

**Lillooet TSA  
Timber Supply Review 3  
Mountain Pine Beetle Impact Assessment**

Addendum to the  
Lillooet TSR3 Analysis Report  
(March 31, 2005)

**March 3, 2008**

Prepared For:

B.C. Ministry of Forests and Range  
Forest Analysis and Inventory Branch  
Victoria, BC

Submitted by:

Forsite  
Box 2079, 330-42<sup>nd</sup> Street SW  
Salmon Arm, B.C V1E 4R1  
(250)832-3366



## Table of Contents

|           |  |           |
|-----------|--|-----------|
| <b>1.</b> | <b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>                              | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>2.</b> | <b>PINE DISTRIBUTION.....</b>                          | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>3.</b> | <b>MPB MORTALITY .....</b>                             | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>4.</b> | <b>SCENARIO OVERVIEW .....</b>                         | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>5.</b> | <b>MPB MODELING APPROACH / METHODOLOGY .....</b>       | <b>3</b>  |
| 5.1.      | BASE CASE + MPB SCENARIO .....                         | 3         |
| 5.1.1     | <i>Baseline</i> .....                                  | 3         |
| 5.1.2     | <i>Mortality in Mature Stands (&gt;60 years)</i> ..... | 3         |
| 5.1.3     | <i>Mortality in Young Stands (&lt;60 years)</i> .....  | 4         |
| 5.1.4     | <i>Cover Constraints</i> .....                         | 4         |
| 5.2.      | PL SALVAGE SCENARIO .....                              | 4         |
| 5.3.      | NO HARVEST IN PL-LEADING STANDS.....                   | 4         |
| <b>6.</b> | <b>RESULTS .....</b>                                   | <b>5</b>  |
| 6.1.      | BASE CASE + MPB .....                                  | 5         |
| 6.1.1     | <i>Harvest Flow</i> .....                              | 5         |
| 6.1.2     | <i>Growing Stock</i> .....                             | 5         |
| 6.1.3     | <i>Harvest Attributes</i> .....                        | 6         |
| 6.1.4     | <i>Age Class Distribution</i> .....                    | 7         |
| 6.2.      | PL SALVAGE SCENARIO .....                              | 7         |
| 6.3.      | NO HARVEST IN PL-LEADING .....                         | 9         |
| <b>7.</b> | <b>DISCUSSION / CONCLUSION .....</b>                   | <b>10</b> |

## 1. Introduction

In 2005, the Lillooet Timber Supply Area's Timber Supply Review #3 Analysis Report<sup>i</sup> was released. This report included both a Current Practice and LRMP Base Case, and provided information on future harvest levels for these scenarios, along with several critical issue analyses. However, the potential impacts of the current Mountain Pine Beetle (MPB) epidemic were not explored. This report has been prepared to provide insight into the potential timber supply impacts that could result from this MPB epidemic.

## 2. Pine Distribution

The Lillooet TSA contains approximately 17.6 million m<sup>3</sup> of Lodgepole pine (PI) volume, of which 84% (14.8 million m<sup>3</sup>) exists in PI-leading stands (Table 1). Within non PI leading stands, Douglas-fir stands contain the most PI volume (9%), while spruce stands contain the next largest amount (5%) of PI volume.

Table 1. Distribution of lodgepole pine volume (m<sup>3</sup>) by Leading Species and PI Percent (%)

| Leading Species | Percent Lodgepole Pine |                  |                  |                  |                  |                |                |                |                | Total          |                   |
|-----------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|
|                 | 91-100                 | 81-90            | 71-80            | 61-70            | 51-60            | 41-50          | 31-40          | 21-30          | 11-20          |                | 0-10              |
| Balsam          | 0                      | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0                | 8,098          | 66,264         | 97,981         | 97,745         | 66,523         | 336,611           |
| Cedar           | 0                      | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0              | 0              | 0              | 0              | 0              | 0                 |
| Decid.          | 0                      | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0              | 0              | 221            | 25             | 987            | 1,234             |
| Douglas-fir     | 0                      | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0                | 62,077         | 495,565        | 388,002        | 364,208        | 252,371        | 1,562,223         |
| Hemlock         | 0                      | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0              | 0              | 0              | 0              | 0              | 0                 |
| Lodgepole Pine  | 6,667,285              | 2,854,767        | 2,108,789        | 1,317,218        | 1,394,743        | 320,580        | 133,271        | 3,068          | 0              | 0              | 14,799,720        |
| Spruce          | 0                      | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0                | 16,526         | 241,793        | 335,788        | 187,478        | 98,985         | 880,569           |
| Other           | 0                      | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0                | 645            | 4,698          | 12,790         | 2,260          | 2,935          | 23,327            |
| <b>Total</b>    | <b>6,667,285</b>       | <b>2,854,767</b> | <b>2,108,789</b> | <b>1,317,218</b> | <b>1,394,743</b> | <b>407,282</b> | <b>936,892</b> | <b>825,060</b> | <b>649,456</b> | <b>418,866</b> | <b>17,580,357</b> |

## 3. MPB Mortality

MoFR Research Branch modeling work (BCMPB)<sup>ii</sup> has predicted that ~80% of all pine volume in the Lillooet TSA will die, and yearly volume killed by MPB will peak in 2009 at 2.95 million m<sup>3</sup> killed/yr (Figure 1). Figure 2 shows that by 2012, the vast majority (90%) of pine volume that is expected to die will be dead<sup>iii</sup> and the full extent of the mortality will occur by 2020.

As the current inventory of PI in the TSR3 dataset is lower than that found the BCMPB project (TSR3 ~17.5 million, BCMPB ~19 million >60yrs old) the 80% kill rate has been used to determine the volume killed in TSR3. Assuming 80% of all PI in the TSR3 dataset dies, this translates into 14.1 million m<sup>3</sup>. This is expected to occur over the next 12 years but the vast majority occurs in the next 5 years so the full mortality will be implemented in the 1st decade during modeling. These assumption forms the basis of all the MPB scenarios shown in this report.

<sup>i</sup> Lillooet TSR3 Analysis Report, March 31, 2005, Forsite Consultants Ltd.  
(<http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hts/tsa/tsa15/tsr3/15ts05ar.pdf>)

<sup>ii</sup> Provincial-Level Projection of the Current Mountain Pine Beetle Outbreak: An Overview of the Model (BCMPB v4) and Results of Year 5 of the Project.

<sup>iii</sup> BCMPB reporting shows a total of 19.4 million m<sup>3</sup> PI volume in the Lillooet TSA. Lillooet TSR3 resultant show 17.4 million m<sup>3</sup> of PI volume. Mortality was implemented using the percentage killed (80%), not the absolute volume.




Figure 1. Yearly PI volume killed by the MPB in the Lillooet TSA (BCMPBv4, 2007).




Figure 2. Cumulative PI Volume killed by the MPB in the Lillooet TSA (BCMPB v4, 2007)

## 4. Scenario Overview

---

In total, three different scenarios were modeled and analysed and are briefly described below. Further details can be found in Section 5.

### Base Case + MPB Mortality

The TSR3 Current Practice scenario assumptions are used while assumptions for MPB mortality (described in section 5) are also implemented. Pine stand mortality is implemented at the end of the first decade and salvage logging is allowed to occur in the first decade as driven by the relative oldest first harvest priority. PI stands were removed from Visual Quality Objectives polygons for the first 30 years to allow flexibility in harvesting within these visual areas. All other assumptions are consistent with the Current Practice Base Case.

### PI Salvage

This scenario explores the potential impact of focusing harvesting efforts toward salvage of PI leadings stands in the first decade. The only change made from the Base Case + MPB scenario was to implement a harvest priority on PI leading stands in the first period.

### No Harvest in PI leading Stands

Because very little harvest of PI leading stands is currently occurring in the TSA due to economic challenges, this scenario explores a worst case scenario where harvest is perpetually excluded from PI leading stands. Assumptions remain the same as the Base Case + MPB scenario except PI leading stands were made ineligible for harvest.

## 5. MPB Modeling Approach / Methodology

---

This section details the modeling approach used for the scenarios mentioned in Section 4. Unless otherwise stated, all assumptions for the “PI Salvage” and “No Harvest in PI-leading stands” scenario remained the same as the Base Case + MPB scenario assumptions.

### 5.1. Base Case + MPB Scenario

#### 5.1.1 Baseline

Modeling used the Current Practice Base Case assumptions documented in the TSR3 Analysis Report appendix. No updates to the inventory were completed so that results are comparable with the results published in the TSR3 Analysis Report (Forsite - March 31, 2005).

This scenario assumes that the 14.1 million m<sup>3</sup> will be lost in the next 10 yrs and very little of the PI mortality will be salvage harvested. This is consistent with current performance in the TSA as pine makes up very little of the harvest profile. No uplift was considered as the TSA is chronically undercut and very little harvesting is happening in PI stands.

#### 5.1.2 Mortality in Mature Stands (>60 years)

As discussed above, 14.1 million m<sup>3</sup> was depleted out of the inventory at the end of the first period. This was done by selecting the highest % PI stands (>60yrs) until an area representing 14.1 million m<sup>3</sup> (all species) was identified. These stands were then set to age zero (volume removed). Because of the way this was implemented, there was ~1.3 million m<sup>3</sup> of non-PI volume depleted from the inventory. This however, was cancelled out by the fact that there was still ~1.3 million m<sup>3</sup> of PI in the rest of landbase that was not depleted. In reality, the pine mortality will be more dispersed (spatially and temporally) than what was modeled here.

Dead unsalvaged stands were given a regen delay of 10 yrs and a concurrent 10 year addition to the MHA and were set to regenerate on their original VDYP curves.

### 5.1.3 Mortality in Young Stands (<60 years)

In order to reflect MPB mortality in young pine stands, additional area was killed in pine leading stands <60 yrs old. The percent of pine killed in younger age classes was estimated based on Lorraine MacLauchlan's recent work<sup>iv</sup> (% of population with attack) and professional judgment about the ultimate extent of the attack in these stands. These assumptions should be considered very 'rough'. In total, an area of 969 ha of young PI stands was killed at the end of the first decade. These stands had their ages set to 0.

Table 2. Mortality applied to stands <60 years.

| Age Class    | PI Leading Area (ha) | % of Stands With Attack | Extent of Mortality | % Pine Mortality | Total Area Impacted |
|--------------|----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| <20          | 17,624               | 0                       | 0                   | 0%               | -                   |
| 20-29        | 2,727                | 30%                     | 50%                 | 15%              | 409                 |
| 30-39        | 336                  | 62%                     | 50%                 | 31%              | 104                 |
| 40-49        | 423                  | 83%                     | 50%                 | 41%              | 173                 |
| 50-59        | 602                  | 93%                     | 50%                 | 47%              | 283                 |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>21,711</b>        |                         |                     |                  | <b>969</b>          |

Impacted young stands were given a 20 year regen delay (less opportunity for natural regeneration) and a concurrent 20 year addition to the MHA.

### 5.1.4 Cover Constraints

Pine leading stands were removed from VQO constraint areas for a period of 30 years because licensees are typically given flexibility around VQOs when impacted by MPB. All other constraints remained in place (CWS, wildlife habitat). Dead OGMAs will not be replaced (very little area in PI leading stands).

## 5.2. PI Salvage Scenario

In order to mimic PI salvage efforts, PI leading stands were prioritized for harvest in the first period. A relative oldest first priority determined which PI stands were harvested and the model exhausted opportunities to log all PI stands before moving to other stand types (1<sup>st</sup> period only). This priority did not persist past the first period because it was implemented using a fixed schedule (hardwired) of logging/mortality for PI stands based on other model runs.

## 5.3. No Harvest in PI-Leading Stands

A 'No-Harvest' constraint was added to all PI-leading AUs for this scenario. This allowed PI-leading stands to contribute to forest cover requirements but prevented all PI-leading stands from being harvested for the entire planning horizon.

<sup>iv</sup> MacLauchlan, L., 2006. Determining susceptibility of young pine plantations to the mountain pine beetle *Dendroctonus ponderosae*, and manipulating future stands to mitigate losses. Forest Investment Account (FIA project Y0610003) – Forest Science Program. Ministry of Forests and Range.

## 6. Results

### 6.1. Base Case + MPB

#### 6.1.1 Harvest Flow

As a result of implementing the MPB mortality assumptions described above, the mid-term harvest level drops from 635,900 m<sup>3</sup>/yr down to 413,900 m<sup>3</sup>/yr starting in the second period. This is down 34.9% from the TSR3 current practice scenario (Figure 3). This harvest level continues until the 10<sup>th</sup> decade, at which point it falls down to the same Long-term harvest flow as the TSR3 current practice base case (379,920 m<sup>3</sup>/yr). This occurs because 32% of the current growing stock disappears at the end of the first decade, and is no longer available to support harvest levels until managed stands begin to come online in 60-70 years from now. The remaining mature growing stock must be metered out more slowly.




Figure 3. Mountain Pine Beetle Base scenario - Harvest Flow

#### 6.1.2 Growing Stock

The resulting change in total growing stock on the THLB over time with MPB mortality assumptions is shown in Figure 4. Growing stock drops sharply in the second period as a result of the MPB mortality. In total, 15.5<sup>v</sup> million m<sup>3</sup> of PI leading stands are killed in the first period. Combined with the harvest that occurred during this decade, the net change in growing stock is 19.9 Million m<sup>3</sup>. By the 10<sup>th</sup> decade, the growing stock recovers to the same level as the current practice (TSR3) scenario as a result of the reduced harvest rate in earlier periods.

<sup>v</sup> As mentioned previously, an equivalent area representing 14.1 million m<sup>3</sup> was selected from the inventory to implement mortality against. A discrepancy of 1.4 million m<sup>3</sup> results from utilizing modeling yield curves as opposed to inventory volumes in the model as well as the fact that the mortality event occurs 5 years into the planning horizon so there is an additional 5 years worth of growth tacked on to the selected area.




Figure 4. Growing Stock on the THLB - MPB scenario

### 6.1.3 Harvest Attributes

The contribution of species groups to the harvest profile is shown in Figure 5. The large volume of harvest in MPB impacted stands beginning in the 9<sup>th</sup> decade is important to note as it shows how much the harvest flow depends on these stands 90-110 years from today. This scenario captures ~850,000 m<sup>3</sup> of PI volume in the first period (14% of 1<sup>st</sup> period harvest volume).




Figure 5. Contribution of species groups to the MPB Base scenario



### 6.1.4 Age Class Distribution

A time-series showing the age-class distribution of the TSA's forest is shown in Figure 6. The relatively large amount of area in the 50 year age class five decades from now is the result of the MPB mortality assumptions implemented in the first decade. By the 15<sup>th</sup> decade, the majority of this PI volume has been harvested and the associated area is more or less evenly distributed in the younger age classes.




Figure 6. Age class composition snapshots at 0, 50, 100, 150, 200, 250 years from now.

### 6.2. PI Salvage Scenario

When PI stands are prioritized for harvest in the first period, approximately 2.33 million m<sup>3</sup> of volume that would have otherwise been lost to MPB mortality is captured and an additional 2.01 million m<sup>3</sup> of PI leading stand volume not originally scheduled for succession was also harvested. This totals to a first period PI-leading harvest volume of 4.34 million m<sup>3</sup>. This resulted in an increase in the mid-term harvest level by 10.9% or 45,000 m<sup>3</sup>/yr (Figure 7). The long-term harvest level was unaffected.




Figure 7. Harvest flow comparison - PI priority vs. MPB base

Figure 8 shows the growing stock for this scenario relative to the Base Case + MPB scenario. The immediate drop in growing stock (decade 1) is less under this scenario because, even with higher harvest levels, the capture of PI volume that would have otherwise been lost to MPB reduces the need to harvest green timber. Thus, the volume that would have been lost anyways is used to meet the harvest volume goal and therefore leaves green stands (growing stock) on the land base.




Figure 8. Growing Stock (m³) on the THLB - PI Priority vs. MPB Base Scenario

Figure 9 shows that the first period harvest is now dominated (67%) by the harvest of PI leading stands. Constraints served to limit the model from harvesting nothing but PI stands.




Figure 9. Contribution of species groups to the PI Priority Scenario

### 6.3. No Harvest in PI-leading

The harvest flow resulting from perpetually excluding harvest from PI leading stands is shown in Figure 10. The initial harvest level was dropped to 442,400 m<sup>3</sup>/yr in order to provide for an orderly (max 10%) decline to the long term harvest level. It did not make sense to show a significant drop in period two if no salvage efforts were occurring in PI stands. This new initial harvest level represents a decrease of 30% (193,400 m<sup>3</sup>) from the current AAC. The harvest levels drops in 10% increments for the first 4 decades to a mid-term harvest of 294,000 m<sup>3</sup>/yr which lasts for 4 decades. The harvest then drops to a LTHL of 218,900 m<sup>3</sup>/yr in the 10<sup>th</sup> decade, which is ~42% below the Base Case + MPB scenario. This correlates closely with the proportion of PI leading stands on the THLB (39%).




Figure 10. Harvest flow comparison - No Harvest in PI leading vs. MPB Base

The contribution of species groups to the harvest flow is depicted in Figure 11. As prescribed, PI is absent from the harvest profile.




Figure 11. Contribution of species groups to the No Harvest in PI-leading scenario

## 7. Discussion / Conclusion

The three scenarios presented here span a wide spectrum of future timber supply outcomes as they relate to MPB mortality and impacts. Based on the mortality projections provided by the province's BCMPB model, all scenarios indicate there will be a significant reduction in timber supply in the short term (Figure 12). The three scenarios can be characterized as follows:

- **Optimistic:** If the TSA is able to make the salvage of PI stands economically viable, and roughly 2/3rds of the AAC is directed toward salvage, the falldown occurs in 10 yrs to a level 28% below the current AAC.
- **'Middle of the Road':** If the TSA can dedicate 14% of the AAC in the next decade toward PI salvage and find a way to access PI stands in the future, the falldown occurs in 10 yrs to a level 34% below the current AAC.
- **Pessimistic:** If the harvest of PI stands in the TSA proves to be perpetually uneconomic, 39% of the landbase and growing stock become unavailable and results in an immediate drop in the harvest level to 442,400 m³/yr (30% below current AAC). The long term harvest level drops to 218,900 m³/yr and is ~42% below the TSR3 Base Case level.

The PI Salvage scenario shows that significant improvements can be realized in the short and midterm if an aggressive salvage effort is implemented.




Figure 12. Harvest flow scenario comparison