

Forest Management Plan Amendment

**Mountain Pine Beetle Addendum
Forest Management Unit S21
Approval Decision**

**Gordon Buchanan Enterprises Ltd.
and
Tolko Industries Ltd.**

**Forest Management Agreement
#0200039**

**Date: September 8, 2010
Effective: May 1, 2010**

Approved by: Original Signed
**Robert W. Stokes, RPF
Acting Executive Director
Forest Management Branch
Forestry Division**

Executive Summary

The Tolko Industries Ltd. and Gordon Buchanan Enterprises Ltd. (Tolko/Buchanan) Forest Management Plan (FMP) Mountain Pine Beetle (MPB) amendment dated January 11, 2008 is approved subject to the satisfactory completion of the Approval Conditions contained in this document.

The MPB amendment has been validated by a Regulated Forestry Professional (RFP).¹ The department recognizes RFP validated work as complete, accurate and prepared with professional due diligence. The MPB amendment has been reviewed and approved by government RFP's.

Approval Decision Conditions Timeline Summary

<i>Condition</i>	<i>Page #</i>	<i>Requirement</i>	<i>Approval Authority</i>	<i>Date</i>
<i>9.1 (i)</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>Spatial Harvest Sequence</i>	<i>Senior Manager, Forest Planning Section</i>	<i>September 30, 2010</i>
<i>10.1</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>Public Consultation</i>	<i>Senior Manager, Forest Planning Section</i>	<i>On-going</i>
<i>10.2</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>First Nations Consultation</i>	<i>Senior Manager, Forest Planning Section</i>	<i>On-going</i>

Approved Annual Allowable Cuts

<i>Timber Type</i>	<i>FMA Total AAC²</i>
<i>Coniferous</i>	<i>216,500 m³</i>
<i>Deciduous</i>	<i>281,000 m³</i>
<i>Total</i>	<i>497,500 m³</i>

Refer to the Tolko/Buchanan Structure Retention Strategy identified in the January 31, 2005 FMP and associated Tolko/Buchanan Planning and Operating Ground Rules for further details on targets and monitoring. Industrial salvage volumes shall be reported as Annual Allowable Cut (AAC) drain by the Forest Management Agreement (FMA) Company and embedded quota holders.

Refer to Tables 1 and 6 for the Historical Allocations, Tables 2 and 7 for the AACs and Tables 3 and 8 for the Quadrant Allowable Cuts.

¹ Refer to the Alberta Forest Management Planning Standard, Annex 2 for professional validation requirements.

² The approved Annual Allowable Cuts (AAC) include structure retention volumes.

Authorization

The FMP amendment for FMA #0200039 effective May 1, 2010 is approved as per the AACs presented in Tables 2 and 7.

The Spatial Harvest Sequence (SHS) contained in this MPB amendment replaces the SHS contained in the FMP dated January 31, 2005.

The next FMP shall be received by the department in time for approval prior to April 30, 2015

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction.....	1
2.0 Forest Management Planning Area.....	1
3.0 Forest Management Plans and Priority of MPB Control Strategies	2
4.0 Habitat for Species of Special Concern (Grizzly Bear Habitat)	2
5.0 Water Yield.....	3
6.0 Long Term Fibre Sustainability	4
7.0 Pine Strategy Implementation.....	4
8.0 Embedded Timber Operators.....	4
9.0 Spatial Harvest Sequence.....	5
10.0 Public and First Nations Consultation	6
11.0 Performance Monitoring and Reporting	6
12.0 Authorization	6
Table 1. Historical Coniferous Allocations and Annual Allowable Cuts.....	7
Table 2. Approved Coniferous Allocations and Annual Allowable Cuts.....	8
Table 3. Coniferous Periodic Allowable and Quadrant Authorized Allowable Cuts.....	9
Table 4. Gordon Buchanan Enterprises Ltd. and Tolko Industries Ltd. FMA Coniferous Chargeability	10
Table 5. Gordon Buchanan Enterprises Ltd. and Tolko Industries Ltd. FMA Coniferous Utilization	11
Table 6. Historical Deciduous Allocations and Annual Allowable Cuts.....	12
Table 7. Approved Deciduous Allocations and Annual Allowable Cuts	13
Table 8. Deciduous Periodic Allowable and Quadrant Authorized Allowable Cuts.....	14
Table 9. Gordon Buchanan Enterprises Ltd. and Tolko Industries Ltd. FMA Deciduous Chargeability	15
Table 10. Gordon Buchanan Enterprises Ltd. and Tolko Industries Ltd. FMA Deciduous Utilization	16
Table 11. Fibre Transfer Agreements within the Gordon Buchanan Enterprises Ltd. and Tolko Industries Ltd. FMA Area.....	17

1.0 Introduction

Alberta is continuing to experience a significant outbreak of mountain pine beetle (MPB) and is applying control treatments and strategies to prevent future outbreaks.³ Alberta is also implementing initiatives that will mitigate the impacts of the current outbreak on future timber supplies and forest-dependent communities. Gordon Buchanan Enterprises Ltd and Tolko Industries Ltd (Tolko/Buchanan) addendum to its approved Forest Management Plan (FMP) meets the requirements established by Alberta for such amendments.⁴ This Decision documents the rationale for approval and direction for ongoing work.

It is important to note the implementation of this plan is not intended to control the current MPB outbreak, but rather to take actions over the next twenty years to create a forest that is more resistant to such outbreaks by dramatically reducing the overall susceptibility of the pine forest (Pine Strategy). This is a prudent and necessary strategy to avoid the types of catastrophic changes being seen in British Columbia's pine forests. However, if the current outbreak in Alberta expands as rapidly as the British Columbia outbreak, the strategies in this plan will have to be modified to address that reality.

Alberta has directed that key outcomes of three scenarios (the current management plan or status quo, the Pine Strategy and the MPB outbreak) be assessed.⁵ The department believes given the MPB outbreak in Alberta, the current management plans do not present likely scenarios and considering today's circumstances, comparison of the Pine Strategy and the MPB outbreak scenarios are the pertinent analyses.

Alberta's goal is to mitigate the effects of MPB on the social, environmental and economic values of Alberta's forests. To achieve this goal, Alberta must make trade-offs which involve achieving a desired result, generally at the complete or partial expense of something else. Stakeholders are often interested in only one value and are not prepared to consider trade-offs, whereas Alberta must make trade-off decisions in order to reasonably meet its goal for the overall benefit of Albertans.

2.0 Forest Management Planning Area

The area under consideration is the Forest Management Agreement (FMA) for Tolko/Buchanan. FMA #0200039 was allocated to Tolko/Buchanan via legislative Order-in-Council (O.C. 29/2002).

The FMA is comprised of two parts located in north central Alberta. The northern part of the FMA is located almost entirely within the Central Mixedwood, with a very small amount to the

³ See the Mountain Pine Beetle Action Plan for Alberta and the Interpretive Bulletin – Planning Mountain Pine Beetle Response Operations on the department of Sustainable Resource Development (SRD website).

⁴ See the Interpretive Bulletin – Planning Mountain Pine Beetle Response Operations (SRD website).

⁵ See the Interpretive Bulletin – Planning Mountain Pine Beetle Response Operations (SRD website).

south within the Dry Mixedwood. The southern part of the FMA is located within Lower Foothills and Central Mixedwood Natural Sub-regions.

In December 2008, the Alberta Land Use Framework (LUF) was released establishing a formal regional planning system to implement provincial policy, to set land-use management objectives and determine land-use trade-offs. Seven LUF regions were identified of which Forest Management Unit (FMU) S21 is located within the Upper Peace, Lower Peace, and Upper Athabasca Planning Regions. Where strategic land use plans are approved, Alberta and the Organization shall discuss implementation of the strategic land use plan and Alberta may require the approved FMP to be amended.⁶

3.0 Forest Management Plans and Priority of MPB Control Strategies

The approved FMP amendment results in a new spatial harvest sequence (SHS) and timber supply. Commitments in the balance of the existing FMP remain in effect until they are replaced by a new FMP. The status of the MPB outbreak will be apparent in time for the preparation of the new FMP, which will then be better able to address trade-offs between key outcomes.

Due to high rates of MPB over-winter survival in 2009 and in-flights from other regions, the number of trees infested by MPB in north central Alberta is higher than in recent years. The Grande Prairie, Peace River, Slave Lake and Whitecourt regions are the most heavily impacted. This latest dispersal will not change Alberta's strategy for managing MPB infestations. Alberta's priorities continue to be to limit the spread of MPB infestations along the eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains and to prevent MPB from spreading eastward into the boreal forest. However, there are many MPB infested trees in Tolko/Buchanan's FMA and the potential for successful MPB mitigation in some areas is unlikely. Therefore, it is crucial to optimize merchantable coniferous fibre recovery from dead and endangered timber, maintain non pine stands for mid-term timber supply and to ensure timely forest renewal. The department expects activities over the next few years to be a combination of control (Level 1 and 2) where possible, prevention (Pine Strategy) and fibre recovery. This combination of actions will promote successful forest renewal on Tolko/Buchanan's FMA. The operational changes necessary to accomplish these activities will be addressed through annual operating plans.

4.0 Habitat for Species of Special Concern (Grizzly Bear Habitat)

On June 3, 2010 the Alberta government designated the grizzly bear as a threatened species. The designation is based on the most current population research and habitat data, and acts on the recommendation from the Endangered Species Conservation Committee, a group of stakeholders including ranchers, industry, academics, wildlife managers and conservation interests.

Alberta's Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan (GBRP) recognizes that reduced grizzly bear survival and reproductive success is linked to human activity in priority habitats. Access development

⁶ See the Alberta Forest Management Planning Standard, Section 1 – Interpretation of CSA Z809-02 Standards, CSA 4 Sustainable Forest Management Requirements.

increases this activity. The recovery plan speaks to the creation of “Grizzly Bear Priority Areas” in high quality habitat, where there is a low risk of mortality. The department is developing an implementation plan for the GBRP. When this is published the Company shall address these requirements in its operational plans.

The impact of the FMP amendment on grizzly bear habitat must be assessed at the current time (year 0) and year 10 using the Foothills Research Institute Grizzly Bear Model. Tolko/Buchanan completed a grizzly bear analysis at (year 0) and year 20. The department completed a supplemental analysis to assess the impact of harvesting activity at (year 0) and at year 10. This analysis assumes there are no new permanent roads constructed for the 10-year period being assessed. New roads would generally increase mortality risk and decrease the area of safe harbours.

Core units S7 and S8 and secondary unit S4 show increases in mortality risk (24.6%, 17.4% and 26.0% respectively) and should therefore receive attention in mitigation strategies to reduce risks to grizzly bears. The small part of core unit S8 within FMU S21 has a road density beginning to approach the 0.6 km/km² threshold, which could be a concern given the modeled increase in mortality risk if this road density applied to the whole Grizzly Bear Watershed Unit, which extends into FMU W13.

Open route density for the other core and secondary units are well below the thresholds of 0.6 and 1.2 km/km² respectively. Harvest activities identified within the Tolko/Buchanan FMP amendment will create young seral stage areas that should result in an increase in forage for bears.

Operational planning can mitigate many of the impacts of timber harvesting. Tolko/Buchanan can act to make roads impassable and to quickly reclaim access into completed compartments. During the implementation of this plan, Tolko/Buchanan will work closely with the Lesser Slave Area staff to develop and implement additional mitigation. Tolko/Buchanan is encouraged to ensure its structure retention targets meet or exceed the 3% average currently identified within the FMP. Tolko/Buchanan is further encouraged to practice integrated land management with respect to access with the oil and gas industry to minimize the associated negative effects on grizzly bear habitat.

5.0 Water Yield

Watershed assessments of the Preferred Forest Management Scenario (PFMS) were completed using the ECA-Alberta hydrologic model. The assessment used average climatic conditions in the watersheds. The results showed that potential impacts would be low in Sweathouse, Utikuma and Salt operating areas, medium in the Kimiwan operating area and high in Whitemud/Birch operating area. Based on these results Tolko/Buchanan shall follow the mitigation strategies as outlined within section 4.1.1.2 in the MPB amendment in order to minimize impacts of the planned harvest on watersheds within the Kimiwan and Whitemud/Birch operating areas. I believe the department’s regulations; planning and operating requirements manage and monitor

forestry operations to prevent long-term adverse impacts to water quality and aquatic and riparian habitats.

6.0 Long Term Fibre Sustainability

The fibre flow proposed in the PFMS is acceptable for the FMA. The coniferous harvest level of 216,500 m³ per year for 20 years, followed by a reduction to 185,000 m³ per year for the remainder of the planning horizon is acceptable. This increased coniferous harvest level reduces the area of MPB susceptible pine in the FMA by accelerating the harvest of susceptible stands. The deciduous harvest level increases from 280,000 m³ per year to 281,000 m³ per year for the first 20 year period and decreases to 270,000 m³ per year for the remainder of the planning horizon.

7.0 Pine Strategy Implementation

The department recognizes that uncertain economic conditions may limit the Company's ability to fully implement the Pine Strategy. The Company has developed a rational and feasible FMP amendment that achieves a significant reduction in MPB susceptible pine on its management area. Ongoing and timely communication with local government staff is essential to manage the issues identified, and those yet to be identified.

The implementation of the Pine Strategy does not guarantee the prevention of future outbreaks in the near term; however, it will create a forest that is more resistant to such outbreaks in the future. In the Slave Lake Area, on-going monitoring will determine the priority and timing of timber salvage operations. Alberta will work with the Company to ensure the strategies address the outbreak and minimize the socio-economic and environmental impacts.

Company operations and preliminary assessments conducted by the department during spring 2010 indicate wide spread presence of MPB in the southern portion of FMU S21. The severity of the MPB infestation will be known by September 2010. Buchanan is also reporting rapidly declining wood quality, making harvest planning and adherence to the SHS uncertain. My interest is maximizing merchantable fibre recovery and prompt reforestation to return these stands to full productivity. MPB operations will be coordinated between the Company and department staff.

8.0 Embedded Timber Operators

Tolko/Buchanan has reached general agreement with all the embedded timber operators and the department regarding annual allowable cut (AAC) sharing. Tables 2 and 7 present the approved AACs for the FMU and each operator.

9.0 Spatial Harvest Sequence

The mapped SHS is the most important output of the FMP amendment as it implements the strategies the companies must follow to achieve the predicted future forest condition. While dependent on many factors, the future forest condition is strongly influenced by harvest patterns, intensity and schedules. It presents spatially and temporally how the integration of environmental, economic and social values will be achieved on the FMA. Adherence to a properly planned harvest sequence is imperative to achieving the predicted future forest. Tolko/Buchanan commits to following the SHS and tracking variance.

The SHS for this MPB amendment incorporates land-use updates to May 1, 2007 and harvest area updates up to and including the 2006 harvest year.

The following is required:

Approval Condition 9.1 – Spatial Harvest Sequence

- i. Tolko/Buchanan shall identify by timber operator, all stands scheduled for harvest in the first 10-year period of the SHS by September 30, 2010.**
- ii. Tolko/Buchanan shall follow the mapped 10-year harvest sequence as presented in the MPB amendment.**
- iii. To address operational planning concerns, all timber disposition holders are authorized to modify the SHS by deleting no more than 20% of the total sequenced area in each compartment by decade, while harvesting no more than 100% of the total area within the SHS by compartment, by decade.**
- iv. Preference should be given to selecting stands from the second 10-year period (2017-2027) of the SHS when replacing deleted stands (from iii above). Where this is not feasible, replacements may be from any other stands identified in the approved net landbase of the FMP, with priority given to pine stands that are ranked highly susceptible to MPB infestations.**
- v. Where timber operators exceed the variance described in (iii), the Area Manager may require the completion of a compartment assessment and the Senior Manager, Forest Planning Section may recommend the adjustment of the approved AAC to reflect the impact of the variance.**
- vi. The department requires the variance from the SHS to be reported annually, and the 5-year Stewardship Report to analyze the variance from the SHS.**
- vii. The department will generally not request a modification of the approved harvest sequence for the first 15 years of the planning period unless required by a change in legislation or a policy approved by the Minister.**

10.0 Public and First Nations Consultation

Tolko/Buchanan is encouraged to continue its efforts to conduct meaningful public, stakeholder and First Nations involvement and keep them advised of its operational plans and accomplishments in addressing the MPB situation throughout the implementation of the MPB amendment.

Approval Condition 10.1 Public Consultation

- i. Tolko/Buchanan shall conduct meaningful public consultation at key points in the FMP implementation; and**
- ii. keep written documentation of all issues and comments raised during operational plan consultation, as well as responses and actions taken to address the concerns.**

Approval Condition 10.2 First Nations Consultation

- i. Tolko/Buchanan shall conduct meaningful First Nations consultation and meet the requirements of *Alberta's First Nations Consultation Guidelines on Land Management and Resource Development* for operational plan development and approvals; and**
- ii. keep written documentation of all issues and comments raised during operational plan consultation, as well as responses and action taken to address the concerns.**

11.0 Performance Monitoring and Reporting

The effective implementation of the Pine Strategy throughout Alberta is very important, and timely information is vital to ensuring the best decisions are made and the most appropriate management strategies are developed. Considering this, the department requires Pine Strategy progress reports to be prepared to keep the department, other agencies and the public knowledgeable and current on the work completed. The department will publish these requirements at a later date.

12.0 Authorization

The FMP amendment for FMA #0200039 effective May 1, 2010 is approved as per the AACs presented in Tables 2 and 7.

The SHS contained in this MPB amendment replaces the SHS contained in the FMP dated January 31, 2005.

The next FMP shall be received by the department in time for approval prior to April 30, 2015.

Table 1. Historical Coniferous Allocations and Annual Allowable Cuts

FMU	Company Name	Disposition Number	Landbase Management Type	Source	Cover Group / Species	Primary Disposition Allocation (%)	Primary Coniferous AAC (m³) 15+/11/30 cm	Total Approved AAC (m³)
S21	Gordon Buchanan Enterprises Ltd.	FMA0200039	Single Combined	FMA-Only	C, CD, DC, D		193,579	193,579
S21	1104384 Alberta Ltd.	CTQS210001	Single Combined	All-FMU	C, CD, DC, D	3.1800%	6,476	6,476
S21	CTPP	CTPP	Single Combined	FMA-Only	C, CD, DC, D		3,624	3,624
FMU S21 Total							203,679	203,679

Notes:
 Previous effective date: May 1, 2004.
 CTPP allocation is a maximum of 3,624 m³/yr, which includes Local Use.
 CTQS210001 is a fixed volume quota of 6,476 m³/yr.

Table 2. Approved Coniferous Allocations and Annual Allowable Cuts

Effective Date: May 1, 2010

FMU	Company Name	Disposition Number	Landbase Management Type	Source	Cover Group / Species	Primary Disposition Allocation (%)	Primary Coniferous AAC (m ³) 15+/11/30 cm	Total Approved AAC (m ³)
S21	Gordon Buchanan Enterprises Ltd.	FMA0200039	Single Combined	FMA-Only	C, CD, DC, D		206,400	206,400
S21	1104384 Alberta Ltd.	CTQS210001	Single Combined	All-FMU	C, CD, DC, D	2.9912%	6,476	6,476
S21	CTPP	CTPP	Single Combined	FMA-Only	C, CD, DC, D		3,624	3,624
FMU S21 Total							216,500	216,500

Notes:

CTPP allocation is a maximum of 3,624 m³/yr, which includes Local Use.

CTQS210001 is a fixed volume quota of 6,476m³/yr.

Table 3. Coniferous Periodic Allowable and Quadrant Authorized Allowable Cuts

3.1	S21	Gordon Buchanan Enterprises Ltd.		Disposition: FMA0200039				
		Period Start: 1-May-07		Period End: 30-Apr-12				
		Period Segment Start Date	Period Segment End Date	Years in Period Segment	Primary Approved Harvest Level (m ³ /yr)	Primary PAC Contribution (m ³)	Total PAC Contribution (m ³)	Notes
1		1-May-07	30-Apr-10	3.0000000000	193,579	580,737.0000	580,737.0000	
2		01-May-10	30-Apr-12	2.0000000000	206,400	412,800.0000	412,800.0000	
		Periodic Reconciliation Volume (m ³)				0	0	
		PAC Total				993,537	993,537	
3.2	S21	1104384 Alberta Ltd.		Disposition: CTQS210001				
		Quadrant Start 1-May-07		Quadrant End 30-Apr-12				
		Quadrant Segment Start Date	Quadrant Segment End Date	Years in Quadrant Segment	Primary Approved Harvest Level (m ³ /yr)	Primary Quadrant Contribution (m ³)	Total Quadrant Contribution (m ³)	Notes
1		1-May-07	30-Apr-12	5.0000000000	6,476	32,380.0000	32,380.0000	
		Quadrant Reconciliation Volume (m ³)				-572	-572	
		QAAC Total				31,808	31,808	
3.3	S21	CTPP		Disposition: CTPP				
		Quadrant Start 1-May-07		Quadrant End 30-Apr-12				
		Quadrant Segment Start Date	Quadrant Segment End Date	Years in Quadrant Segment	Primary Approved Harvest Level (m ³ /yr)	Primary Quadrant Contribution (m ³)	Total Quadrant Contribution (m ³)	Notes
1		1-May-07	30-Apr-12	5.0000000000	3,624	18,120.0000	18,120.0000	
		Quadrant Reconciliation Volume (m ³)				0	0	
		QAAC Total				18,120	18,120	

Table 4. Gordon Buchanan Enterprises Ltd. and Tolko Industries Ltd. FMA Coniferous Chargeability
 Effective Date: May 1, 2010

FMU	Company Name	Disposition Number	Coniferous Species Used in AAC	Species NOT Chargeable to AAC	Rights to Species NOT Chargeable to AAC	Structure Retention (%)	Structure Retention (%) Accounted for in AAC	Net Landbase Deletions and Deferrals	Net Landbase Deletions and Deferrals: Rights to Timber	Industrial Salvage Chargeability Strategy
All dispositions and FMUs (unless otherwise noted)			All	None	N/A	3	Structure Retention is AAC Chargeable. Minimum 1% with an average of 3%.	Table 4-1, Page 4-7 Landbase Summary: Entire FMA - January 31, 2005.	Deletions and Deferrals do not contribute to the AAC.	All Industrial Salvage is AAC Chargeable. Refer to August 29, 2005 Buchanan/Tolko Industrial Salvage Timber Submission.

Table 5. Gordon Buchanan Enterprises Ltd. and Tolko Industries Ltd. FMA Coniferous Utilization

Effective Date: May 1, 2010

FMU	Company Name	Disposition Number	AAC Type	Cover Group / Species	Utilization used to determine Harvest Level in PFMS				Operational Utilization				
					Top Diameter (cm)	Stump Diameter (cm)	Minimum Length (m)	Stump Height (cm)	Top Diameter (cm)	Stump Diameter (cm)	Minimum Length (m)	Stump Height (cm)	Coniferous Harvest Level (m ³ /yr) based on Operational Utilization
All dispositions, FMUs and AAC types (unless otherwise noted)			All	C, CD, DC, D	11	15	2.44	30	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 6. Historical Deciduous Allocations and Annual Allowable Cuts

FMU	Company Name	Disposition Number	Landbase Management Type	Source	Cover Group / Species	Primary Deciduous AAC (m³) 15+/10/30 cm	Total Approved AAC (m³)
S21	Tolko Industries Ltd.	FMA0200039	Single Combined	FMA-Only	C, CD, DC, D	279,500	279,500
S21	CTPP	CTPP	Single Combined	All-FMU	C, CD, DC, D	500	500
FMU S21 Total						280,000	280,000

Notes:
 Previous effective date: May 1, 2004.
 CTPP allocation is a maximum of 500 m³/yr, which includes Local Use.

Table 7. Approved Deciduous Allocations and Annual Allowable Cuts

Effective Date: May 1, 2010

FMU	Company Name	Disposition Number	Landbase Management Type	Source	Cover Group / Species	Primary Deciduous AAC (m ³) 15+/10/30 cm	Total Approved AAC (m ³)
S21	Tolko Industries Ltd.	FMA0200039	Single Combined	FMA-Only	C, CD, CD, D	280,500	280,500
S21	CTPP	CTPP	Single Combined	All-FMU	C, CD, CD, D	500	500
FMU S21 Total						281,000	281,000

Notes:

CTPP allocation is a maximum of 500 m³/yr, which includes Local Use.

Table 8. Deciduous Periodic Allowable and Quadrant Authorized Allowable Cuts

8.1	S21	Tolko Industries Ltd.		Disposition: FMA0200039					
		Period Start: 1-May-07		Period End: 30-Apr-12					
		Period Segment Start Date	Period Segment End Date	Years in Period Segment	Primary Approved Harvest Level (m ³ /yr)	Primary PAC Contribution (m ³)	Total PAC Contribution (m ³)	Notes	
		1	1-May-07	30-Apr-10	3.0000000000	279,500	838,500.0000	838,500.0000	
		2	01-May-10	30-Apr-12	2.0000000000	280,500	561,000.0000	561,000.0000	
		Periodic Reconciliation Volume (m ³)				0	0		
		PAC Total				1,399,500	1,399,500		
8.2	S21	CTPP		Disposition: CTPP					
		Quadrant Start 1-May-07		Quadrant End 30-Apr-12					
		Quadrant Segment Start Date	Quadrant Segment End Date	Years in Quadrant Segment	Primary Approved Harvest Level (m ³ /yr)	Primary Quadrant Contribution (m ³)	Total Quadrant Contribution (m ³)	Notes	
		1	1-May-07	30-Apr-12	5.0000000000	500	2,500.0000	2,500.0000	
		Quadrant Reconciliation Volume (m ³)				0	0		
		QAAC Total				2,500	2,500		

Table 9. Gordon Buchanan Enterprises Ltd. and Tolko Industries Ltd. FMA Deciduous Chargeability
 Effective Date: May 1, 2010

FMU	Company Name	Disposition Number	Deciduous Species Used in AAC	Species NOT Chargeable to AAC	Rights to Species NOT Chargeable to AAC	Structure Retention (%)	Structure Retention (%) Accounted for in AAC	Net Landbase Deletions and Deferrals	Net Landbase Deletions and Deferrals: Rights to Timber	Industrial Salvage Chargeability Strategy
All dispositions and FMUs (unless otherwise noted)			All	None	N/A	3	Structure Retention is AAC Chargeable. Minimum 1% with an average of 3%.	Table 4-1, Page 4-7 Landbase Summary: Entire FMA - January 31, 2005.	Deletions and Deferrals do not contribute to the AAC.	All Industrial Salvage is AAC Chargeable. Refer to August 29, 2005 Buchanan/Tolko Industrial Salvage Timber Submission.

Table 10. Gordon Buchanan Enterprises Ltd. and Tolko Industries Ltd. FMA Deciduous Utilization

Effective Date: May 1, 2010

FMU	Company Name	Disposition Number	AAC Type	Cover Group / Species	Utilization used to determine Harvest Level in PFMS				Operational Utilization				
					Top Diameter (cm)	Stump Diameter (cm)	Minimum Length (m)	Stump Height (cm)	Top Diameter (cm)	Stump Diameter (cm)	Minimum Length (m)	Stump Height (cm)	Deciduous Harvest Level (m ³ /yr) based on Operational Utilization
All dispositions, FMUs And AAC Types(unless otherwise noted)			All	C, CD, DC, D	10	15	2.44	30	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 11. Fiber Transfer Agreements within the Gordon Buchanan Enterprises Ltd. and Tolko Industries Ltd. FMA Area

Source Company	Source Dispositon Number	Transfer Type	Company Directed To	Species Group	Volume (m³/yr)	Comments
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A