided with the annual work schedule under Wildland Fire Opportunities, Response, Prevention and Preparedness section (Part D Section 3.2.4).  Revisions are to support the Ministry’s response during escalated wildland fire circumstances and help deliver on the Ministry’s mandate to minimize risk to wildland fire within the forest (i.e., support forest sector resiliency and mitigate effects due to climate change). The revisions are consistent with the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers Wildland Fire Management Working Group Action Plan and specifically include:   * wildland fire forest fuel risk as a consideration for harvest eligibility criteria. * consideration of opportunities to mitigate wildland fire risk surrounding communities, assets, and resources in the selection of harvest areas.   identification of the potential for wildland fire within the forest landscape urban interface as a management consideration in the preparation of a FMP. | B / 3.19 | This would be a great location/opportunity to work with the fire program to streamline approval processes for fire projects. For example, if a forest wishes to conduct a prescribed burn, it would be great to have those components incorporated into the FMP so projects are approved and can be implemented under an AWS once conditions are favorable. It will likely improve efficiency in completing projects and achieving desired results. |
| 27 | **Silvicultural Options**  Silvicultural options represent broad options appropriate for the forest as described in the silvicultural ground rules and are used in the base model. | A / 1.2.4.5  B / 4.4 | Add new text to clarify that any commercial thinning will be identified and represented in the base model.  Update terminology within this section by replacing the term past performance with silviculture outcomes  Add that silvicultural options will also specify the limits to which the option can be applied on the management unit considering ecological and economic constraints (e.g., silviculture program budgets). | N/A  B / 3.15.1 | Will this limit opportunity during an FMP if CT becomes a tool that is desired during plan implementation? Can CT be a silvicultural option in an SGR to allow for opportunities for trials and/or research? |
| 41 | **Roads**  Planning requirements for new primary, branch, and operational roads. | A / 1.3.6  B / 4.5  D / 3.2 | Add that in addition to be being based on public comments, primary and branch roads and their associated use management strategies will be finalized based on the spatial harvest schedule and First Nation and Métis community consultation at stage two). Planning teams will also be required to consider historical roads information when planning new roads.  Add that each planned/confirmed primary/branch road corridor will be identified and the use management strategy for the road will be recorded in the FMP in accordance with FIM.  To reduce footprint on landscape (i.e., limit loss of productive land by anthropogenetic disturbances) and enhance the opportunity to use historical road information and the opportunity to use existing roads and/or roadbeds, add that the requirement for identifying and rationalizing new primary, branch roads and operational road boundaries will not apply in circumstances where an existing roadbed will be used. The applicable one-kilometre road corridors or operational road boundary will be portrayed in the FMP to support First Nation and Métis community, and public consultation.  Add that if a new branch road or operational road and or existing road is required for forest management purposes and must traverse a railway, the Grade Crossings regulations under the federal Railway Safety Act (1985), as amended from time to time, will apply and the rationale for such a crossing will be provided in the FMP text.  Revise existing road definition (consistent with roads inventory) as it relates to documentation requirements within the FMP. | A / 1.2.10  B / 3.16 | The direction around railway crossings should be consistent for primary roads, branch roads and operational roads. There is no need to justify or document why existing roads need to cross railways. This should be limited to new construction only.  In many cases, railway crossings are private where permits have been issued and are not necessarily held by SFL’s. This gets messy if there is an assumed responsibility of private assets under the FMP. There are a wide range of impacts to the public and other private business that need to be understood and considered before an SFL is tasked with justifying the existence of a rail crossing. |
| FIM | **Datasets for FMP and AWS** |  |  |  | See notes above on data items. Reducing burden and data sets will ensure better service delivery and reduce red tape and errors. |
| SM | **Mass Scaling** |  |  |  | There should be a process to address excessive wood drying. Some product sectors are under-sampled and excessive drying will result in lower weights which falsely under-represents volumes. |