

Bringing fire risk mitigation into forest management in northwestern Ontario: A summary report of a workshop held at the Dryden Fire Management Centre in Dryden, Ontario on November 19, 2025



Information Report IR-36
Science and Research Branch
Ministry of Natural Resources

Ontario

Science and Research Information Report IR-36

Bringing fire risk mitigation into forest management in northwestern Ontario

A summary report of a workshop held at the Dryden Fire Management Centre in Dryden, Ontario on November 19, 2025

Centre for Northern Forest Ecosystem Research

2026

Science and Research Branch

Ministry of Natural Resources

© 2026, King's Printer for Ontario

Copies of this publication are available from info.mnrscience@ontario.ca.

Cette publication hautement spécialisée, Bringing Fire Risk Mitigation into Forest Management in Northwestern Ontario: A Summary Report of a Workshop Held at the Dryden Fire Management Centre in Dryden, Ontario on November 19 2025, n'est disponible qu'en anglais conformément au Règlement 671/92, selon lequel il n'est pas obligatoire de la traduire en vertu de la Loi sur les services en français. Pour obtenir des renseignements en français, veuillez communiquer avec le ministère des Richesses naturelles au info.mnrscience@ontario.ca.

Some of the information in this document may not be compatible with assistive technologies. If you need any of the information in an alternate format, please contact info.mnrscience@ontario.ca.

Cite this report as:

> Centre for Northern Forest Ecosystem Research. 2026. Bringing fire risk mitigation into forest management in northwestern Ontario: A summary report of a workshop held at the Dryden Fire Management Centre in Dryden, Ontario on November 19, 2025. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Science and Research Branch, Peterborough, ON. Science and Research Information Report IR-36. 9 p. + appendices

Abstract

This report summarizes a workshop organized by researchers from the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources' Science and Research Branch (SRB) where ministry staff and representatives from forest industry and Indigenous organizations shared their perspectives on wildfire risk mitigation practices. Workshop participants learned about the NRCan-funded Wildfire Resilience through Innovation and Collaboration research project and two subprojects occurring in northwestern Ontario. SRB researchers facilitated discussions and received feedback from workshop participants which will help shape future research. A follow-up workshop will be scheduled to visit the experimental sites post-treatment as part of an ongoing engagement process to inform interested parties.

Résumé

Appliquer l'atténuation des risques d'incendie à la gestion forestière dans le Nord-Ouest de l'Ontario : rapport sommaire d'un atelier qui s'est tenu au centre de gestion des incendies de Dryden, en Ontario, le 19 novembre 2025

Ce rapport est le résumé d'un atelier organisé par des chercheurs de la Direction des sciences et de la recherche (DSR) du ministère des Richesses naturelles. Au cours de cet atelier, le personnel du Ministère ainsi que des représentants de l'industrie forestière et d'organismes Autochtones ont fait part de leur point de vue sur les pratiques d'atténuation des risques d'incendie de végétation. Les participants à l'atelier ont appris au sujet du Projet de résilience aux feux de forêt grâce à l'innovation et à la collaboration, projet financé par NRCan, ainsi que deux sous-projets qui se déroulent dans le Nord-Ouest de l'Ontario. Les chercheurs de la DSR ont facilité les discussions et entendu les réactions des participants qui contribueront à façonner la recherche future. Un atelier de suivi sera mis à l'horaire pour visiter les sites expérimentaux post-traitement dans le cadre d'un processus en cours lié à l'engagement d'informer les parties intéressées.

Acknowledgements

Financial support for the workshop was provided through the Wildfire Resilient Futures Initiative of Natural Resources Canada.

Contents

Abstract iii
Résumé iii
Acknowledgements iii
Introduction 1
The workshop 1
Presentation session 1 1
Discussion session 1 2
Presentation session 2 5
Discussion session 2 6
Wrap up and next steps 9
Appendix 1 10
Appendix 2 12

Introduction

Given the recent extreme wildfire seasons in Canada and predictions that these events will become more frequent and severe due to warmer, drier conditions driven by climate change, the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) is collaborating with First Nations, universities, and forest industry partners to study ways to manage forests that can help reduce wildfire risk. This research project, titled Wildfire Resilience through Innovation and Collaboration (WRIC), is funded through Natural Resources Canada's Wildfire Resilient Futures Initiative (WRFI). Through this project the researchers aim to:

- determine which forest management practices are most effective at reducing fire risk
- learn how to more quickly and accurately assess forest conditions thereby reducing community fire risk
- document barriers and disincentives to implementing practices such as commercial thinning and prescribed burning
- determine ways to structure planning and management approaches to best achieve adaptive, multi-objective forest management and meet forest industry, fire risk management, and First Nations' goals

The collaborative research consists of eleven sub-projects (Appendix 1) focused on fire risk mapping and modelling, ways to use less conventional forest management methods such as commercial thinning, partial harvest, and prescribed burning to mitigate fire risk, and strategies to enable First Nations to participate in adaptive, multi-objective forestry. Another component of the project is a demonstration site led by the Ojibway Nation of Saugeen. The demonstration site consists of a fire-conscious forest management plan to reduce fuel load and fire risk on and adjacent to Ojibway Nation of Saugeen reserve lands and provides opportunities for researchers to learn about practical approaches to combine fire risk mitigation, revenue generation, and ecosystem stewardship.

To share information about the *Commercial thinning to reduce fuel loads/create shaded fire breaks* sub project (Appendix 1) and hear perspectives and concerns from people connected to the forest management units where the experimental research is taking place, researchers from the MNR's Centre for Northern Forest Ecosystem Research (CNFER) hosted a workshop in Dryden, Ontario. The goal of this report is to summarize the perspectives shared at this workshop.

The workshop

Presentation session 1

The one-day workshop was held on November 19, 2025, at the Dryden Fire Management Centre. Twenty-three people attended including representatives from the MNR's Science and Research and Aviation Forest Fire and Emergency Services (AFFES) branches, and Regional Operations Division, Grand Council Treaty 3, Nokiiwin Tribal Council, Domtar, Dryden Fibre Canada, Dryden Forest Management Company, and the Wildfire Resilience Consortium of Canada (Appendix 2).

The workshop objectives were to:

- share plans for research on adaptive forestry practices occurring in northwestern Ontario — specifically in the Dryden and English River forest management units
- seek input, advice, concerns, and priorities of First Nations, forest industry, and MNR staff in the region
- discuss general priorities and concerns for fire-conscious forest management

Presentation 1: Wildfire resilience through innovation and collaboration (Jeff Robinson, Social Science Analyst, CNFER)

- Background information and general project overview
- Project rationale and main goals
- Brief introduction of 11 subprojects (Appendix 1)
- The MNR is committed to advancing science and practice of wildfire risk mitigation and anticipates broad applicability of findings.

Presentation 2: Challenges and opportunities for bringing fire risk mitigation into forest management (Doug Reid, Science Coordinator, CNFER)

- Challenges and questions for increasing fire risk mitigation in forest management planning
- Summary of overarching legislation and guides that direct wildfire management strategy
- Summary of the ways the Forest Management Planning Manual directs risk mitigation
- Introduction of tools:
    - Precommercial and commercial thinning
    - Prescribed burning
    - Tree species selection
    - Spatial harvesting patterns

Discussion session 1

Forest management planning challenges/opportunities

The group was asked about the challenges they foresee when incorporating fire risk mitigation into forest management plans and the forest management planning process, e.g., using non-conventional harvesting to create shaded fuel breaks. Responses included:

- It can slow down the harvest, potentially creating higher costs.
- The potential for lower recovery from the harvest.
- The cost of using the FireSmart approach on a larger scale would be prohibitive.
- The complications that come with forest management planning, including competing and sometimes different objectives outlined between guides and/or in the forest management planning guide itself—for example, manage for caribou or mitigate fire risk. Maximizing harvest yield and fire risk mitigation are different objectives.
- The perceived inflexibility of ten-year forest management planning cycles.

- *NIMBYism* (not in my backyard)—people generally don't want to see clearcut harvests or prescribed burning near their homes/cottages and they don't appreciate or understand the value of the reduced wildfire risk that could come from these practices.

It was suggested that the experience of having a wildfire threaten one's home or community can often overcome NIMBYism. For example, recent tragedies in western Canada have been the catalyst for change in other parts of the country. Enhanced public education was suggested as another way to have more people more open to these kinds of treatments, with the hope that communities do not need to be scared before taking action.

Workshop participants also heard that it would be easier to incorporate wildfire risk reduction approaches into forest management plans if fuel loading maps, possibly derived from the recent LiDAR acquisition across Ontario's Managed Forest, and MNR-based value maps were available at the beginning of the forest management planning cycle.

The challenge of competing objectives was acknowledged, and participants heard that the challenge is how to "layer the cake to get the sweet icing on top". It was suggested that the perceived inflexibility of the forest management planning cycle could be addressed by annually updating plans for wildfire risk mitigation work, because changes to the forest and its flammability (e.g., large blowdown events, budworm outbreaks) can happen in the planning cycle.

Challenges, risks, and current limitations to prescribed burning

Forest industry representatives expressed concerns over the difficulties they experience while planning for and executing an approved prescribed burn plan. A key challenge is developing an approach to ensure a prescribed burn happens during the same year it is proposed. One suggestion was to have the flexibility to shift from the "Cadillac to Honda Civic" version of a prescribed burn. For example, the ideal scenario might be to conduct a high complexity burn using aerial ignition and more specialized personnel, but if the conditions are right but personnel availability is limited, the alternative could be to use ground ignition. Workshop participants were told about an approved prescribed burn intended to help clean up a forest block after a large blowdown event. That burn was attempted over two fire seasons but never carried out due to lack of available trained AFFES staff. This prescribed burn plan was to be carried over for one more year with the hope that it would happen in 2026. Concerns were raised about whether delayed prescribed burns are as effective as originally intended (i.e., site preparation for planting). Forestry companies worry that they could lose sites like this to hardwood species because they were forced to postpone burning, requiring herbicides to reduce the advanced hardwood competition that resulted from the delay in the prescribed burn.

Financial capacity can also limit prescribed burning opportunities or make them less desirable than their alternatives. Using fire as an herbicide alternative was estimated at over $1000 per hectare while herbicide costs are less than $700 per hectare. Workshop participants heard that the Forestry Futures Trust and AFFES's training budget can help lower prescribed burning costs.

AFFES acknowledged the capacity issues and continues to work to address them, but workshop participants were cautioned that it takes time. Some prescribed burning contractors in Ontario can handle low complexity burns, but at the time of the workshop only a few people across the province were trained/authorized to work at the high complexity burn level. These specialists are also used in firefighting operations and AFFES staff must adhere to their mandate and prioritize protecting lives and values. Therefore, the use of prescribed burning in forest management remains a lower priority. Critical decisions such as "we cannot support the ignition of a given prescribed burn due to concerns about it getting away today" must be made, and often without an alternate plan.

Workshop participants also discussed the risks of prescribed burns. For example, a key reason prescribed burns happen less now than in the past is due to an incident where weather conditions changed rapidly and unexpectedly, resulting in the prescribed burn getting out of control and lives being lost. As a result, more checks and balances are in place to ensure the safety of all involved. Nevertheless, some participants believe that the extremely demanding requirements is the main reason prescribed burns are less utilized than they could be. As one participant noted, even under a "dream scenario" for a prescribed burn where the capacity exists and all other conditions are ideal, the concern over the fire getting away and the potential loss of allocated wood supply in an area is sufficient to make forestry companies decide not to proceed with a burn.

Policy and legislation issues

A concern was shared that multiple governments, ministries, municipal, and other groups are trying to reduce and mitigate fire risk using different approaches, and that AFFES does not have an overarching, clear mandate or role to play in fire risk reduction. It was suggested that the federal government and forestry companies need to interact more often, as First Nation reserves are federal land and therefore not considered in provincial forest management plans.

Some participants representing Indigenous organizations also raised the concept of co-benefits to ensure that multiple objectives are considered, pursued, and incentivized, including benefits to the logging companies and Indigenous communities thereby promoting fire risk mitigation efforts. For example, areas created to mitigate fire risk become excellent blueberry and/or moose hunting habitat.

The concept of *defensible space* (e.g., forested areas that are managed to slow fires rather than using physical fire breaks such as gravel roads around a community) was introduced as a desirable alternative by representatives from Indigenous organizations. It was suggested that using fire overlays and fuel load maps to build spatial models, having management decision support tools, and creating *special management zones* around communities when creating forest management plans would all be beneficial.

Incentives for forest industry to be involved in fire risk mitigation

Cost and economic viability are key considerations, but it is also important to forestry companies to provide a livelihood for people and shareholders. The objective is to manage the forest so that it will continue to provide for workers and their families for generations.

Is the juice worth the squeeze? was another sentiment shared with workshop participants. Essentially, some management practices, which may reduce fire risk in some areas, such as commercial thinning or prescribed burning, are not always feasible. For example, we should not expect a contractor to lose money or wear out their harvesting equipment to process low value to unmerchantable material. It remains difficult to quantify the non-market benefits of protecting a forest from wildfire, and those activities are not directly compensated for.

Presentation session 2

Presentation 3: Commercial thinning combined with prescribed burning (underburning) to reduce fuel loads by creating shaded fire breaks around communities (Shes Bhandari, Boreal Silviculture Research Scientist, CNFER)

- Can fuel load and fire risk be lowered through thinning activities followed by prescribed burning (i.e., low intensity underburning to reduce harvest slash loadings)?
- Fine fuels left behind after thinning activities would be removed by the prescribed burn which, in turn, leads to lower fuel loads and stimulate the regeneration of more desirable shrubs (e.g., blueberries). The net result would be a more open-grown, healthy, and less flammable forest.
- Commercial thinning (i.e., thinning from below) should lead to better growth in the retained trees leading to higher value wood products at final harvest.

Commercial thinning issues

The question was raised on how much is known about commercial thinning in jack pine stands regarding the reduction of ignition probability in fire pathways. Removing ground and ladder fuels from the stand reduces the risk of a surface fire getting to the crown. It is also easier to suppress fire in a thinned stand as crews have better access and can move themselves and their equipment through the forest more easily.

At this initial stage of the research, the benefits of increased commercial thinning to communities remains unclear, as limited examples exist in Northern Ontario. The planned research is designed, in part, to help address this question. Another workshop participant commented about managing fire risk and how risk should be viewed as a scale, and not simply as a risk or no risk comparison. They asked how fire risk mitigation affects this scale, suggesting that if risk mitigation methods don't benefit communities sufficiently, perhaps it is not worth the effort. One participant highlighted that the Ojibway Nation of Saugeen demonstration site is a good example of shared vision and co-benefits between the federal government, the provincial government, and the First Nation community.

Presentation 4: Wildfire Resilient Futures Initiative (WRFI) Wapikaimaski experimental research site (Matt Corbett, Fire Science Specialist, AFFES)

Experimental research in English River forest management unit is being conducted to:

- assess fuel hazards and fire behaviour in mixedwood fuel harvest areas using prescribed fire as a silvicultural tool
- build operational capacity for more complex prescribed burns
- evaluate the effectiveness of prescribed fire to reduce fuel hazards
- promote knowledge exchange and support policy development around wildfire risk reduction

A presentation slide included a post-harvest view of the mixedwood study site where only the merchantable conifer trees were harvested, leaving all the hardwood species stems. Opinions were offered as to whether this harvest would be considered a *classic clearcut* and viewed as *emulating natural disturbance*, and, therefore, in accordance with a MNR's guidelines (i.e., retaining 25 stems per hectare that are representative of the previous stand). Specific comments about the conifer-only harvest were "it's not a parking lot" and "I'd like to hunt in that stand" suggesting that people would be open to this type of harvest as opposed to one that removes all trees, leaving only the minimum 25 trees per hectare required by the Forest Management Planning Manual.

One participant commented that the public feels that fire risk increases after a harvest due to the added slash (i.e., limbs, treetops, undersized logs) on the ground. It was also acknowledged that stem removal in the stand reduces risk of crown fire but also likely temporarily increases fire risk generally after a harvest due to the slash on the ground. The work at the Wapikaimaski experimental research site will address these kinds of questions and will investigate how cut to length harvesting and variable canopy retention levels affects fire behaviour.

In response to a question about long-term monitoring of the experimental site, Matt Corbett indicated that a defined plan did not yet exist but that he has interest in going back at year five, year ten, and perhaps beyond, as the regenerating stand develops to evaluate the *flammability* of the two-tiered or single canopy with veterans (i.e., retained overstory plus the regenerating cohort) stand conditions.

Discussion session 2

The remainder of the workshop consisted of further questions and discussion about the proposed research in the Dryden and English River forest management units, and general wildfire risk mitigation and associated forestry practices.

A representative from Nokiiwin Tribal Council asked about the possibility of having Indigenous community members present during the Wapikaimaski experimental burns for educational purposes. He stated that even if it's not safe or reasonable for them to be present during the execution of the burns, it would be valuable for them to visit the sites after the prescribed burn treatments are applied.

A question was raised about how many people in AFFES specialize in fire science. A response suggested that only a handful were in Northern Ontario with one registered professional forester (RPF). Workshop participants were told that AFFES is looking to increase their level of expertise in the organization. This lack of capacity is a potential barrier to increasing the use of prescribed burns as a viable approach to mitigating wildfire risk.

A workshop participant asked about research showing that clearcut harvesting reduces forest fire risk. Specifically, he stated that there are a lot of opinions, but asked "what do we actually know about how this practice reduces fire risk?"

One participant mentioned that fire risk mitigation is, in part, forest management, but we need to better frame it as such.

We also should consider the comparison between full tree and cut-to-length harvesting, as more slash and, particularly fine fuels, are produced immediately after a cut-to-length harvest.

Another raised point relates to the variability in forest structure throughout stand development stages. A zero- to ten-year-old forest has different types and amounts of fuel compared to an 11- to 25-year-old or 26- to 40-year-old forest. Therefore, fire risk will vary as the forest ages, regardless of the harvest or silvicultural methods applied to it.

Another participant welcomed this type of innovative thinking and research being applied with a forest management lens, but wondered how much is gained if a stand is thinned at 50 years of age, and then the final harvest is done at age 65. The response was that from a silvicultural perspective, the final harvest after a thinning treatment (i.e., thinning from below) yields more higher-valued wood products.

A few other general concerns were raised about commercial thinning and prescribed burns:

- If a prescribed burn is too intense, it could damage/kill the remaining trees in a thinned stand.
- The forest is not static, fuel loading will increase over time after a prescribed burn.
- Does a thinned stand provide more defensible space than a standard clear cut?
- Prescribed burns aren't normally done in 50-year-old stands — what other ladder fuels might be in the experimental jack pine sites?

It was suggested that the research and experiments presented at the workshop are designed specifically to address these concerns, allowing us to learn together and develop a set of best management practices.

Indigenous Traditional uses of fire

- Indigenous people used different types of fire for different objectives.
- Fire was used to increase hunting opportunities.
- Fire was used to create proper growing conditions for willow to make willow baskets.
- Unfortunately, due to realities of shared history, some Indigenous traditional knowledge, especially the different uses of fire, may have been lost.

What affects the risk tolerance of communities, municipalities, or other groups?

- FireSmart plans were compared to *mini land use plans*, and workshop participants heard that these could be built into forest management plans if they are available when the plan is being written.
- Frustration was expressed that the Forest Management Planning Manual does not provide specific direction about this; instead, it tends to refer to higher level documentation such as Crown or municipal land use plans to provide guidance.

Community Wildfire Protection Plans

An AFFES representative introduced Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPP) as one avenue for municipalities and Indigenous communities to have a fire mitigation zone implemented into a forest management plan. A community or municipality needs to have a written plan to access available funding (government grant of $15,000 over two years) to support the work. Indigenous Services Canada has a similar federally funded program for First Nations. More communities are invited to participate each year, and the incentive has a relatively wide scope, including fire risk mitigation, education, and vegetation management. An example of an out-of-scope item is buying a fire truck for the community. The following paragraphs outline the main questions asked about CWPPs and the answers that were generated through group discussion.

How do you implement a CWPP into a forest management plan?

Implementation must be done early as harvesting is required. It cannot be an amendment to an existing forest management plan. If it is up front and available at the beginning stages, the CWPP can become a Strategic Management Zone in the forest management plan and directs forest industry operators to treat the area differently.

How standardized are CWPPs?

Very broadly, many of them are made by RPFs or someone else with little to no fire science background. Certain criteria must be met when generating a CWPP. A map is the most important component for getting the government grant. It shows the hazardous fuels, fire history, high risk areas, etc. The level of detail in a CWPP depends on community input, and the individual leading its development. Having an invested interest in developing and implementing the plan is critical to its success.

Who signs off on CWPPs?

The municipality applies for the grant and is provided a list of qualified contractors, but they are not held to using anyone from that list. Anyone, including the municipality or community's own staff, can write the plan, but the plan must meet a set of checkboxes/requirements.

Who does someone from forest industry call to find out which communities have a CWPP when writing a forest management plan?

AFFES should be aware of all plans for municipalities and unincorporated townships, but they won't necessarily know about all First Nations with CWPPs because they are federally funded.

However, AFFES will likely have some knowledge of First Nations with federally supported CWPPs.

Fuel pathways

A participant working with GCT3 spoke about the fire exposure/fuel pathways modelling approach first described by Jen Beverly in Alberta[1]. This approach assesses how fire can move into a community. With other methods, it is difficult to prioritize where the greatest risk to a community is. This approach requires multiple scales of planning, moving outward beyond the community footprint to the surrounding jurisdictions where the risk comes from. This approach can help with planning as it will highlight the areas to prioritize.

Consultation

Some discussion occurred about the consultation process as outlined in the Forest Management Planning Manual. Participants felt that the current system does not allow for efficient consultation. Forest management planners feel they do not get rewarded for doing consultation "right", i.e., up front, rather they feel they are penalized for this because it can lead to more work later in the planning process.

Wrap up and next steps

The Dryden forest management plan was coming up for renewal at the time of the workshop and planning for the new plan would occur in fall of 2026. Workshop attendees agreed that it would be useful to hold another workshop like this one also in the fall of 2026. Participants also agreed that a trip to Ojibway Nation of Saugeen demonstration site and/or the Dryden area WRIC research sites would be useful and interesting. It was suggested that the next workshop occur over two days to allow for site visits and presentations with group discussion. Day 1 might focus on integrating wildfire risk mitigation into forest management planning and day 2 could focus on community treatment and include a community/site visit to discuss lessons learned.

[1] Beverly, J.L., N. McLoughlin and E. Chapman. 2021. A simple metric of landscape fire exposure. Landscape Ecology 36: 785–801.

Appendix 1

Table A1.1. A detailed list of sub-projects included in the Wildfire Resilience through Innovation and Collaboration research project including expected outcomes from each sub-project and the names and contact information for the lead researchers, all from the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources.

Sub-project	Lead researcher(s)*	Expected outcomes
Mapping boreal ladder fuels with single photon lidar	Stephen Mayor & Hiromitsu Sato	Develop fine-scaled spatial maps of Ontario's Managed Forest fuel loading as an indicator of fire risk to support the Canadian Forest Fire Danger Rating System.
Strategies for enabling First Nations' participation in adaptive, multi-objective forestry	Lance Robinson	Understanding the obstacles to adaptive forest management approaches that combine First Nation, forest industry, and fire risk mitigation objectives.
Lidar to estimate fuel loading in pre-commercial thinning in jack pine	Shes Bhandari and Dave Morris	Develop models to allow accelerated risk determination and inform innovative mitigation approaches to reduce risk to communities.
Commercial thinning to reduce fuel loads/create shaded fire breaks	Shes Bhandari and Dave Morris	Testing the effectiveness of commercial thinning to reduce wildfire risk to communities. Volumes removed through thinning will support a sustainable and resilient forest sector.
Forest fuel management in boreal mixedwood forests	Rongzhou Man	Partial harvest allows for timber production while sustaining forest cover and reducing fuel loads of standing forests near communities and ecologically sensitive areas.
Forecasting broad scale effects of climate, forest migration, and insect-fire interactions on fire regime	Stephen Mayor and Hiromitsu Sato	Inform and support decision making on forest and fire management, focusing on spruce budworm control, fire suppression, and prescribed burns.

Sub-project	Lead researcher(s)*	Expected outcomes
Impacts of peatland fire regime on northern communities and carbon release	Stephen Mayor and Hiromitsu Sato	Provide insight into current/forecast fire regimes of peatlands and interactions between fire and climate change to assess effects on fire risk, ecosystem change, and carbon.
Fire regime impacts of forest management responses to spruce budworm outbreak	Stephen Mayor and Hiromitsu Sato	Evaluating options to reduce budworm-killed fuel pre- (BTK insecticide) and post-outbreak (salvage, prescribed burns) to inform forest management decisions.
Simulating silvicultural treatment impacts on fire regime	Stephen Mayor and Hiromitsu Sato	Evaluating silvicultural and forest management options that can be implemented immediately on the landscape to alter fire regime.
Prescribed burns to reduce spruce budworm fuels	Stephen Mayor and Hiromitsu Sato	Increasing understanding of this understudied fuel type and its effects on fire risk to improve fire regime forecasting.
Knowledge sharing on Indigenous experiences in adaptive forestry for wildfire mitigation	Lance Robinson	Workshops to share knowledge and experiences while attempting to implement fire-conscious forest management.

*Contact:

Stephen Mayor – stephen.mayor@ontario.ca

Hiromitsu Sato – hiromitsu.sato@ontario.ca

Lance Robinson – lance.robinson@ontario.ca

Shes Bhandari – shes.bhandari@ontario.ca

Dave Morris – dave.m.morris@ontario.ca

Rongzhou Man – rongzhou.man@ontario.ca

Appendix 2

Table A2.1. Attendees, in alphabetical order, of the *Bringing fire risk mitigation into forest management in northwestern Ontario* workshop held in at the Dryden Fire Management Centre on November 19, 2025. MNR = Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources; ROD = Regional Operations Division; AFFES = Aviation, Forest Fire, and Emergency Services; SRB = Science and Research Branch; CNFER = Centre for Northern Forest Ecosystem Research.

Name	Affiliation
DJ Armit	MNR/ROD
Iain Arnold	MNR/AFFES
Andrew Base	Nokiiwin Tribal Council
Bill Bertrand	MNR/AFFES
Shes Bhandari	MNR/SRB/CNFER
Maya Boivin	Wildfire Resilience Consortium of Canada
Matt Corbett	MNR/AFFES
Iain Davidson-Hunt	University of Manitoba (working with Grand Council Treaty 3)
Justin Ersser	Grand Council Treaty 3
Matthew Hupf	Domtar
Mandy Hutchison	Dryden Fibre Canada
Beau Johnson	Domtar
Derek Johnson	MNR/ROD
John Johnson	MNR/AFFES
Darren Mclarty	MNR/AFFES
Krista Prosser	MNR/AFFES Indigenous Relations team
Doug Reid	MNR/SRB/CNFER
Jeff Robinson	MNR/SRB/CNFER
Ricardo Velasquez	MNR/ROD
Cole Wear	Dryden Fibre Canada
Amy Wildhaber	Dryden Forest Management Company
Ben Wilkinson	MNR/AFFES
Steve Young	Dryden Forest Management Company

(0k P.R. 25 02 27)
ISBN 978-1-4868-9646-2 (pdf)