

---

## APPENDIX A: INFORMATION SHEETS

---

The following Information Sheets provide the current Forested Land Criteria as well as the minimum requirements and additional considerations for each of the common deficiencies to be eligible for a variance, so it can be left in place without further reclamation to correct it (in addition to the requirements described above in Section 3):

- Subsided areas
- Hill cuts
- Soil stockpiles
- Woody debris piles
- Topsoil depth and distribution
- Sparse desirable herbaceous vegetation cover
- Problematic vegetation

Each of the Information Sheets presents a single deficiency and the factors that may be used to justify a variance request. It is not uncommon for multiple deficiencies to exist on a site, in part because some of the deficiencies are correlated (e.g., Soil Stockpiles and Topsoil Depth and Distribution). In those cases, each of the deficiencies must be justified to obtain the variance. Sites with multiple deficiencies are more difficult to justify not doing additional reclamation.

---

## SUBSIDED AREAS

---

Before proceeding through this Information Sheet, refer to Sections 1 and 3 to review the purpose and scope of the guidance document and the minimum requirements for variance approval. Variances are considered and accepted under exceptional circumstances and are not meant to provide an excuse or justification for not fulfilling reclamation obligations or lack of due diligence.

---




Figure 1. Examples of subsided areas. Requirements and factors presented in this Information Sheet are used to determine if these are eligible to be left in place.

a) and b) before vegetation encroachment; c) and d) after vegetation encroachment.

Subsidence is defined as “lowering of the soil surface due to a reduction in volume through settling or other means” (Powter, 2002) and occurs in localized areas where soil settling occurs unevenly (e.g., at well centre, or in association with cut and fill construction practices). Subsidence may result from settling of uncompacted fill materials, improper fill material placement during reclamation and/or the presence of snow mixed in with fill materials. Subsided areas (Figure 1) form as the result of subsidence; the amount of time over which a subsided area may continue to subside (i.e., becoming deeper or wider) will vary for different sites. Subsided areas can result in a change to the micro- or meso-contour of the site and present



themselves as areas on-site with lower elevation (i.e., depressions)<sup>1</sup>. Edges of deeper subsided areas can be subject to slumping and erosion, and subsided areas can result in ponding. Subsided areas typically range in size from 1 to 10 m<sup>2</sup> on well centres and greater than 10 m<sup>2</sup> on sumps or pits, and typically range in depth from 0.2 m to 0.6 m, although can be up to 1 m deep (Acden Vertex Limited Partnership, personal communication 2019). Slopes leading to subsided areas can range from gradual to abrupt.

### Natural Analogs and Acceptable Reclamation Practices in Other Industries

There are two main categories of microtopographical equivalents to subsided areas that can be examined for comparison purposes: naturally occurring variation in micro-contour within forests in the region or creation of microtopographic heterogeneity on reclaimed/reforested sites in other industries to improve revegetation success (Tokay et al., 2019). The most common natural analogs to subsided areas are natural depressions, windthrow pits (Figure 2) or beaver/muskrat runs. Windthrow pits can range from 15 to 55 cm deep, depending on the forest type (Kuuluvainen and Juntunen, 1998; Lee and Sturgess, 2002).



Figure 2. Windthrow mound and pit microtopography.

There are several microtopographic features created during reclamation/reforestation in other industries that are comparable to subsided areas. Although some of these examples are not directly comparable to subsided areas visually, the concept of variations in elevation created in reclaimed areas is comparable. At coal and oil sands mines, surface roughness (or “rough and loose” microtopography) is created during soil replacement by spreading topsoil unevenly or after placement by progressively digging holes with an excavator bucket and dumping the material beside and partially inside the hole across a reclaimed area (Alberta Environment and Water, 2012; MacKenzie and Naeth, 2010; Osko et al., 2018b; Polster, 2011); resultant microtopographic features have been up to 1.5 m tall, 3.5 to 5 m wide and spaced 1 to 2 m apart in some cases (Melnik et al., 2018). Mounding in the forestry industry can create mounds that range from 30 to 40 cm tall and approximately 0.5 to 0.6 m<sup>2</sup> in size (DeLong et al., 1997; Gradowski et al., 2008).

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that depressions that occur at well centre which are typically referred to as subsided areas may actually be the result of incomplete fill replacement (i.e., not all of the fill material that was removed from the well hole was replaced into the hole during abandonment and reclamation). It is impossible to delineate areas of subsidence from areas that were not completely filled and for the purposes of this document they are treated together.

Mounding during well pad, road, pipeline, or seismic line reclamation has resulted in a roughened surface with mounds 0.75 to 1 m tall (Bentham and Coupal, 2015; Shunina et al., 2016); note that mounds of this size are often meant to create an access deterrent, suggesting that the resultant terrain is not usable by recreational and traditional users. Site preparation guidance documents targeted at the oil and gas industry recommend that mounds have a final height after settling of 20 to 30 cm for mineral soil mounds and 40 cm for organic soil mounds (Natural Resources Canada, 2019).

### **Current Forested Land Criteria**

Subsided areas that do not meet the Forested Land Criteria typically fail the stability and operability criteria as per sections 9.3.2 and 9.5 of the Forested Land Criteria and the Combined Assessment Tool ([CAT; Alberta Energy Regulator, 2019c]):

- Stability: Subsidence
  - Areas of subsidence are  $<4 \text{ m}^2$ , stable and unlikely to risk the site's stability (note that stability is assessed by the absence of ongoing slumping and erosion).
  - $>4 \text{ m}^2$  subsided areas occurring on-site are consistent with that observed off-site.
- Operability: Contour
  - Macro-, meso- and micro- contours<sup>2</sup> on-site are comparable to off-site.
  - Macro-, meso- and micro-contours are not affecting site management.
  - Macro- and meso-contours on-site should be integrated with adjacent off-site landscape features.
  - Macro- and meso-contours shall not result in excessive erosion, slumping/wasting or altered water flow patterns<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> Typically subsided areas would be considered micro-contours as they occur on the  $<10 \text{ m}$  width scale. Subsided areas that are  $>10 \text{ m}$  in size would be considered meso- or macro-contours depending on their size.

<sup>3</sup> There are specific criteria for these impacts (i.e., erosion, slumping and altered water flow patterns) in Sections 9.1, 9.2 and 9.3 of the Forested Land Criteria that subsided areas must also meet.

## Minimum Requirements for a Variance

A subsided area can be left in place with a variance even if it is larger than 4 m<sup>2</sup> if it is not limiting forest ecosystem function or equivalent land capability of the site as a whole (as discussed in Section 3) and if all of the following requirements are met:

- The site passes the Forested Land Criteria for vegetation<sup>4</sup>:
  - If the site was reclaimed prior to June 1, 2007 and was seeded with grasses: Minimum 80% compatible vegetation cover based on the seed mix and the plants are healthy<sup>5</sup>.
  - If a Natural Recovery Site (regardless of reclamation date): A minimum of 25% canopy cover of herbaceous species; and, a minimum 25% canopy cover of woody species or a minimum stem count of 5/10 m<sup>2</sup> plot (i.e., 5,000 stems/ha), and the plants are healthy.
  - If a Planted Site: A minimum of 25% canopy cover of herbaceous species; and, a minimum 25% canopy cover of woody species or a minimum stem count of 2/10 m<sup>2</sup> plot (i.e., 2,000 stems/ha), and the plants are healthy.
- The subsided area presents a low risk to the safety of wildlife, livestock or recreational and traditional users (including ATV/UTV/snowmobile users). As such, subsided areas can only be left in place if they have the following characteristics:
  - Edges of subsided area have gradual slopes (<3:1 or 33%) that are not prone to collapse (i.e., not abrupt or vertical slopes).
  - Not located on a trail or cutline that crosses through the site.

There are a few exceptions to this based on a risk-management approach: The risk associated with a safety hazard has two components: probability (i.e., likelihood of occurrence) and severity (i.e., consequences of occurrence). Although the severity of an individual subsided area remains constant unless reclamation activities are conducted to remove it, the probability of occurrence is affected by the location of the site. Sites that have a low likelihood of land users encountering the safety hazard have a reduced level of risk and can be treated differently than sites with a greater likelihood of land users encountering the safety hazard. Sites can be considered to have a low risk of safety hazards (and therefore subsided areas can be left in place on these sites) if they meet both of the following:

- Sites with an access road that is blocked by an access deterrent which may include:

---

<sup>4</sup> It is possible for a site to fail the vegetation criteria but still receive a variance for subsidence if, for example, the vegetation failure occurs on a different area of the site or if the vegetation failure is not caused by the subsidence (e.g., sparse desirable herbaceous vegetation due to the low productivity site conditions); professional judgment should be used in these cases to determine eligibility for a variance.

<sup>5</sup> Note that sites that are dominated by seeded grasses are not considered to have the same ecological value as sites that meet the natural recovery or planted vegetation criteria, and the rationale for a variance is weaker (i.e., redistribution is less of a concern). The rationale is stronger if a portion of the site or the access road has forest vegetation and meets the natural recovery or planted vegetation criteria.

- Large trees and/or shrubs.
  - Boulders.
  - Large soil mounds.
- Sites that are not currently within a grazing lease.
- The subsided area is stable:
  - Not slumping.
  - Non-erosive.
  - Not increasing in size over time (i.e., no evidence of continuing subsidence during multiple assessments, if available).
- **Either**
  - a) the subsided area is comparable to surrounding off-site areas with similar micro- or meso-contour, such as natural analogs to subsided areas including depressions, windthrow pits or beaver/muskrat runs (Figure 2). When considering the contour of surrounding off-site areas, a large enough area must be assessed to make this determination. The assessment area should not be limited solely to areas directly adjacent to the site; representative areas up to 10 km away from the site could be considered. If the size and depth of any observed natural analogs are comparable to the size and depth of the subsided areas on-site, this can be used as a justification for leaving subsided areas in place. Photographs and documentation of the dimensions and location of observed natural analogs should be included in the justification submitted to the AER (as discussed in Section 4).
- **or**
  - b) the subsided area is not impacting drainage or hydrology for the site as a whole or off-site: if the subsided area is not comparable to surrounding off-site areas (option (a) above), it may still be left in place if it is not impacting drainage or hydrology for the site as a whole. As subsided areas are depressions, it is acceptable that they will have occasional or seasonal ponding (i.e., hold water), but the expectation is that the overall drainage patterns for the site as a whole and the surrounding forest are not impacted by subsided areas.
- The subsided area is not influencing operability of the site for current, future and potential land uses (or overlapping tenure holders). Subsided areas should not impede the operability of commercial forestry equipment. Operability of commercial forestry equipment is often most limited by steep slopes; stability of machinery is reduced on slopes >35% and the risk level is considered high on slopes >50% (BC Forest Safety Council, 2011). In forested areas, slopes of the subsided area should be <33% (i.e., <3:1).

## Additional Considerations

Additional considerations for requesting/approving a variance for a subsided area include:

- Environmental impacts of re-entering the site to conduct reclamation activities to correct the subsided area.
  - Reclamation to correct a subsided area could first require that topsoil that was replaced during original reclamation be re-stripped to allow subsoil to be recontoured to match the grade to the remainder of the site. The disturbance area on the site can extend far beyond the subsided area if fill material needs to be sourced from an elevated area on-site. In some cases, imported material must be used if sufficient subsoil is not available on-site. Topsoil is then replaced after re-contouring is complete. Refer to Section 3.2 for factors to consider related to reclamation of deficiencies.
- Naturally occurring variation in micro-contour within forests in the region
  - Regardless of whether natural analogs of subsided areas (i.e., depressions, windthrow, beaver/muskrat runs) occur in areas adjacent to the site, these natural analogs may occur within the region. Literature values for the dimensions of these features may be cited as part of the justification (refer to Appendix C).
- Comparison with microtopographical features on other reclaimed/reforested sites that are similar in size to a subsided area (these microtopographical features are used as a means of improving forest species establishment and promoting ecological diversity). Examples include:
  - Surface roughness (microtopographical heterogeneity) created during soil replacement at coal and oil sands mines.
  - Mounding in the forestry industry.
  - Mounding during well pad, road, pipeline, or seismic line reclamation.

If the site is eligible for a variance, the “Variance – Landscape” category in OneStop is used.



---

## HILL CUTS

---

Before proceeding through this Information Sheet, refer to Sections 1 and 3 to review the purpose and scope of the guidance document and the minimum requirements for variance approval. Variances are considered and accepted under exceptional circumstances and are not meant to provide an excuse or justification for not fulfilling reclamation obligations or lack of due diligence.

---



Figure 1. Examples of hill cuts. Requirements and factors presented in this Information Sheet are used to determine if these are eligible to be left in place.

Cut and fill is a construction technique for wellsites and access roads located on slopes whereby soils are excavated from the upper slope portion of the site (after topsoil salvage) and used on the lower slope portion of the site to create a level surface for the drill rig and associated work areas or the access road. During reclamation it can be challenging to replace the excavated material correctly to match the surrounding off-site topography at the lease edge, particularly if snow gets mixed in with soils during replacement and settling (subsidence) of the placed material occurs. Best practice is to over build cut and fills during reclamation with the expectation that the over built material will settle (Cenovus Energy, 2016; Osko et al., 2018); however, it is difficult to predict actual settling rates. The resulting difference in elevation between on-site and off-site areas will hereafter be referred to as a hill cut, regardless of the



status of reclamation (Figure 1). The height of a hill cut varies with material type, but typically ranges from 0.2 to 1 m; in rarer cases it can be greater than 3 m and up to 10 m in mountainous regions (Acden Vertex Limited Partnership, personal communication 2019). Hill cuts are typically located on one edge (or possibly two edges) of the site or run parallel to the access road. Hill cuts are prone to slumping and erosion and may alter surface water flow patterns. Hill cuts may also have impacts on the trafficability/operability of the site (e.g., for forest harvesting equipment), restrict or alter wildlife movement and can be an aesthetic concern (appear unnatural) for recreational and traditional users. Topsoil replacement is often lacking on hill cut areas (or topsoil is buried below the hill cut) which results in bare areas or areas of sparse vegetation (topsoil deficiencies are discussed in the Topsoil Depth and Distribution Information Sheet).

### **Natural Analogs and Acceptable Reclamation Practices in Other Industries**

There are two main categories of microtopographical features that can be compared to hill cuts, if not directly in terms of appearance, at least conceptually in terms of presenting variations in elevation on the site: naturally occurring variation in contour within forests in the region or creation of microtopographic heterogeneity on reclaimed/reforested sites in other industries to improve revegetation success (Tokay et al., 2019). Some potential natural analogs to hill cuts are steep slopes, stream banks, natural ridges, small eskers, windthrow pits or beaver/muskrat runs.

Reclamation practices in other industries to improve revegetation success such as the creation of microtopographic heterogeneity during reclamation in the mining and oil and gas industries and during site preparation in the forestry industry can have similar dimensions to hill cuts (Tokay et al., 2019). Although some of these examples are not directly comparable to hill cuts visually, the concept of variations in elevation created in reclaimed areas is comparable. At coal and oil sands mines, surface roughness (or “rough and loose” microtopography) is created during soil replacement by spreading topsoil unevenly or after placement by progressively digging holes with an excavator bucket and dumping the material beside and partially inside the hole across a reclaimed area (Alberta Environment and Water, 2012; MacKenzie and Naeth, 2010; Osko et al., 2018b; Polster, 2011); resultant microtopographic features have been up to 1.5 m tall, 3.5 to 5 m wide and spaced 1 to 2 m apart in some cases (Melnik et al., 2018). Mounding in the forestry industry can create mounds that range from 30 to 40 cm tall and approximately 0.5 to 0.6 m<sup>2</sup> in size (DeLong et al., 1997; Gradowski et al., 2008). Disc trenching is another comparable site preparation technique used in forestry that creates both elevated and depressed planting sites, typically in rows or strips across the site. Mounding during well pad, road, pipeline, or seismic line reclamation has resulted in a roughened surface with mounds 0.75 to 1 m tall (Bentham and Coupal, 2015; Shunina et al., 2016); note that mounds of this size are often meant to create an access deterrent, suggesting that the resultant terrain is not usable by recreational and traditional users. Site preparation guidance documents targeted at the oil and gas industry recommend that mounds have a final height after settling of 20 to 30 cm for mineral soil mounds and 40 cm for organic soil mounds (Natural Resources Canada, 2019).

## Current Forested Land Criteria

Hill cuts that do not meet the Forested Land Criteria typically fail for the operability criteria as per Section 9.5 of the Forested Land Criteria and the Combined Assessment Tool:

- Macro- and meso-contours<sup>1</sup> on-site are comparable to off-site.
- Macro- and meso-contours are not affecting site management.
- Macro- and meso-contours on-site should be integrated with adjacent off-site landscape features.
- Macro- and meso-contours shall not result in excessive erosion, slumping/wasting or altered water flow patterns<sup>2</sup>.

## Minimum Requirements for a Variance

A hill cut can be left in place with a variance if it is not limiting forest ecosystem function or equivalent land capability of the site as a whole (as discussed in Section 3) and if the following requirements are met:

- The site passes the Forested Land Criteria for vegetation<sup>3</sup>:
  - If the site was reclaimed prior to June 1, 2007 and was seeded with grasses: Minimum 80% compatible vegetation cover based on the seed mix and the plants are healthy<sup>4</sup>.
  - If a Natural Recovery Site (regardless of reclamation date): A minimum of 25% canopy cover of herbaceous species; and, a minimum 25% canopy cover of woody species or a minimum stem count of 5/10 m<sup>2</sup> plot (i.e., 5,000 stems/ha), and the plants are healthy.
  - If a Planted Site: A minimum of 25% canopy cover of herbaceous species; and, a minimum 25% canopy cover of woody species or a minimum stem count of 2/10 m<sup>2</sup> plot (i.e., 2,000 stems/ha), and the plants are healthy.
- The hill cut presents a low risk to the safety of wildlife, livestock or recreational and traditional users (including ATV/UTV/snowmobile users). As such, hill cuts can only be left in place if they have gradual slopes (<3:1 or 33%) that are not prone to collapse.

There are a few exceptions to this based on a risk-management approach: The risk associated with a safety hazard has two components: probability (i.e., likelihood of occurrence) and severity (i.e., consequences of occurrence). Although the severity of an individual subsided area remains

---

<sup>1</sup> Hills cuts are typically considered at the macro- and meso- contour level as they tend to be >10 m long.

<sup>2</sup> There are specific criteria for these impacts (i.e., erosion, slumping and altered water flow patterns) as well as for bare areas in Sections 9.1, 9.2, 9.3 and 9.4 of the Forested Land Criteria that hill cuts must also meet.

<sup>3</sup> It is possible for a site to fail the vegetation criteria but still receive a variance for a hill cut if, for example, the vegetation failure occurs on a different area of the site or if the vegetation failure is not caused by the hill cut (e.g., sparse desirable herbaceous vegetation due to the low productivity site conditions); professional judgment should be used in these cases to determine eligibility for a variance.

<sup>4</sup> Note that sites that are dominated by seeded grasses are not considered to have the same ecological value as sites that meet the natural recovery or planted vegetation criteria, and the rationale for a variance is weaker (i.e., redisturbance is less of a concern). The rationale is stronger if a portion of the site or the access road has forest vegetation and meets the natural recovery or planted vegetation criteria.

constant unless reclamation activities are conducted to remove it, the probability of occurrence is affected by the location of the site. Sites that have a low likelihood of land users encountering the safety hazard have a reduced level of risk and can be treated differently than sites with a greater likelihood of land users encountering the safety hazard. Sites can be considered to have a low risk of safety hazards (and therefore hill cuts on these sites can be left in place) if they meet both of the following:

- Sites with an access road that is blocked by an access deterrent which may include (but is not limited to):
  - Large trees and/or shrubs.
  - Boulders.
  - Large soil mounds.
- Sites that are not currently within a grazing lease.
- The hill cut is stable:
  - Not slumping.
  - Non-erosive.
- **Either**
  - a) the hill cut is comparable to surrounding off-site areas with similar micro- or meso-contour, such as natural analogs to hill cuts including stream banks, ridges, eskers, windthrow pits or beaver/muskrat runs. When considering the contour of surrounding off-site areas, a large enough area must be assessed to make this determination. The assessment area should not be limited solely to areas directly adjacent to the site; representative areas up to 10 km away from the site could be considered. If the size and depth of any observed natural analogs are comparable to the size and depth of the hill cut on-site, this can be used as a justification for leaving hill cuts in place. Photographs and documentation of the dimensions and location of observed natural analogs should be included in the justification submitted to the AER (as discussed in Section 4).
- **or**
  - b) the hill cut is not impacting drainage or hydrology for the site as a whole or off-site.
- The hill cut is not influencing operability of the site for current, future and potential land uses (or overlapping tenure holders).
  - Forestry: Hill cuts should not impede the operability of commercial forestry equipment. Operability of commercial forestry equipment is often most limited by steep slopes; stability of machinery is reduced on slopes >35% and the risk level is considered high on slopes >50% (BC Forest Safety Council, 2011). In forested areas, slopes of the hill cut should be <33% (<3:1).



- Agriculture: If the site is in the White Area, there is potential for the site to be used for agriculture in the future. Hill cuts should not have micro- or meso-contours that would prevent the use of cultivation equipment if the site is in the White Area.

### **Additional Considerations**

Additional considerations for requesting/approving a variance for a hill cut include:

- Environmental impacts of re-entering the site to conduct reclamation activities to correct the hill cut.
  - Reclamation to correct a hill cut may require re-stripping topsoil if the work area was previously partially reclaimed, to allow subsoil to be recontoured to match the grade to the remainder of the site and/or adjacent topography. The disturbance area on the site can extend far beyond the hill cut if fill material must be sourced from another area on-site. In some cases, imported material or material from off-site may be required if sufficient subsoil is not available on-site, which could create additional disturbance on the landscape. Topsoil is then replaced after re-contouring is complete. Refer to Section 3.2 for factors to consider related to reclamation of deficiencies.
- Naturally occurring variation in micro-contour within forests in the region.
  - Regardless of whether natural analogs of hill cuts (i.e., stream banks, natural ridges, eskers, windthrow pits, beaver/muskrat runs) occur in areas adjacent to the site, these natural analogs may occur within the region. Literature values for the dimensions of these features may be cited as part of the justification.
- Comparison with microtopographical features on other reclaimed/reforested sites that are similar in size to a hill cut (these microtopographical features are used as a means of improving revegetation success and promoting ecological diversity. Examples include:
  - Surface roughness (microtopographical heterogeneity) created during soil replacement at coal and oil sands mines.
  - Mounding or disc trenching in the forestry industry.
  - Mounding during well pad, road, pipeline, or seismic line reclamation.

If the site is eligible for a variance, the “Variance – Landscape” category in OneStop is used.

---

## SOIL STOCKPILES

---

**Before proceeding through this Information Sheet, refer to Sections 1 and 3 to review the purpose and scope of the guidance document and the minimum requirements for variance approval. Variances are considered and accepted under exceptional circumstances and are not meant to provide an excuse or justification for not fulfilling reclamation obligations or lack of due diligence.**

---

Soil stockpiles that are left in place (Figure 1) may include topsoil and subsoil stockpiles and are often less than 1 m tall but can range in height up to 3 m (Acden Vertex Limited Partnership, personal communication 2019). Soil stockpiles on wellsites are typically shaped as long, narrow windrows. Soil stockpiles left in place may alter drainage flow patterns, create barriers to wildlife movement on the landscape, have impacts on the trafficability/operability of the site (e.g., for forest harvesting equipment) and can be an aesthetic concern (appear unnatural) for recreational and traditional users.

### **Natural Analogs and Acceptable Reclamation Practices in Other Industries**

There are two main categories of microtopographical features that can be compared to the topography of soil stockpiles: naturally occurring variation in contour within forests in the region or creation of microtopographic heterogeneity on reclaimed/reforested sites in other industries to improve revegetation success (Tokay et al., 2019). Some potential natural analogs to soil stockpiles are natural ridges, small eskers and hummocky terrain.

Reclamation practices in other industries to improve revegetation success such as the creation of microtopographic heterogeneity during reclamation in the mining and oil and gas industries and during site preparation in the forestry industry can have similar dimensions to soil stockpiles (Tokay et al., 2019). Although many of these examples are not directly comparable to soil stockpiles visually, the concept of variations in elevation created in reclaimed areas is comparable. At coal and oil sands mines, surface roughness (or “rough and loose” microtopography) is created during soil replacement by spreading topsoil unevenly or after placement by progressively digging holes with an excavator bucket and dumping the material beside and



Figure 1. Examples of topsoil stockpiles left in place. Requirements and factors presented in this Information Sheet are used to determine if these are eligible to be left in place.

partially inside the hole across a reclaimed area (Alberta Environment and Water, 2012; MacKenzie and Naeth, 2010; Osko et al., 2018b; Polster, 2011); resultant microtopographic features have been up to 1.5 m tall, 3.5 to 5 m wide and spaced 1 to 2 m apart in some cases (Melnik et al., 2018). Mounding in the forestry industry can create mounds that range from 30 to 40 cm tall and approximately 0.5 to 0.6 m<sup>2</sup> in size (DeLong et al., 1997; Gradowski et al., 2008). Disc trenching is another comparable site preparation technique used in forestry that creates both elevated and depressed planting sites, typically in rows or strips across the site. Mounding during well pad, road, pipeline, or seismic line reclamation has resulted in a roughened surface with mounds 0.75 to 1 m tall (Bentham and Coupal, 2015; Shunina et al., 2016); note that mounds of this size are often meant to create an access deterrent, suggesting that the resultant terrain is not usable by recreational and traditional users. Site preparation guidance documents targeted at the oil and gas industry recommend that mounds have a final height after settling of 20 to 30 cm for mineral soil mounds and 40 cm for organic soil mounds (Natural Resources Canada, 2019).

### **Current Forested Land Criteria**

Soil stockpiles that do not meet the Forested Land Criteria typically fail the operability criteria as per Section 9.5 of the Forested Land Criteria and the Combined Assessment Tool:

- Macro- and meso-contours<sup>1</sup> on-site are comparable to off-site.
- Macro- and meso-contours are not affecting site management.
- Macro- and meso-contours on-site should be integrated with adjacent off-site landscape features.
- Macro- and meso-contours shall not result in excessive erosion, slumping/wasting or altered water flow patterns<sup>2</sup>.

Soil stockpiles and windrows left in place can also result in the site failing to meet topsoil depth and distribution criteria (refer to the Topsoil Depth and Distribution Information Sheet).

---

<sup>1</sup> Soil stockpiles are typically considered at the macro- and meso- contour level as they tend to be >10 m long.

<sup>2</sup> There are specific criteria for these impacts (i.e., erosion, slumping and altered water flow patterns) in Sections 9.1, 9.2 and 9.3 of the Forested Land Criteria that soil stockpiles must also meet.



## Minimum Requirements for a Variance

A soil stockpile can be left in place with a variance if it is not limiting forest ecosystem function or equivalent land capability of the site as a whole (as discussed in Section 3) and if all of the following requirements are met:

- The site passes the Forested Land Criteria for vegetation<sup>3</sup>:
  - If the site was reclaimed prior to June 1, 2007 and was seeded with grasses: Minimum 80% compatible vegetation cover based on the seed mix and the plants are healthy<sup>4</sup>.
  - If a Natural Recovery Site (regardless of reclamation date): A minimum of 25% canopy cover of herbaceous species; and, a minimum 25% canopy cover of woody species or a minimum stem count of 5/10 m<sup>2</sup> plot (i.e., 5,000 stems/ha), and the plants are healthy.
  - If a Planted Site: A minimum of 25% canopy cover of herbaceous species; and, a minimum 25% canopy cover of woody species or a minimum stem count of 2/10 m<sup>2</sup> plot (i.e., 2,000 stems/ha), and the plants are healthy.
- **Either**
  - a) the site passes the Forested Land Criteria for topsoil depth and distribution.
- **or**
  - b) the topsoil depth and distribution are deemed acceptable, as described in the Topsoil Depth and Distribution Information Sheet.
- The soil stockpile presents a low risk to the safety of wildlife, livestock or recreational and traditional users (including ATV/UTV/snowmobile users). As such, soil stockpiles can only be left in place if they have gentle slopes that are <3:1 or 33%.

There are a few exceptions to this based on a risk-management approach: The risk associated with a safety hazard has two components: probability (i.e., likelihood of occurrence) and severity (i.e., consequences of occurrence). Although the severity of an individual subsided area remains constant unless reclamation activities are conducted to remove it, the probability of occurrence is affected by the location of the site. Sites that have a low likelihood of land users encountering the safety hazard have a reduced level of risk and can be treated differently than sites with a greater likelihood of land users encountering the safety hazard. Sites can be considered to have a

---

<sup>3</sup> It is possible for a site to fail the vegetation criteria but still receive a variance for soil stockpiles if, for example, the vegetation failure occurs on a different area of the site or if the vegetation failure is not caused by the soil stockpile (e.g., sparse desirable herbaceous vegetation due to the low productivity site conditions); professional judgment should be used in these cases to determine eligibility for a variance.

<sup>4</sup> Note that sites that are dominated by seeded grasses are not considered to have the same ecological value as sites that meet the natural recovery or planted vegetation criteria, and the rationale for a variance is weaker (i.e., redistribution is less of a concern). The rationale is stronger if a portion of the site or the access road has forest vegetation and meets the natural recovery or planted vegetation criteria.

low risk of safety hazards (and therefore soil stockpiles can be left in place on these sites) if they meet both of the following:

- Sites with an access road that is blocked by an access deterrent which may include (but is not limited to):
  - Large trees and/or shrubs.
  - Boulders.
  - Large soil mounds.
- Sites that are not currently within a grazing lease.
- The soil stockpile is stable:
  - Not slumping.
  - Non-erosive.
- **Either**
  - a) the soil stockpile is comparable to surrounding off-site areas with similar micro- or meso-contour, such as natural analogs to soil stockpiles including ridges, eskers and hummocky terrain. When considering the contour of surrounding off-site areas, a large enough area must be assessed to make this determination. The assessment area should not be limited solely to areas directly adjacent to the site; representative areas up to 10 km away from the site could be considered. If the size and depth of any observed natural analogs are comparable to the size and depth of the soil stockpile on-site, this can be used as a justification for leaving soil stockpiles in place. Photographs and documentation of the dimensions and location of observed natural analogs should be included in the justification submitted to the AER (as discussed in Section 4).
- **or**
  - b) the soil stockpile is not impacting drainage or hydrology for the site as a whole or off-site.
- The soil stockpile is not influencing operability of the site for current, future and potential land uses (or overlapping tenure holders).
  - Forestry: Soil stockpiles should not impede the operability of commercial forestry equipment. Operability of commercial forestry equipment is often most limited by steep slopes; stability of machinery is reduced on slopes >35% and the risk level is considered high on slopes >50% (BC Forest Safety Council, 2011). In forested areas, slopes of the soil stockpile should be <33% (<3:1).
  - Agriculture: If the site is in the White Area, there is potential for the site to be used for agriculture in the future. Soil stockpiles should not have micro- or meso-contours that would prevent the use of cultivation equipment if the site is in the White Area.

## Additional Considerations

Additional considerations for requesting/approving a variance for a soil stockpile include:

- Environmental impacts of re-entering the site to conduct reclamation activities to remove the soil stockpile.
  - Reclamation to correct a soil stockpile left in place would require that the material within the pile be spread across the site. Refer to Section 3.2 for factors to consider related to reclamation of deficiencies.
- Weed seed bank present within the soil stockpile.
  - If the seed bank within the soil stockpile contains seeds from problematic species (e.g., noxious weeds), spreading the soil stockpile will also spread these species across the site, likely resulting in the need for weed control. Negative impacts of weed control are discussed in the Problematic Species Information Sheet.
- Naturally occurring variation in micro-contour within forests in the region.
  - Regardless of whether natural analogs of soil stockpiles (i.e., natural ridges, eskers and hummocky terrain) occur in areas adjacent to the site, these natural analogs may occur within the region. Literature values for the dimensions of these features may be cited as part of the justification.
- Comparison with microtopographical features on other reclaimed/reforested sites that are similar in size to a soil stockpile (these microtopographical features are used as a means of improving revegetation success and promoting ecological diversity). Examples include:
  - Surface roughness (microtopographical heterogeneity) created during soil replacement at coal and oil sands mines.
  - Mounding or disc trenching in the forestry industry.
  - Mounding during well pad, road, pipeline, or seismic line reclamation.

If the site is eligible for a variance, the “Variance – Landscape” category in OneStop is used.



---

## WOODY DEBRIS PILES

---

**Before proceeding through this Information Sheet, refer to Sections 1 and 3 to review the purpose and scope of the guidance document and the minimum requirements for variance approval. Variances are considered and accepted under exceptional circumstances and are not meant to provide an excuse or justification for not fulfilling reclamation obligations or lack of due diligence.**

---

Woody debris piles (also sometimes referred to as wood piles or log piles) left in place are often less than 1 m high but have been observed to range up to 2 to 3 m high (Acden Vertex Limited Partnership, personal communication 2019; Figure 1). Piles are typically along the edges of wellsites, on log decks or along the edge of access roads. Woody debris piles left in place can prevent vegetation establishment within the area occupied by the pile and can be considered a fire hazard if they encroach into the surrounding undisturbed forest and act as a ladder fuel (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2018a).



Figure 1. Examples of woody debris piles left in place. Requirements and factors presented in this Information Sheet are used to determine if these are eligible to be left in place.

### Natural Analogs and Acceptable Practices in Other Industries

There are two main categories of equivalents to woody debris piles that can be examined for comparison purposes: naturally occurring windthrow within forests in the region or woody debris management practices on reclaimed or harvested sites in other industries. Naturally occurring windthrow can result in accumulation of woody debris on the soil surface.

In recent literature on OSE reclamation, windrows are proposed as an alternative to spreading for dealing with coarse woody debris at some sites (especially sites with high wood volumes) because windrows reduce the total area of soil in direct contact with coarse woody debris. Open soils are warmer which may stimulate soil productivity and aspen suckering (Frerichs, 2017; Frerichs et al., 2017).

The forestry industry is allowed to leave woody debris piles in place if they meet the *Debris Management Standards for Timber Harvest Operations* guidelines (Alberta Agriculture and Forestry, 2018b):

- Height is <2 m.

- Base diameter <3 m.
- Distance between piles is >15 m.
- Distance from standing timber is >25 m.

Note: the wildfire risk is lower for wellsites (and other non-linear associated facilities) than for cut blocks due to the smaller size of the woody debris piles typically associated with wellsites, and thus these guidelines may not be appropriate<sup>1</sup>.

Woody debris management guidelines for fence line clearing for grazing dispositions advise that for clearings between 10 and 30 m wide, the woody debris pile should be located >5 m from the edge of the clearing and should be disposed of within 24 months, while for clearings <10 m wide, the woody debris pile can remain in place provided that the woody material is within the lease boundary, piled away from standing timber, and leaners are cut and made to lie flat to the ground (Powter, personal communication 2020). An 8 m break in woody debris windrows is required every 60 m to allow for movement of wildlife and livestock.

### **Current Forested Land Criteria**

Woody debris piles left in place that fail to meet the Forested Land typically fail for debris as per Section 9.6.1 of the Forested Land Criteria and the Combined Assessment Tool:

- Coarse woody debris shall be spread over the site and may not be piled, windrowed or concentrated in one area as this may pose a fire hazard, particularly in areas near settlements.

### **Minimum Requirements for a Variance**

From a reclamation perspective, a woody debris pile can be left in place with a variance if it is not limiting forest ecosystem function or equivalent land capability of the site as a whole (as discussed in Section 3) and if all of the following requirements are met:

- The site passes the Forested Land Criteria for vegetation<sup>2</sup>:
  - If the site was reclaimed prior to June 1, 2007 and was seeded with grasses: Minimum 80% compatible vegetation cover based on the seed mix and the plants are healthy<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note the following knowledge gap: The actual level of risk of wildfire presented by small woody debris piles (i.e., <1 m tall) left in place on wellsites has not been definitively determined. Risk-based approaches based on woody debris piles generated from forestry operations may not be required for smaller woody debris piles on facilities as small as wellsites, log decks, remote sumps, etc.

<sup>2</sup> It is possible for a site to fail the vegetation criteria but still receive a variance for a woody debris pile if, for example, the vegetation failure occurs on a different area of the site or if the vegetation failure is not caused by the woody debris pile (e.g., sparse desirable herbaceous vegetation due to the low productivity site conditions); professional judgment should be used in these cases to determine eligibility for a variance.

<sup>3</sup> Note that sites that are dominated by seeded grasses are not considered to have the same ecological value as sites that meet the natural recovery or planted vegetation criteria, and the rationale for a variance is weaker (i.e., redistribution is less of a concern). The rationale is stronger if a portion of the site or the access road has forest vegetation and meets the natural recovery or planted vegetation criteria.

- If a Natural Recovery Site (regardless of reclamation date): A minimum of 25% canopy cover of herbaceous species; and, a minimum 25% canopy cover of woody species or a minimum stem count of 5/10 m<sup>2</sup> plot (i.e., 5,000 stems/ha), and the plants are healthy.
- If a Planted Site: A minimum of 25% canopy cover of herbaceous species; and, a minimum 25% canopy cover of woody species or a minimum stem count of 2/10 m<sup>2</sup> plot (i.e., 2,000 stems/ha), and the plants are healthy.
- Vegetation is growing through the woody debris pile.
- Risk of wildfire is low.
  - Factors to consider in the determination of wildfire risk include:
    - Decomposition status: Wildfire risk is lower if the woody debris pile is old and rotting.
    - Location on the site: Wildfire risk is higher if the woody debris pile is located on the edge of the site as opposed to a more central location, especially if woody debris is leaning against trees in the undisturbed forest (Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, 2008).
    - Surrounding forest type: Wildfire risk is higher if the surrounding forest is coniferous (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2018a).
    - Grass: Wildfire risk is higher if the vegetation on-site is grass dominated, particularly tall, dense grass populations as opposed to shorter and less dense grasses (Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, 2008).
    - Facility type: Wildfire risk is higher if the woody debris pile is located on an access road as opposed to a wellsite as woody debris piles on linear features can act as a wick for wildfire, resulting in long distance spread of wildfire along linear features (Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, 2008).

### **Additional Reclamation Considerations**

Additional considerations for requesting/approving a variance include:

- Environmental impacts of re-entering the site to conduct reclamation activities to remove the woody debris pile.
  - Reclamation to correct a woody debris pile left in place would require that the wood within the pile be spread across the site, which may or may not require the use of heavy machinery depending on the volume of wood in the pile. Refer to Section 3.2 for factors to consider related to reclamation of deficiencies.
- Merchantability of the timber within the woody debris pile (diameter of the logs).
  - Merchantable timber is required to be salvaged and removed; however occasionally it is left in place. It is considered less acceptable to leave merchantable timber in place in woody debris piles than non-merchantable timber.



- Acceptable woody debris management practices in other industries:
  - Use of woody debris piles (or windrows) in reclamation on OSE sites.
  - Debris management guidelines for forestry.
  - Debris management guidelines for fence line clearing for grazing dispositions.
- Naturally occurring windthrow within forests in the region.
  - Observed windthrow near the site or examples from literature may be included as part of the justification.

### **Additional Regulatory Requirements**

In addition to the requirements and factors discussed above, woody debris piles may be required to meet additional requirements through the following:

- *Master Schedule of Standards and Conditions* (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2018a).
- *Public Lands Act* (Government of Alberta, 2000c) and associated regulations.
- *Forest and Prairie Protection Act* (Government of Alberta, 2000b) and associated regulations.
- *Forests Act* (Government of Alberta, 2000a) and associated regulations.

If the site is eligible for a variance, the “Variance – Landscape” category in OneStop is used.

---

## TOPSOIL DEPTH AND DISTRIBUTION

---

**Before proceeding through this Information Sheet, refer to Sections 1 and 3 to review the purpose and scope of the guidance document and the minimum requirements for variance approval. Variances are considered and accepted under exceptional circumstances and are not meant to provide an excuse or justification for not fulfilling reclamation obligations or lack of due diligence.**

---

The Forested Land Criteria requires that the forest floor (LFH) and topsoil (A horizons) are salvaged and replaced on-site; however, there are several instances when forest floor and topsoil may not be replaced or when the soil that is replaced may not meet the definition of topsoil as it is admixed with subsoil horizons:

- Topsoil may not have been salvaged or stockpiled on sites constructed prior to April 30, 1994, and thus is not available for replacement.
- A mineral soil pad was constructed on top of undisturbed soils, and that mineral soil pad is to remain in place at closure. The pad would not have topsoil on it.
- Salvage of topsoil and subsoil in a single lift (i.e., salvaging topsoil and subsoil together) during construction resulted in an admixed soil with lower organic matter, altered soil texture and other modified properties no longer consistent with the original topsoil. Admixing may occur due to soil conditions and equipment limitations (e.g., topsoil in forested areas can often be less than 10 cm thick and salvaging a thin layer can be difficult or the site is only accessible in the winter and soil must be salvaged under frozen conditions).
- Soil salvage did not include the entire depth of the available topsoil horizons<sup>1</sup>; thus, there is insufficient topsoil for replacement.
- Topsoil was not replaced evenly such that portions of the site have minimal topsoil while other areas have an excess.
- No soil replacement occurred after well abandonment. While topsoil may have been salvaged and stockpiled, soil replacement did not occur prior to natural encroachment of forest vegetation; topsoil remains in place in a stockpile or windrow (refer to the Soil Stockpiles Information Sheet). This scenario is considered the least desirable and is the least likely to be eligible for a variance, although decisions should still consider all of the factors described below.

Impacts that may occur as a result of a shortage or lack of topsoil include delayed vegetation growth and establishment, reduced vegetation productivity, altered species composition or delayed successional pathways due to lack of propagules and/or lack of organic matter and nutrients to support plant growth.

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, in some cases only the LFH was salvaged and the Ae horizon was salvaged with the subsoil (or was left in place if no subsoil salvage occurred).

## Current Forested Land Criteria

Undisturbed forested soil profiles are comprised of organic forest floor horizons (L, F, H and O) above mineral Ae, Ahe or Ah horizons followed by the subsoil (mineral B horizons) as defined in the *Canadian System of Soil Classification – Third Edition* (Soil Classification Working Group, 1998). The Forested Land Criteria uses the terms topsoil and surface soil interchangeably and defines them as the “uppermost mineral material, valued as a growing medium” or as the “uppermost mineral or organic material, valued as a growing medium”<sup>2</sup>. The Forested Land Criteria also specifically defines topsoil as the “A horizon, including the Ah, Ahe and Ae horizons.” It is this last definition of topsoil that is used in evaluating topsoil depth and distribution. The off-site average topsoil depth is assessed as the combined depth of Ah, Ahe and Ae horizons but does not include LFH. Depending on how the forest floor and topsoil horizons were salvaged during construction, the replaced layer of topsoil on-site after reclamation is often a combination of the LFH and A horizons.

As per section 11.1.3.1 and Table 1 of the Forested Land Criteria and the Combined Assessment Tool, the following conditions must be met for topsoil depth and distribution:

- For sites in the Green Area, topsoil must be “adequately replaced as per topsoil depth and distribution requirements by construction date.”
  - Sites constructed prior to April 30, 1994 are “encouraged but not required to comply with soil expectations” in the Forested Land Criteria (regardless of abandonment and reclamation date). Sites that do not meet the soil criteria do not require a variance and can still be submitted as a routine (baseline review) application.
  - Sites constructed between April 30, 1994, and June 1, 2007, are “expected to comply with the soil components” in the Forested Land Criteria but “extenuating soil situations may arise”. Thus, for the site as a whole, topsoil depth should be 80% or greater than the average topsoil depth in off-site control areas, and generally, all assessment points should have at least 50% of the off-site average. Sites that do not meet the soil criteria must obtain a variance.
  - Sites constructed on or after June 1, 2007, are “required to comply with all aspects” of the Forested Land Criteria (as described in the previous bullet). Sites that do not meet the soil criteria must obtain a variance.
- For sites in the White Area, regardless of construction date, sites are “required to comply with all aspects” of the Forested Land Criteria with the following variation:
  - Sites constructed prior to April 30, 1994: “Topsoil depth replacement must have less than 40% variance between the lease mean and the control mean (i.e., Lease Mean  $\geq$  60% of Control Mean)”. Sites that do not meet these criteria must obtain a variance.

---

<sup>2</sup> These two definitions are found in different sections of the Forested Land Criteria.

- Site constructed between April 30, 1994, and June 1, 2007: “Topsoil depth replacement must have less than 20% variance between the lease mean and the control mean (i.e., Lease Mean  $\geq$  80% of Control Mean).” Sites that do not meet these criteria must obtain a variance.

When topsoil depths in off-site control areas are less than 15 cm, topsoil “must include the topsoil plus the B-horizon up to a total depth of 15 cm unless the B-horizon is considered unsuitable,” as per the Forested Land Criteria. Thus, in these instances the topsoil may be admixed but this is permissible. Despite being permissible, a variance must still be obtained because the current Record of Observation (RoO) datasheet automatically flags the parameter as a fail.

### Minimum Requirements for a Variance

If topsoil depth and distribution do not meet the Forested Land Criteria, a variance for topsoil depth and distribution could be obtained if the reduction or lack of topsoil is not limiting forest ecosystem function or equivalent land capability of the site as a whole (as discussed in Section 3) and if all of the following requirements are met:

- The site passes the Forested Land Criteria for vegetation:
  - If the site was reclaimed prior to June 1, 2007 and was seeded with grasses: Minimum 80% compatible vegetation cover based on the seed mix and the plants are healthy<sup>3</sup>.
  - If a Natural Recovery Site (regardless of reclamation date): A minimum of 25% canopy cover of herbaceous species; and, a minimum 25% canopy cover of woody species or a minimum stem count of 5/10 m<sup>2</sup> plot (i.e., 5,000 stems/ha), and the plants are healthy.
  - If a Planted Site: A minimum of 25% canopy cover of herbaceous species; and, a minimum 25% canopy cover of woody species or a minimum stem count of 2/10 m<sup>2</sup> plot (i.e., 2,000 stems/ha), and the plants are healthy.
- The site has at least five years of woody vegetation growth (based on the assessment requirements for forested land in the *Conservation and Reclamation Directive for Renewable Energy Operations*; Alberta Environment and Parks, 2018b).
- There are no rooting restrictions.
- The environmental impacts of re-entering the site to conduct reclamation activities to correct topsoil depth outweigh the benefits<sup>4</sup>.
  - Reclamation to correct insufficient topsoil depth and distribution would require that any topsoil present in on-site soil stockpiles be spread across the entire site or the portions of the

---

<sup>3</sup> Note that sites that are dominated by seeded grasses are not considered to have the same ecological value as sites that meet the natural recovery or planted vegetation criteria, and the rationale for a variance is weaker (i.e., redisturbance is less of a concern). Sites dominated by seeded grasses can still be candidates for a variance if the access road has forest vegetation and meets the natural recovery or planted vegetation criteria.

<sup>4</sup> Though not included in the other Information Sheets as a requirement to be eligible for a variance, environmental impacts are included as a requirement for topsoil depth and distribution variances to align with a vegetation override as described in the Forested Land Criteria.



site that require additional topsoil. If no topsoil is available on-site, it would have to be sourced from an alternate location and transported to the site. Refer to Section 3.2 for factors to consider related to reclamation of deficiencies.

### **Additional Considerations**

Additional considerations for requesting/approving a variance include:

- Evidence of limitations to woody vegetation growth/productivity in comparison to off-site or regional conditions.
  - One of the following metrics can be used to assess for limitations to woody vegetation growth/productivity:
    - Tree and shrub leader length indicates either sustainable growth (i.e., annual leader growth on-site is similar between years and does not significantly decrease) and/or leader growth on-site is comparable to off-site controls.
    - Mean annual increment of trees on-site in comparison to the appropriate mean annual increment standards (e.g., provincial standards defined by Stadt et al. [2014]), as per the requirements of the *Reforestation Standard of Alberta* (Alberta Agriculture and Forestry, 2018a). Note that the age of on-site trees may be variable if only a portion of the site was disturbed during reclamation; trees that established during site operation that were not disturbed during reclamation will be older than trees that established after reclamation. If on-site trees cannot be assigned a single age, examining an age range may be more appropriate (e.g., trees aged 9 to 14).
- Location of the site in terms of land designation (Green vs. White Area)
  - If the site is located in the White Area, there is potential for the site to be used for agriculture in the future. If the site does not have topsoil (or has not had topsoil replaced) this could limit its agriculture capability and thus it may not be acceptable to leave the site without topsoil (or without replacing available topsoil).
- Shallow off-site and pre-disturbance topsoil depth
  - As discussed above, the Forested Land Criteria allows admixing of topsoil with subsoil if the topsoil depth is less than 15 cm.
- Soil salvage limitations during construction
  - If soil had to be salvaged under non-ideal conditions (e.g., winter access only requiring soils to be salvaged when frozen) resulting in admixed or insufficient topsoil for replacement, the description of these extenuating circumstances supports the justification for a variance. More information on preparation of justifications for variances is provided in Section 4.
- Characteristics of the upper layer of soil on-site and comparison to off-site soil suitability criteria (e.g., *Soil Quality Relative to Disturbance and Reclamation* (Alberta Soils Advisory Committee, 1987)).

- If topsoil is not present, but soil quality characteristics on-site are comparable to off-site controls, this would support the justification that on-site soils have equivalent capability.
- Presence of soil stockpiles.
  - If topsoil was not replaced and stockpiles are present on-site, refer to Soil Stockpile Information Sheet for the minimum requirements to leave the stockpiles in place with a variance. If these criteria are not met, reclamation to spread the soil stockpiles is likely required.
- Availability of suitable topsoil for import
  - The characteristics of topsoil available for import must be carefully considered in terms of texture, nutrients, weed propagules and targeted ecosite. Use of imported topsoil should consider the trade-off between the value of increasing topsoil depth and the potential negative consequences of using topsoil that is not consistent with the control soil conditions and that is not suited for forested reclamation (e.g., agricultural topsoil).

If the site is eligible for a variance, the “Vegetation Override – Forested” category in OneStop is used.

---

## DESIRABLE HERBACEOUS SPECIES COVER

---

**Before proceeding through this Information Sheet, refer to Sections 1 and 3 to review the purpose and scope of the guidance document and the minimum requirements for variance approval. Variances are considered and accepted under exceptional circumstances and are not meant to provide an excuse or justification for not fulfilling reclamation obligations or lack of due diligence.**

---

Desirable herbaceous species are defined in the Forested Land Criteria as grass and forb species that are appropriate for the representative ecosite (e.g., the off-site ecosite). Depending on the construction and reclamation date, desirable herbaceous species may include agronomic species that were part of the seed mix (i.e., compatible species). There are several reasons why a site may have sparse desirable herbaceous species cover, many of which are not related to reclamation practices such as naturally low productivity site conditions (dry and/or low nutrient sites such as a and b ecosites in the Central Mixedwood Natural Subregion (Beckingham and Archibald, 1996)); low levels of plant propagules; or, lack of or admixing of topsoil due to unsatisfactory reclamation practices. From a landscape perspective, the impact of sparse desirable herbaceous vegetation cover could be soil erosion, if there are no other types of vegetation present on site to mitigate this potential.

A sparse desirable herbaceous species cover deficiency occurs when one (or more) of the assessment grids, does not meet the Forested Land Criteria. The discussion in this Information Sheet does not refer to small sparse areas that are not representative of the assessment grid as a whole.

### Current Forested Land Criteria

As per section 8.1 of the Forested Land Criteria, the following conditions must be met for desirable herbaceous species cover:

- If the site was reclaimed prior to June 1, 2007, and was seeded with grasses: A minimum of 80% compatible vegetation cover based on the seed mix and the plants are healthy. There are no additional requirements for woody vegetation.
- If the site was reclaimed prior to June 1, 2007 and was not seeded with grasses: A minimum of 25% canopy cover of herbaceous species and the plants are healthy, in addition to cover requirements for woody vegetation.
- If the site was reclaimed after June 1, 2007: A minimum of 25% canopy cover of herbaceous species and the plants are healthy, in addition to cover requirements for woody vegetation.

### Minimum Requirements for a Variance

If desirable herbaceous species cover does not meet the Forested Land Criteria, a variance for desirable herbaceous species cover could be obtained if the sparse desirable herbaceous vegetation cover is not

limiting forest ecosystem function or equivalent land capability of the site as a whole (as discussed in Section 3) and if the following four requirements are met:

- The sites pass the Forested Land Criteria for erosion
- The site passes the Forested Land Criteria for woody vegetation cover and/or density:
  - If a Natural Recovery Site (regardless of reclamation date): a minimum 25% canopy cover of woody species or a minimum stem count of 5/10 m<sup>2</sup> plot (i.e., 5,000 stems/ha), and the plants are healthy.
  - If a Planted Site (regardless of reclamation date): a minimum 25% canopy cover of woody species or a minimum stem count of 2/10 m<sup>2</sup> plot (i.e., 2,000 stems/ha), and the plants are healthy.
- Non-native or undesirable herbaceous species cover is less than half of the desirable herbaceous species cover.
- One or more of the following is true:
  - The combined percent cover of desirable herbaceous species and woody species is >25%.
  - The combined percent cover of desirable herbaceous species, mosses and lichens is >25%.
  - Percent cover of herbaceous species at representative off-site control points is <25% (i.e., low desirable herbaceous cover is comparable to control locations)<sup>1</sup>, for example, in low productivity a or b ecosites in the Central Mixedwood Natural Subregion (Beckingham and Archibald, 1996).
  - The site was reclaimed after June 1, 2007, but interim reclamation including revegetation with a seed mix occurred prior to June 1, 2007. In this case, the pre-2007 criteria for seeded species, requiring 80% cover of compatible vegetation based on the seed mix, can be applied to the portion(s) of the site that were seeded prior to June 1, 2007; post-2007 criteria would still apply for the remainder of the site.

### **Additional Considerations**

Additional considerations for requesting/approving a variance include:

- Environmental impacts of re-entering the site to conduct reclamation activities to correct sparse desirable herbaceous vegetation, noting that reclamation work in this case would predominantly be conducted by hand rather than with heavy equipment. Refer to Section 3.2 for factors to consider related to reclamation of deficiencies.

---

<sup>1</sup> This approach is similar to the native-infill species concept in the Native Grasslands Criteria (Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development, 2013b); acceptable levels of total desirable herbaceous cover on forested sites can be defined by the abundance of herbaceous species in off-site controls.



- Availability of suitable seed mixes
  - Commercially available native seed mixes are often grass dominated, sourced from non-local origins, and lacking the most desirable native grass species for forested environments (e.g., hairy wild rye) as well as desirable native forb species (Powter et al., 2018). Use of seed mixes should consider the trade-off between increasing total herbaceous species cover, potentially without adding truly desirable herbaceous species, with the negative consequences of increased competition for naturally recovering vegetation.

If the site is eligible for a variance, the “Variance - Other” category in OneStop is used.

---

## PROBLEMATIC SPECIES

---

**Before proceeding through this Information Sheet, refer to Sections 1 and 3 to review the purpose and scope of the guidance document and the minimum requirements for variance approval. Variances are considered and accepted under exceptional circumstances and are not meant to provide an excuse or justification for not fulfilling reclamation obligations or lack of due diligence.**

---

In addition to the more well-known noxious weeds (*Weed Control Regulation*; Government of Alberta, 2010), there are three other classifications of weeds that are used in OneStop to describe problematic vegetation (Alberta Energy Regulator, 2019b):

- Incompatible vegetation – noxious weeds.
- Incompatible vegetation – invasive species.
- Incompatible vegetation – problem introduced species.
- Incompatible vegetation – undesirable/problem weeds.

Sites with prohibited noxious weeds (as per the *Weed Control Regulation*) are not eligible for a variance and cannot be certified.

The four options could present some confusion, as the interpretation of the terms “invasive species,” “problem introduced species,” and/or “undesirable/problem weed” depends largely on the situational context of the reclamation area, its surrounding vegetation and land use, site history, natural region and subregion, previous management actions, and the species of concern. Noxious weeds, however, are a unique category in that they are defined by legislation (*Weed Control Regulation*). The other three terms were derived from previous provincial government guidance documents. Relevant literature and guidance documents pertaining to the natural subregion, county, or plant communities in question should be consulted to aid in the determination (refer to Appendix C). Ultimately the onus is on the reclamation practitioner applying for the variance to conduct due diligence to understand if and how problematic vegetation may be classified in terms of these definitions.

All four categories of species can be problematic to reclamation areas due to their highly aggressive colonization potential, ability to decrease biodiversity, and in some instances the potential to be allelopathic (i.e., inhibit other species from germinating or growing). Problematic species can compete with desirable vegetation onsite and slow vegetation recovery to targeted forest ecosystems and have the potential to spread off-site into adjacent undisturbed areas, necessitating control. Problematic vegetation species of any of the four categories should not be included in the RoO as desirable species cover, unless they can be considered compatible species as defined in the Forested Land Criteria

### *Noxious weeds*

The *Weed Control Regulation* lists the plant species that are designated as noxious weeds in Alberta. The *Weed Control Regulation* also provides authority for a municipality to designate plants that are not listed as weeds in the *Weed Control Regulation* as noxious weeds (and to change the designation of noxious weeds to prohibited noxious weeds).

### *Invasive species*

The “invasive species” term has not often been formally codified as its usage is broad and subjective and can be used to refer to any number of non-native aggressively colonizing species, particularly those that “displace the original structure of the plant community” (Powter, 2002). Practitioners should conduct due diligence in preparing their professional justification for a variance request to understand if a species of concern may be considered an invasive in the specific region and plant community.

### *Problem Introduced Species*

Most often, this label encompasses agronomic species that mount considerable invasion pressure in forested areas. Alberta Environment (2003) defines problem introduced plants as forage plants that were introduced for crop or forage production purposes, and either invade or persist in native plant communities. Examples of plants that have been identified as problematic in the Central Parkland and Foothills regions include sweet clover, alsike clover, timothy, smooth brome, and reed canary grass (although the latter is actually a native species, it is used as a forage species).

### *Undesirable/Problem Weeds*

In the context of reclaiming a forested ecosystem, if an invading species is not listed as a prohibited noxious or noxious weed and is not agronomic in nature then the species can be considered an undesirable/problem weed. Specific counties or regions can consider species to be undesirable/problem weeds, even if they are not listed as noxious or prohibited noxious in legislation. Practitioners are encouraged to consult relevant native plant community guides, as well as speak to local authorities, weed inspectors or public land managers to understand if the species of concern is labeled as undesirable in the area that they are seeking to reclaim.

## **Current Forested Land Criteria**

For noxious weeds, both the requirements of the Forested Land Criteria (Section 10.4) and the *Weed Control Act* (Government of Alberta, 2008) must be met:

- Noxious weeds must be controlled on-site.
- Noxious weed ratings<sup>1</sup> on-site must be comparable to those off-site: the average rating on-site cannot be greater than the average rating off-site, and the difference in the average ratings between on-site and off-site must be <0. For example, if one off-site assessment point has a noxious weeds rating of 4, there could be noxious weeds present on-site but these must have ratings <4.

It is important to note that the *Weed Control Act* defines “control” differently than “destroy,” as follows:

1(c)<sup>2</sup> “control” means

(i) to inhibit the growth or spread, or

---

<sup>1</sup> Ratings are used in the Forested Land Criteria to assess various parameters, including noxious and other weeds.

<sup>2</sup> Numbers and letters appearing at the start of the excerpt refer to a specific section of the referenced legislation.

(ii) to destroy;

(d) “destroy” means

(i) to kill all growing parts, or

(ii) to render reproductive mechanisms non-viable;

For the other weed categories, the following conditions must be met, as per Section 10.4 of the Forested Land Criteria:

- Invasive species, problem introduced species and undesirable/problem weeds must be controlled so that they do not impede operability, management or the functioning of the native plant community.
- Invasive species, problem introduced species and undesirable/problem weeds should not require a change in management practice on-site compared to off-site.
- There cannot be a difference >2 ratings categories between the lowest control rating and the lowest rating at any assessment point on the lease. The difference in average ratings between on-site and off-site must be <0.30 (or 0.15, depending on sample intensity).

The Forested Land Criteria provides an additional list of conditions that, if all are met, can allow a site to pass the assessment and the application can be submitted through the baseline review process, even if the site does not meet the previously stated criteria for noxious weeds or other weed categories:

- The site is on Public Lands (excluding Provincial Parks and Protected Areas).
- The site has met Criteria for all other parameters being assessed.
- The site fails the comparison for controlled<sup>3</sup> and/or undesirable problem weeds that are resulting from a single source of weeds from off-site.

### **Minimum Requirements for a Variance**

If problematic species do not meet the Forested Land Criteria, or the three additional conditions specified in the Criteria, the site can be eligible for a variance to allow problematic species to be left in place without further reclamation, if all of the following requirements are met:

- The site is passing the Forested Land Criteria for vegetation (excluding weeds), which should be an indicator that the site is on a trajectory towards native species dominance:
  - If a Natural Recovery Site (regardless of reclamation date): A minimum of 25% canopy cover of herbaceous species; and, a minimum 25% canopy cover of woody species or a minimum stem count of 5/10 m<sup>2</sup> plot (i.e., 5,000 stems/ha), and the plants are healthy.

---

<sup>3</sup> While the Forested Land Criteria uses the term “controlled” weeds in this clause rather than “noxious” weeds, the application of this clause to noxious weeds is implied.



- If a Planted Site: A minimum of 25% canopy cover of herbaceous species; and, a minimum 25% canopy cover of woody species or a minimum stem count of 2/10 m<sup>2</sup> plot (i.e., 2,000 stems/ha), and the plants are healthy.
- **Either a) the growth and spread of weeds is inhibited (as per the definition of control noted above).** The following factors can be used to make this determination, keeping in mind that control does not require complete elimination:
  - Trends over time.
    - Spread of weeds can be considered to be inhibited if their abundance on-site is decreasing over time. Data from multiple assessments is needed to demonstrate trends in abundance over time.
  - Distribution of weeds and native vegetation on-site.
    - Weed populations are less likely to grow and spread if the plants on-site are present as scattered individuals among native vegetation, forming only small patches (<4 m<sup>2</sup>). Weeds are also easier to control if the plants that are present on-site are not flowering and appear to have reduced vigour (e.g., leaves appear limp and/or reduced in size).
    - When native vegetation completely covers the site and there are no sparse or bare patches to provide a receptive seed bed for weeds to establish, the likelihood of weed populations colonizing and spreading on-site is reduced (Haeussler et al., 1999; Sumners and Archibold, 2007), likely by the competitive pressure exerted by the native vegetation.
  - Movement of noxious weeds into off-site areas (applies to noxious weeds only).
    - If there is evidence of the noxious weed population moving from the site into adjacent off-site areas, the growth and spread of noxious weeds cannot be considered to be inhibited. Literature has shown that non-native and invasive plants (i.e., noxious weeds) have typically not been observed, or have been found in low numbers, more than 20 to 30 m from boreal forest edges, suggesting that weed growth and development is not supported by the mature forested environment (Small et al., 2018).
    - Noxious weed populations located on or near linear features are considered more likely to spread (especially to non-forested areas) and are more difficult to justify leaving them in place.
  - Potential for third party activity to spread the weeds from the site to off-site areas (applies to noxious weeds only).
    - If there is no evidence of third-party activity in and around the site, the potential for the spread of the noxious weed into off-site areas is reduced.

- **Or b) The source of weeds is shown to be third-party activity<sup>4</sup>.** Weeds can be considered to be the result of third-party impacts if:
  - Weeds are present on a nearby public highway, on an access road on the way to the site or on other facilities that share the same access route (unless the source is a wellsite or access road that is owned by the same entity as the site seeking the variance), and there is a vector that could spread the weeds to the site (wind, water, animals, humans, etc.). Wind dispersal distances of species such as perennial sow-thistle and Canada thistle have been recorded in the literature as approximately 10 m (Becker et al., 2008; Moore, 1975; Sheldon and Burrows, 1973); however, helicopters can create wind currents that may spread these species further than reported in the literature, in addition to acting as a vector between sites in and of themselves.
  - Grazing activity is occurring on-site or nearby (e.g., within 100 m), acting as an ongoing source of weeds.
  - There is evidence of third-party or recreational traffic (e.g., ATV/UTV tracks) on the site which has resulted in the introduction of weeds.

If third-party sources of weeds are not being controlled (whether due to unsuccessful past treatments or through lack of control efforts) it would be extremely difficult for the operator to reduce the impacts and the spread of the weeds onto the site seeking certification.

### **Additional Considerations**

Additional considerations for requesting/approving a variance include:

- Whether the cover of weeds is expected to out-compete or adversely affect the growth and development of desirable native vegetation.
  - The phenology and ecology of the invading weed species affects its potential to impact the ability of a developing forest environment to meet equivalent land capability (refer to *Optimizing Weed Control for Progressive Reclamation: Literature Review* (Small et al., 2018) and associated references for a discussion of the nature of weed growth in forested ecosystems).
    - There are three questions to consider:
 

Will the species adversely affect the growth and development of a forest canopy through aggressive growth and shading?

Is the species known to have allelopathic properties that inhibit germination of forest understory species?

---

<sup>4</sup> Third party impacts are defined in the Terms and Acronyms section of this document. Further discussion of what constitutes third-party activity and the operator's responsibilities are described in the *Conservation and Reclamation Information Letter: Third Party Impact on Reclamation* (Alberta Environment, 1997).

What is the shade tolerance profile for the species – will it die off when shaded by a canopy?

For example, perennial sow-thistle and scentless chamomile are aggressive, shade-intolerant species that can quickly colonize large areas of land, despite herbicide application and other control efforts. However, these species are not known to suppress growth of tree seedlings or understory shrubs (MacFarlane, 2003, cited in Langor et al., 2014), and so although they are strong colonizers, they will eventually be outcompeted by the developing forest canopy of the reclamation area (Small et al., 2018). Conversely, species that grow very tall and in very thick, dense patches (such as white sweet clover, although not a noxious weed) show real potential to suppress growth of planted tree or shrub seedlings and therefore affect the development of equivalent land capability. Meeting target (planting) densities for woody species and abundance criteria for herbaceous species are both lines of evidence that forest development would not be impeded by a problematic species invasion.

- Site condition.
  - When there are poor soil conditions on-site (e.g., rooting restrictions, low nutrient and organic matter status), growth of forest vegetation may be reduced or limited, which may create an opportunity for weed species, many of which rely on shallow root systems, to take advantage of the lack of competition to establish themselves (Small et al., 2018); note that resource availability can change the competitive dynamics between species and impact the outcome of competition depending on the species involved (Buss et al., 2018).
- Previous weed control on the site.
  - Previous attempts at control demonstrate proactive efforts on the part of the operator to control weeds.
  - Weed populations that persist over time even with weed control can still be considered to be controlled as per the *Weed Control Act* if their growth and spread are inhibited, as discussed above.
- Negative consequences of continued weed control.
  - Damage and mortality of desirable native vegetation from herbicide overspray, particularly as a result of broadcast spraying.
  - Impacts to ecological recovery. Direct effects of herbicide include the reduction in cover and species richness of non-target vegetation species, impacts to soil microbial communities, and potential toxic effects to wildlife. The removal of native forbs, shrubs or trees impacts the composition, structure and function of the plant community and can alter the successional pathway of the site as a whole, which then has impacts on wildlife forage, habitat provision and biodiversity (Alberta Sustainable Resource Development, 2004; Helander et al., 2012; Miller and Miller, 2004;).

- Delay in reclamation certification application by at least one growing season as per the Forested Land Criteria.
- Damage to the access road required to re-enter the site to conduct weed control.
  - Damage to the access road is considered more severe if a forested vegetation community (tree and shrubs) has established on the access road or if the access road crosses sensitive environments (e.g., peatlands, wetlands or creeks).
  - Longer access roads require more disturbance than shorter access roads.
  - Damage to the access road can result in continued spreading of weed seeds via equipment used to access the site

In preparing the professional justification for a variance request for weeds, the applicant should include data, photos, historical weed management information, and any other supporting information that clearly indicates that the weeds originate from an off-site location, and that they were not associated with or introduced from the reclamation area itself, if applicable. More information on data required for a professional justification can be found in Section 4.



## **Knowledge Gaps**

There are a few species that are designated as noxious weeds or undesirable/problem weeds that likely will not impede forest development or the establishment of equivalent land capability. These are weeds, such as scentless chamomile or perennial sow-thistle, that are not shade tolerant and do not grow thick enough to out-compete woody stems (Schoonmaker et al. 2018; Small et al. 2018). However, there are knowledge gaps surrounding the interaction and growth dynamics between these types of weeds and the developing forest on reclamation areas. Weed control is often heavily prescribed for all noxious weeds across the province, although the establishing forest canopy may act as a significant deterrent to weed invasion itself.

---

## APPENDIX B: CHECKLIST OF KEY FACTORS BY DEFICIENCY TYPE

---

### REQUIREMENTS AND FACTORS TO CONSIDER FOR LANDSCAPE DEFICIENCIES

#### *Subsided Area, Hill Cuts, Soil Stockpiles*

- ☐ On-site vegetation
- ☐ Dimensions and characteristics of deficiency
- ☐ Slopes of deficiency
- ☐ Level of risk to the safety of recreational and traditional land users, livestock and wildlife
  - ☐ Deterrents to access
- ☐ Stability of deficiency
- ☐ Comparison to off-site conditions and/or to typical regional conditions
- ☐ Impacts of deficiency on ecological function
- ☐ Current, future and potential land uses of the site
- ☐ Consequences of re-entering the site to conduct reclamation to correct the deficiency
  - ☐ Damage to existing vegetation
  - ☐ Soil re-disturbance
  - ☐ Delayed ecological recovery
  - ☐ Rutting and compaction
  - ☐ Potential for increased recreational use
  - ☐ Weed establishment and potential need for chemical weed control
  - ☐ Potential for use of low-impact reclamation options
  - ☐ Weed seed bank present within the soil stockpile (soil stockpiles only)
  - ☐ Size of the disturbance area to correct the deficiency
- ☐ Comparison to post-reclamation conditions and features in other industries

#### *Woody Debris Piles*

- ☐ On-site vegetation
- ☐ Vegetation growth within the woody debris pile
- ☐ Dimensions and characteristics of the wood pile
- ☐ Risk of wildfire
  - ☐ Age of wood pile and decomposition status
  - ☐ Type of forest
  - ☐ Dominance of grass on-site and growth habit of grass
  - ☐ Location of the pile relative to the edge of the site and presence of leaning logs
  - ☐ Facility type
- ☐ Consequences of re-entering the site to conduct reclamation to correct the deficiency

- ☐ Damage to existing vegetation
- ☐ Delayed ecological recovery
- ☐ Rutting and compaction
- ☐ Potential for increased recreational use
- ☐ Weed establishment and potential need for chemical weed control
- ☐ Potential for use of low-impact reclamation options
- ☐ Size of the disturbance area to correct the deficiency
- ☐ Merchantability of the timber within the woody debris pile
- ☐ Management and reclamation of woody debris piles in other industries (e.g., forestry, OSE)
- ☐ Comparison to off-site conditions and/or to typical regional conditions

**REQUIREMENTS AND FACTORS TO CONSIDER FOR TOPSOIL DEPTH AND DISTRIBUTION DEFICIENCY**

- ☐ On-site vegetation
- ☐ Age of the site
- ☐ Rooting restrictions
- ☐ Consequences of re-entering the site to conduct reclamation to correct the deficiency
  - ☐ Damage to existing vegetation
  - ☐ Delayed ecological recovery
  - ☐ Rutting and compaction
  - ☐ Potential for increased recreational use
  - ☐ Weed establishment and potential need for chemical weed control
  - ☐ Potential for use of low-impact reclamation options
- ☐ Woody vegetation growth and productivity
- ☐ Current, future and potential land uses of the site
- ☐ Comparison to off-site, pre-disturbance and/or typical regional conditions
- ☐ Soil salvage limitations during construction
- ☐ Soil suitability
- ☐ Presence of soil stockpiles
- ☐ Availability of suitable topsoil

**REQUIREMENTS AND FACTORS TO CONSIDER FOR SPARSE DESIRABLE HERBACEOUS VEGETATION DEFICIENCY**

- ☐ Erosion
- ☐ On-site woody vegetation density and cover
- ☐ Non-native or undesirable herbaceous species cover
- ☐ On-site percent cover of mosses and lichens
- ☐ Off-site percent cover of herbaceous species
- ☐ Interim reclamation of portions of the site

- ☐ Consequences of re-entering the site to conduct reclamation to correct the deficiency
  - ☐ Damage to existing vegetation
  - ☐ Delayed ecological recovery
  - ☐ Rutting and compaction
  - ☐ Potential for increased recreational use
  - ☐ Weed establishment and potential need for chemical weed control
  - ☐ Potential for use of low-impact reclamation options
- ☐ Availability of suitable seed mixes

**REQUIREMENTS AND FACTORS TO CONSIDER FOR PROBLEMATIC SPECIES DEFICIENCY**

- ☐ On-site vegetation (cover, density of woody plants, presence of sparse or bare areas)
- ☐ Trends over time
- ☐ Distribution of the weed population and native vegetation on-site
- ☐ Movement of noxious weeds into off-site areas
- ☐ Third party activity
  - ☐ As a dispersal agent of noxious weeds
  - ☐ As a source of weeds
- ☐ Problematic species, phenology and ecology
- ☐ Impacts of weeds on on-site vegetation and ecosystem development
- ☐ Site and soil conditions
- ☐ Previous weed control on the site
- ☐ Negative consequences of continued weed control
- ☐ Damage to the access road required to access the site to conduct weed control

---

## APPENDIX C: ADDITIONAL READING

---

The following is a list of references, sorted by category, that may be helpful in understanding forest ecology and in justifying reclamation deficiencies from an ecological perspective.

### ***Forest Dynamics***

Chen, H.Y.H and R.V. Popadiouk. 2002. Dynamics of North American Boreal Mixedwoods. *Environmental Reviews* 10: 137-166.

Hart, S.A. and H.Y.H. Chen. 2006. Understory Vegetation Dynamics of North American Boreal Forests. *Critical Reviews in Plant Sciences* 25: 381-397.

### ***Ecological Recovery in Forests***

Alberta Environment. 2010. Guidelines for Reclamation to Forest Vegetation in the Athabasca Oil Sands Region, 2nd Edition. Prepared by the Terrestrial Subgroup of the Reclamation Working Group of the Cumulative Environmental Management Association, Fort McMurray, Alberta. 332 pp. Available at: <https://open.alberta.ca/dataset/966069fc-7910-4fc5-85da-3a717bfbddc5/resource/1056c2a6-0815-4d0a-ab0c-80938e1e5bd1/download/8269.pdf>.

Bergeron, Y., H.Y.H. Chen, N.C. Kenkel, A.L. Leduc and S.E. Macdonald. 2014. Boreal Mixedwood Stand Dynamics: Ecological Processes Underlying Multiple Pathways. *The Forestry Chronicle* 90: 202-213.

Macdonald, E., S. Quideau and S. Landhäusser. 2012. Rebuilding Boreal Forest Ecosystems after Industrial Disturbance. Chapter 7 In: *Restoration and Reclamation of Boreal Ecosystems: Attaining Sustainable Development*. Vitt, D.H. and J.S Bhatti (Editors). Cambridge University Press, New York. pp. 123-160.

### ***Upland Wellsite and In-situ Reclamation***

Tokay, H., C.B. Powter, B. Xu, B. Drozdowski, D. MacKenzie and S. Levy. 2019. Evaluation of Reclamation Practices on Upland and Peatland Wellsites. Prepared for the Petroleum Technology Alliance of Canada, Calgary, Alberta. 221 pp.

Cenovus Energy. 2016. OSE Visual Reference Guide. Cenovus Energy, Calgary, Alberta. 24 pp. Available at: <https://www.cenovus.com/news/docs/oil-sands-exploration-visual-reference-guide.pdf>.

Frerichs, L.A., E.W. Bork, T.J. Osko and M.A. Naeth. 2017. Effects of Boreal Well Site Reclamation Practices on Long-Term Planted Spruce and Deciduous Tree Regeneration. *Forests* 8(201). Available at: <https://www.mdpi.com/1999-4907/8/6/201/pdf>.

Jones, C.E., S. Bachmann, V.J. Liefers and S.M. Landhäusser. 2018. Rapid Understory Plant Recovery Following Forest Floor Protection on Temporary Drilling Pads. *Restoration Ecology* 26: 48–55.

MacKenzie, D. and K. Renkema. 2013. In-Situ Oil Sands Extraction Reclamation and Restoration Practices and Opportunities Compilation. Canada's Oil Sands Innovation Alliance, Edmonton, Alberta. 80 pp. plus appendices. Available at: [https://www.cosia.ca/sites/default/files/attachments/COSIA\\_In-Situ\\_Extraction\\_Reclamation\\_and\\_Restoration\\_Compilation.pdf](https://www.cosia.ca/sites/default/files/attachments/COSIA_In-Situ_Extraction_Reclamation_and_Restoration_Compilation.pdf).



Osko, T. and M. Glasgow. 2010. Removing the Wellsite Footprint: Recommended Practices for Construction and Reclamation of Wellsites on Upland Forests in Boreal Alberta. University of Alberta, Department of renewable Resources, Edmonton, Alberta. 57 pp. plus appendices. Available at: [http://www.biology.ualberta.ca/faculty/stan\\_boutin/ilm/uploads/footprint/Upland Recommendations - Final Revised - Small File.pdf](http://www.biology.ualberta.ca/faculty/stan_boutin/ilm/uploads/footprint/Upland Recommendations - Final Revised - Small File.pdf).

Osko, T., M. Pyper and S. Odsen. 2018. Faster Forests: A Visual Guide to Improved Construction and Reclamation Practices on Oil Sands Exploration Sites. Prepared for the Faster Forests Program. 28 pp.

### ***Plant Community and Natural Subregion Guides***

Beckingham, J.D. and J.H. Archibald. 1996. Field Guide to Ecosites of Northern Alberta. Special Report 5. Canadian Forest Service Northwest Region Northern Forestry Centre, Edmonton, Alberta.

Beckingham, J.D., I.G.W. Corns and J.H. Archibald. 1996. Field Guide to Ecosites of West-Central Alberta. Special Report 9. Natural Resources Canada, Canadian Forest Service, Northern Forestry Centre, Edmonton, Alberta.

Moisey, D., J. Young, D. Lawrence, C. Stone, M.G. Willoughby, A. Book. 2016. Guide to Range Plant Community Types and Carrying Capacity for the Dry and Central Mixedwood Subregions in Alberta. 8<sup>th</sup> Approximation. Alberta Environment and Parks, Boreal Rangeland Resource Stewardship Section. Available at: <https://open.alberta.ca/publications/9781460129760>

Natural Regions Committee. 2006. Natural Regions and Subregions of Alberta. Pub. No. T/852. Comp. D.J. Downing and W.W. Pettapiece, Government of Alberta. Available at: [https://www.albertaparks.ca/media/2942026/nrsrcomplete\\_may\\_06.pdf](https://www.albertaparks.ca/media/2942026/nrsrcomplete_may_06.pdf)

Willoughby, M.G., J.D. Beckingham, J.H. Archibald, D. Moisey, J. Young, D. Lawrence, C. Stone and A. Book. 2019. Guide to Ecological Sites of the Dry Mixedwood Subregion. 2nd Approximation. Alberta Environment and Parks, Rangeland Resource Stewardship Section, Lands Division. Edmonton, Alberta. Available at: <https://open.alberta.ca/publications/9781460146484>

Willoughby, M.G., J.D. Beckingham, J.H. Archibald, D. Moisey, J. Young, D. Lawrence, C. Stone and A. Book. 2019. Guide to Ecological Sites of the Central Mixedwood Subregion. 2nd Approximation. Alberta Environment and Parks, Rangeland Resource Stewardship Section, Lands Division. Edmonton, Alberta. Available at: <https://open.alberta.ca/publications/9781460146477>.

Willoughby, M.G., J.H. Archibald, G.D. Klappstein, I.G.W. Corns, J.D. Beckingham and T.L. France. 2020. Guide to Ecological Sites of the Lower Foothills Subregion. Third Approximation. Alberta Environment and Parks, Edmonton, Alberta. Available at: <https://open.alberta.ca/publications/9781460147252>

### ***Windthrow***

Some examples of papers that provide dimensions of windthrow mound and pit microtopography are listed below, organized by specific forest types.

Aspen-dominated boreal forests (28-year-old):

Lee, P. and K. Sturgess. 2002. The Effects of Logs, Stumps, and Root Throws on Understory Communities within 28-Year-Old Aspen-Dominated Boreal Forests. *Canadian Journal of Botany* 79: 905-916.

Black spruce-balsam fir boreal forest (eastern Canada):

Waldron, K. J.-C. Ruel and S. Gauthier. 2013. Forest Structural Attributes after Windthrow and Consequences of Salvage Logging. *Forest Ecology and Management* 289: 28-37.

Pine dominated boreal forests in Finland:

Kuuluvainen, T. and P. Juntunen. 1998. Seedling Establishment in Relation to Microhabitat Variation in a Windthrow Gap in a Boreal *Pinus Sylvestris* Forest. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 9: 551-562.

***Microtopography (site preparation, mounding, etc.)***

Bentham, P. and B. Coupal. 2015. Habitat Restoration as a Key Conservation Lever for Woodland Caribou: A Review of Restoration Programs and Key Learnings from Alberta. *Rangifer* 35: 123-148.

DeLong, H.B., V.J. Lieffers and P.V. Blenis. 1997. Microsite Effects on First-Year Establishment and Overwinter Survival of White Spruce in Aspen-Dominated Boreal Mixedwoods. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 27: 1452–1457.

Gradowski, T., D. Sidders, T. Keddy, V.J. Lieffers and S.M. Landhäusser. 2008. Effects of Overstory Retention and Site Preparation on Growth of Planted White Spruce Seedlings in Deciduous and Coniferous Dominated Boreal Plains Mixedwoods. *Forest Ecology and Management* 255: 3744-3749.

Melnik, K., S.M. Landhäusser and K. Devito. 2018. Role of Microtopography in the Expression of Soil Propagule Banks on Reclamation Sites. *Restoration Ecology* 26: S200-S210.

Natural Resources Canada. 2019. Site Preparation for Restoring Forest Cover on Oil and Gas Sites. Natural Resources Canada. 38 pp. Available at: <https://cfs.nrcan.gc.ca/pubwarehouse/pdfs/39507.pdf>

Schott, K.M., J. Karst and S.M. Landhäusser. 2014. The Role of Microsite Conditions in Restoring Trembling Aspen (*Populus Tremuloides* Michx) from Seed. *Restoration Ecology* 22: 292-295.

***Woody Debris Management***

Frerichs, L.A. 2017. Decadal Assessment of Successional Development on Reclaimed Upland Boreal Well Sites. M.Sc. Thesis. Department of Renewable Resources, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta. 144 pp. plus appendices. Available at: [https://era.library.ualberta.ca/items/30fb8946-3f74-437d-9d4a-41622810385d/view/11e56e33-7c34-4899-bb65-eed88d69279c/Frerichs\\_Laurie\\_A\\_201701\\_MSc.pdf](https://era.library.ualberta.ca/items/30fb8946-3f74-437d-9d4a-41622810385d/view/11e56e33-7c34-4899-bb65-eed88d69279c/Frerichs_Laurie_A_201701_MSc.pdf).

Frerichs, L.A., E.W. Bork, T.J. Osko and M.A. Naeth. 2017. Effects of Boreal Well Site Reclamation Practices on Long-Term Planted Spruce and Deciduous Tree Regeneration. *Forests* 8(201). Available at: <https://www.mdpi.com/1999-4907/8/6/201/pdf>.

Vinge, T. and M. Pyper. 2012. Managing Woody Materials on Industrial Sites: Meeting Economic, Ecological, and Forest Health Goals Through a Collaborative Approach. University of Alberta, Department of Renewable Resources, Edmonton, Alberta.

### ***Topsoil and Forest Recovery***

Forest Landings in Northeastern British Columbia:

- Bulmer, C.E. and M. Krzic. 2003. Soil Properties and Lodgepole Pine Growth on Rehabilitated Landings in Northeastern British Columbia. *Canadian Journal of Soil Science* 83: 465-474
- Bulmer, C. E., M.G. Schmidt, B. Kishchuk, and C. Preston. 1998. Impacts of Blading and Burning Site Preparation on Soil Properties and Site Productivity in the Sub-boreal Spruce Zone of Central British Columbia. Inf. Rep. BC-X-377. Canadian Forest Service, Victoria, British Columbia.
- Bulmer, C., L. Venner and C. Prescott, 2007. Forest Soil Rehabilitation with Tillage and Wood Waste Enhances Seedling Establishment but Not Height After 8 Years. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 37: 1894-1906.
- Campbell, D.B., C.E. Bulmer, M.D. Jones, L.J. Philip and J.J. Zwiazek. 2008. Incorporation of Topsoil and Burn-Pile Debris Substantially Increases Early Growth of Lodgepole Pine on Landings. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 38: 257-267.

Capping studies in the oil sands:

- Barber, L.A., J. Bockstette, D.O. Christensen, L.K. Tallon and S.M. Landhausser. 2015. Effect of soil cover system design on cover system performance and early tree establishment. In A.B. Fourie, M. Tibbett, L. Sawatsky and D. van Zyl (Eds), *Mine Closure 2015* (pp. 1-9). Vancouver, Canada: InfoMine Inc.
- Jones, C.E., 2016. Early Vegetation Community Development and Dispersal in Upland Boreal Forest Reclamation. M.Sc. Thesis. Department of Renewable Resources, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta. 118 pp. Available at: <https://era.library.ualberta.ca/items/3249f37b-95f2-42e6-aa0e-58357fde1ec9/download/43d6115e-0e6a-456c-b108-165f3d580450>.
- MacKenzie, D.D., 2013. Oil Sands Mine Reclamation Using Boreal Forest Surface Soil (LFH) in Northern Alberta. Ph.D. Thesis. Department of Renewable Resources, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta. 240 pp. Available at: [https://era.library.ualberta.ca/rails/active\\_storage/blobs/nvpAotmV7b6SKN7XtjA1kkLP/MacKenzie\\_Dean\\_Winter-202013.pdf](https://era.library.ualberta.ca/rails/active_storage/blobs/nvpAotmV7b6SKN7XtjA1kkLP/MacKenzie_Dean_Winter-202013.pdf).

### ***Soil Stockpiles***

- Dhar, A., P.G. Comeau, R. Vassov. 2019. Effects of Cover Soil Stockpiling on Plant Community Development Following Reclamation of Oil Sands Sites in Alberta. *Restoration Ecology* 27: 352-360.
- Frerichs, L.A. 2017. Decadal Assessment of Successional Development on Reclaimed Upland Boreal Well Sites. M.Sc. Thesis. Department of Renewable Resources, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta. 144 pp. plus appendices. Available at: [https://era.library.ualberta.ca/items/30fb8946-3f74-437d-9d4a-41622810385d/view/11e56e33-7c34-4899-bb65-eed88d69279c/Frerichs\\_Laurie\\_A\\_201701\\_MSc.pdf](https://era.library.ualberta.ca/items/30fb8946-3f74-437d-9d4a-41622810385d/view/11e56e33-7c34-4899-bb65-eed88d69279c/Frerichs_Laurie_A_201701_MSc.pdf).
- Frerichs, L.A., E.W. Bork, T.J. Osko and M.A. Naeth. 2017. Effects of Boreal Well Site Reclamation Practices on Long-Term Planted Spruce and Deciduous Tree Regeneration. *Forests* 8(201). Available at: <https://www.mdpi.com/1999-4907/8/6/201/pdf>.

MacKenzie, D.D. and M.A. Naeth. 2019. Native seed, soil and atmosphere respond to boreal forest topsoil (LFH) storage. PLoS ONE 14: e0220367.

Thurber Consultants Ltd., Land Resources Network Ltd. and Norwest Soil Research Ltd. 1990. Review of the Effects of Storage on Topsoil Quality, RRTAC 90-5. Prepared for the Alberta Land Conservation and Reclamation Council, Edmonton, Alberta. 116 pp. Available at: <http://hdl.handle.net/10402/era.22608>

### ***Forestry Standards/Tree Growth and Yield***

Alberta Agriculture and Forestry. 2018a. Reforestation Standard of Alberta. Alberta Agriculture and Forestry, Forestry Division, Forest Management Branch, Edmonton, Alberta. 376 pp. Available at: [https://www1.agric.gov.ab.ca/\\$department/deptdocs.nsf/all/formain15749/\\$FILE/reforestation-standard-alberta-may1-2018.pdf](https://www1.agric.gov.ab.ca/$department/deptdocs.nsf/all/formain15749/$FILE/reforestation-standard-alberta-may1-2018.pdf).

Government of Alberta. 2019. Growth and Yield Projection Systems. Available at: <https://www.alberta.ca/growth-and-yield-projection-system.aspx>

Stadt., K.J., T. Nunifu and D. Aitkin. 2014. Mean Annual Increment Standards for Crown Forest Management Units. Government of Alberta, Environment and Sustainable Resource Development, Edmonton, Alberta. 38 pp.

### ***Weed Category Guides***

Adams, B.W., G. Ehler, C. Stone, D. Lawrence, M. Alexander, M. Willoughby, C. Hincz, D. Moisey, A. Burkinshaw, J. Carlson, K. France, 2009. Rangeland Health Assessment for Grassland, Forest and Tame Pasture. Alberta Sustainable Resource Development, Lands Division, Rangeland Management Branch. 128 pp. Available at: <https://open.alberta.ca/publications/0778528480-2009>

Alberta Environment. 2003. Problem Introduced Forages on Prairie and Parkland Reclamation Sites: Guidance for Non-Cultivated Land. Alberta Environment, Edmonton, Alberta. 3 pp. Available at: <https://open.alberta.ca/dataset/fe3da282-d974-46ae-bca1-6446cacee828/resource/6defb0e-91ee-49d5-b4de-f6c4458b1bdf/download/problemintroducedforages-sep2003.pdf>

### ***Information on Specific Weed Species***

Alberta Biodiversity Monitoring Institute. 2018a. Scentless Chamomile (*Tripleurospermum inodorum*). Available at: <https://abmi.ca/home/data-analytics/biobrowser-home/species-profile?tsn=99004519>

Alberta Biodiversity Monitoring Institute. 2018b. Perennial Sow Thistle (*Sonchus arvensis*). Available at: <https://abmi.ca/home/data-analytics/biobrowser-home/species-profile?tsn=99004587>

Alberta Biodiversity Monitoring Institute. 2018c. Common Tansy (*Tanacetum vulgare*). Available at: <https://abmi.ca/home/data-analytics/biobrowser-home/species-profile?tsn=99004514>

Alberta Invasive Species Council. 2020. Noxious Species Fact Sheets. Available at: <https://abinvasives.ca/invasive-species/fact-sheets/noxious-species/>

- Becker, R.L., M.J. Haar, B.D. Kinkaid, L.D. Klossner and F. Forcella. 2008. Production and Wind Dispersal of Canada Thistle (*Cirsium arvense* L.) Achenes. Report Number MN/RC 2008-39. Prepared for the Minnesota Department of Transportation, St. Paul, Minnesota. 42 pp.
- McWilliams, J. 2004. *Sonchus arvensis*. In: Fire Effects Information System. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory. Available at: <https://www.fs.fed.us/database/feis/plants/forb/sonarv/all.html>
- Zouhar, K.. 2001. *Cirsium arvense*. In: Fire Effects Information System, [Online]. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory. Available at: <https://www.fs.fed.us/database/feis/plants/forb/cirarv/all.html>

### ***Other Weed References***

- Helander, M, K. Sakkonen and I. Saloniemi. 2012. Glyphosate in Northern Ecosystems. *Trends in Plant Science* 17: 569-574.
- Langor, D.W., E.K. Cameron, C.J.K. MacQuarrie, A. McBeath, A. McClay, B. Peter, M. Pybus, T. Ramsfield, K. Ryall, T. Scarr, D. Yemshanov, I. DeMerchant, R. Footitt and G.R. Pohl. 2014. Non-Native Species in Canada's Boreal Zone: Diversity, Impacts, and Risk. *Environmental Reviews* 22: 372-420.
- Leeson, J.Y., C. Neeser, N. Kimmel and M. Vadnais. 2010. Alberta Weed Survey: Dryland 2010. Weed Survey Series Publication 12-1. Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Saskatchewan Research Centre, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. 493 pp. Available at: <http://www.agric.gov.ab.ca/flippingbook/weed-survey/files/ab-2010-report-final.pdf>.
- MacFarlane, A.K. 2003. Vegetation Response to Seismic Lines: Edge Effects and On-Line Succession. M.Sc. Thesis. University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta. (cited in Langor et al., 2014.)
- Miller, K. V. and J.H. Miller. 2004. Forestry Herbicide Influences on Biodiversity and Wildlife Habitat Southern Forests. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 32: 1049-1060.
- Schoonmaker, A., S. Schreiber, C. Powter and B. Drozdowski. 2018. Optimizing Weed Control for Progressive Reclamation: Risk Analysis on Regulated Weeds in the Boreal Region. Prepared for Canada's Oil Sands Innovation Alliance by InnoTech Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta. 68 pp. Available at: [https://www.cosia.ca/sites/default/files/attachments/COSIA Optimizing Weed Control Risk Analysis on Regulated Weeds in the Boreal Region - 2019 01 30.pdf](https://www.cosia.ca/sites/default/files/attachments/COSIA%20Optimizing%20Weed%20Control%20Risk%20Analysis%20on%20Regulated%20Weeds%20in%20the%20Boreal%20Region%20-%202019%2001%2030.pdf).
- Small, C., D. Degenhardt, B. Drozdowski, S. Thacker, C. Powter, A. Schoonmaker and S. Schreiber. 2018. Optimizing Weed Control for Progressive Reclamation: Literature Review. Prepared for Canada's Oil Sands Innovation Alliance by InnoTech Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta. 48 pp. Available at: [https://www.cosia.ca/sites/default/files/attachments/COSIA Optimizing Weed Control Literature Review - 2019 01 30.pdf](https://www.cosia.ca/sites/default/files/attachments/COSIA%20Optimizing%20Weed%20Control%20Literature%20Review%20-%202019%2001%2030.pdf).
- Sumners, W.H. and O.W. Archibold. 2007. Exotic Plant Species in the Southern Boreal Forest of Saskatchewan. *Forest Ecology and Management* 251: 156-163



---

## APPENDIX D: VARIANCE JUSTIFICATION FORM

---

This Variance Justification Form is proposed as a new standardized form for submitting variance requests. It is based the Combined Assessment Tool (CAT) and Record of Observations (RoO) forms used for detailed site assessments (DSAs) (Alberta Energy Regulator, 2019c) and uses many of the same terminology and definitions (refer to the Forested Land Criteria for definitions).

### Variance Justification Form Instructions

All fields must be completed except for those listed as “if available” or “if applicable.”

Fill in the header and footer text with site-specific details.

#### *Site Overview*

- For the Unique ID/License No, use the following based on the facility type:
  - Wellsite: Unique Well Identifier (UWI)
  - Pipeline: Line Number
  - Other Facility: License Number
  - Oil Sands Exploration Program: Exploration Number (OSE/CEP) Number
- For the Provincial Land Use Area, enter one of the following:
  - Green Area
  - White Area
- For the Provincial Land Use Type, enter one of the following:
  - Private Land
  - Public Land
  - Public Land – Provincial Park
- For the Surface Legal Land Location, do not provide a list of all of the legal subdivisions (LSDs) in which the sites occurs, only provide the LSDs for the furthest extent of all facilities.
- Multiple entries can be made for soil classification, as needed

#### *Facility Information*

- Facilities include wellsites, access roads, remote sumps, log decks, campsites, rights-of-way, etc. All facilities associated with the wellsite should be listed here.
- Multiple entries can be made for ecosite phase or soil series, as needed

### *Site History Information*

- For Pre-existing Conditions, include any known trails or roads from recreational or traditional use, previous survey work or any other relevant third-party activity that occurred before the site was constructed.
- For Pre-existing Conditions and Pre-disturbance Biophysical Information, include any known pre-existing or pre-disturbance biophysical information that is not provided elsewhere on the form.
- For Level of Disturbance at Construction enter one of the following (refer to definitions in the Forested Land Criteria):
  - Full disturbance
  - Full disturbance; 2 lift
  - Full disturbance; 3 lift
  - Low/minimum disturbance
  - Padded
  - No disturbance
- For Level of Disturbance at Reclamation, enter one of the following (refer to definitions in the Forested Land Criteria):
  - Full disturbance
  - Minimum disturbance
  - Staged/progressive reclamation
- For Revegetation Approach, enter one of the following (refer to definitions in the Forested Land Criteria).
  - Natural recovery (use for all sites that were not seeded or planted)
  - Seeded Grasses Pre-2007
  - Planted
- Delete or add portions of the table as required based on the number of facilities.

### *Detailed Site Assessment Information*

- For Additional Site Biophysical Information, include additional data that was collected that is not required by the Forested Land Criteria such as weed species data, additional landscape, vegetation, soils or wildlife information, etc. (refer to Section 4).
- For Evidence of Third-party Use, include any evidence of trails or roads from recreational or traditional use, grazing activity, hay bales or any other relevant third-party activity that is currently present/occurring on the site.

*Justification*

- Refer to Section 4 for instructions on completing the justification.
- Use the same box to discuss all deficiencies on all facilities.

*Site Photographs*

- Additional pages of photographs can be added to the form (using the same format). There is no limit to the number of photographs that can be included.

*Sign-off*

- Fill in the information in the Person Preparing Justification portion and sign the form.
- Leave the Name of Regulatory Official Approving Variance blank

*Attached Supporting Information*

- List additional supporting information that will be attached to the form in the “Other” boxes at the bottom of the table.

## Variance Justification Form

### Site Overview

Operator							Criteria
Unique ID/ License #							Forested
Facility and Disposition							
Land Use		Surface Legal Land Locations(s) (Furthest Extent)					
Provincial Land Use Area		Qtr	LSD	Sec	Twp	Rng	Mer
Provincial Land Use Type							
Grazing Lease (Yes/No)							
Ecological Land Classification		Soil Classification					
Natural Region		Soil Order(s)					
Natural Subregion		Soil Great Group(s)					
Nearby Populated Area(s)		Overlapping Dispositions (if applicable)					
Name	Distance (km)						

### Facility Information

Facility		UTM Coordinates (NAD83)			Dimensions (m x m)	Ecosite Phase(s)	Soil Series
		Zone	Easting	Northing			
1							
2							
3							
4							

Site History Information

Facility	Survey Date	Construction Date	Abandonment Date	Reclamation Date	Revegetation Date				
1									
2									
3									
4									
<b>Facility 1</b>									
Pre-existing Conditions and Pre-disturbance Biophysical Information (if available)									
Level of Disturbance at Construction:									
Description of Construction Activities or Limitations (e.g., soil salvage limitations) (if available)									
Level of Disturbance at Reclamation:									
Description of Reclamation Activities and/or Amendments (if available)									
Description of Herbicide Application History (if applicable)									
Revegetation Approach:									
Description of Revegetation Activities									
<b>Facility 2</b>									
Pre-existing Conditions and Pre-disturbance Biophysical Information (if available)									
Level of Disturbance at Construction:									
Description of Construction Activities or Limitations (e.g., soil salvage limitations) (if available)									
Level of Disturbance at Reclamation:									

<b>Description of Reclamation Activities and/or Amendments (if available)</b>	
<b>Description of Herbicide Application History (if applicable)</b>	
<b>Revegetation Approach:</b>	
<b>Description of Revegetation Activities</b>	
<b>Facility 3</b>	
<b>Pre-existing Conditions and Pre-disturbance Biophysical Information (if available)</b>	
<b>Level of Disturbance at Construction:</b>	
<b>Description of Construction Activities or Limitations (e.g., soil salvage limitations) (if available)</b>	
<b>Level of Disturbance at Reclamation:</b>	
<b>Description of Reclamation Activities and/or Amendments (if available)</b>	
<b>Description of Herbicide Application History (if applicable)</b>	
<b>Revegetation Approach:</b>	
<b>Description of Revegetation Activities</b>	
<b>Facility 4</b>	
<b>Pre-existing Conditions and Pre-disturbance Biophysical Information (if available)</b>	
<b>Level of Disturbance at Construction:</b>	



<b>Description of Construction Activities or Limitations</b> (e.g., soil salvage limitations) (if available)	
<b>Level of Disturbance at Reclamation:</b>	
<b>Description of Reclamation Activities and/or Amendments</b> (if available)	
<b>Description of Herbicide Application History</b> (if applicable)	
<b>Revegetation Approach:</b>	
<b>Description of Revegetation Activities</b>	

**Detailed Site Assessment Information** (if available)

Facility		Category Failed (Yes/No)			
		Landscape	Vegetation	Level 1 Soil	Level 2 Soil
1					
2					
3					
4					
<b>Landscape Assessment Date</b>		<b>Soils Assessment Date</b>		<b>Vegetation Assessment Date</b>	
<b>Additional Site Biophysical Information</b>					
<b>Evidence of Third-party Use</b>					

**Justification**

<b>Deficiency Type</b>	
<b>Current Criteria Requirements</b>	
<b>Description of Deficiency</b> (including location and extent/dimensions of the deficiency)	
<b>Rationale for Variance</b>	
<b>Literature or Case Studies Cited</b>	

### Site Photographs



Photo 1. Photo caption

Photo Date: Month Day, Year



Photo 2. Photo caption

Photo Date: Month Day, Year

### Site Photographs




Photo 3. Photo caption

Photo Date: Month Day, Year



Photo 4. Photo caption

Photo Date: Month Day, Year

**Sign-off**

Person Preparing Justification		
	Name (Print)	Title
	Signature	Date (mm/dd/yyyy)
Name of Regulatory Official Approving Variance		
	Name	Date (mm/dd/yyyy)

**Attached Supporting Information**

<input type="checkbox"/>	Site diagram (including overlapping dispositions, location of deficiency, comparable condition off-site)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Survey plans
<input type="checkbox"/>	Detailed Site Assessment (DSA), including combined assessment tool (CAT) and record of observation (RoO) and any supporting reports (e.g., Phase I Environmental Site Assessments, previous DSAs)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Aerial photographs
<input type="checkbox"/>	Construction records
<input type="checkbox"/>	Pre-disturbance biophysical information
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: