An SX trial project was initiated by the Cariboo Research Section and Jacobson Bros. prior, I believe, to the development of this working plan. The Cariboo project (SX 86101C) was to be carried out principally by the licencee, probably with Section 88 funding. I believe the licencee should be kept involved in trials as much as possible as this encourages support and ensures a receptive audience for the results. However, I also believe that the project proposed by the Branch is much more onerous than the original from the Cariboo and so would not ask a licencee to be responsible for all phases of this trial. We should follow the plan prepared by the Branch, but include Jacobson's in the site selection, set-up and staking as well as the planting of this project. The original SX number (SX 86101C) should be retained.

Further to the details of the working plan:

1. Given the magnitude of the trial, I suggest only one of the original cutblocks proposed by Jacobson's should be used. The trial should be a fully randomized design if the site is appropriate. Otherwise a randomized complete block replicated four times could be used.

2. How and when will the root pruning be done? Who will be responsible for it?

3. Pre-planting characterization of stock should include:
   - root growth capacity;
   - shoot and root dry weights of three replicates of 25 trees;
   - root collar caliper;
   - planting height from root collar to the top of the terminal bud.

4. Assessments should begin in the fall of the first growing season and follow standard Cariboo Research Section procedures and formats. This will allow the identification of nursery effects and facilitate the comparison of data with other Cariboo research results.
5. It may be advantageous to include the assessment of this trial with SX 84118Q under the control of someone hired specifically for the job rather than rely on operations staff. I will pursue this option.

6. How will toppling be assessed? Is it reasonable to expect much toppling incidence after only five growing seasons? Remember that the site is relatively high in elevation and so growth is expected to be slow.

7. What is a "radical sample"? Selection of trees to be sampled should be better defined. How will the seedlings be handled between the site and North Road lab to minimize respiratory dry weight losses? Why wouldn't you use the laboratory facilities available in Williams Lake office? How will the excavations be done (this is very difficult)?

8. What is a "representative root form" and will it be a subjective assessment based on the few trees excavated for radical samples?

9. The "Responsibilities" section should be revised to include Regional and licencee involvement. It is my position that Silviculture Branch should never be wholly responsible for all phases of a trial. This is unnecessary, inefficient, and contrary to the intent of section 6.10 of the Silviculture Manual. Regional staff have a legitimate role to play in defining objectives for and conducting trials and they should be prepared to be involved.

10. SX trial proposals should include the author's name.

In summary, I would recommend that this working plan be reconsidered and rewritten. I fully support the project and its intent but believe the working plan is not sufficient to properly direct the trial.

[Signature]
Warren Mitchell, R.P.F.
Acting Research Forester
Cariboo Forest Region