

Mission TFL26

## Bear Mt – Commercial Thinning

Planted in 1965 with Fdc

Commercial thinning in 1997

CWHdm 05

	<b>Pre-Harvest</b>	<b>Post Harvest</b>
Species Comp	Fd87Hw13	Fdc100
Stems per ha	589	280
BA	32m <sup>2</sup>	
SI = 40		

9m skyline w/intermediate supports

Radial configuration (herringbone) to central 3-4m wide yarding corridor

Thin from below – all trees <30cm dbh, and not dominant or co-dominant

Harvest costs \$45/m<sup>3</sup> Stumpage @ \$17/m<sup>3</sup> = \$62/m<sup>3</sup>, small appraisal allowance for CT

Log value between around \$55/m<sup>3</sup> (doing at a loss)

Objectives:

- improve growth of remaining trees
- analyze silviculture benefits of intermediate cutting
- research markets for small diameter or second growth wood
- provide training and employment opportunity
- provide wildlife habitat and forage
- study the benefits to visual impact

## Pure Species

Over the past 20 years, Mission has moved from planting primarily Douglas-fir (with a 20% cedar component) to 70% Cedar and up to 100% Cedar plantations in some BEC zones, pre-dating this, even back in the 1970-80s, we do have some very nice pure cedar plantations.

There are various successes with this approach – specifically related to BEC zones/aspect and hemlock ingress. It is important to recognize that a 'pure' cedar plantation does not result in a pure cedar stand – nor would it be something we would encourage. Given the current state of health of our primary Douglas-fir leading sites – even hedging all our bets on cedar is a risk.

## CONSIDERATIONS for GROUP DISCUSSION

So how can we adapt in the short term?

What do we as silviculturalists prescribe in light of what has been learned today?

Do you take a short term, mid term or long term approach?

Will we be forced to cut our rotations short for the declining Douglas-fir to ensure healthy sustainable forests?

What other alternative species can we anticipate to adapt quickly? Pw/Ss/Ep/Dr

Fertilization/Biosolids?