

### BEC-Tree Species Description: ICHwk3

Historically the forests of the Goat variant of the Wet Cool Interior Cedar – Hemlock biogeoclimatic unit (ICHwk3) were dominated by old growth stands of either western redcedar on moist to wet sites, or western hemlock on drier sites or wetter sites with poorly structured lacustrine soils. Hybrid white spruce or subalpine fir dominated stands were common at higher elevations or in locations of cold air drainage. Douglas-fir occurred as a component of stands on drier sites and occasionally as relatively pure stands on very dry sites. Lodgepole pine only occurred on very dry sites or in bogs. Trembling aspen and paper birch dominated seral stands occurred primarily on south facing aspects where fire was more common. Black cottonwood occurred as a minor component in moist to wet stands often associated with riparian areas and it occasionally dominated stands on the wider floodplains of major water courses.

Age class distribution as a % of total forest area [Source: VRIMS 2008]

Stand age class	7-9 natural forest	7-9 harvested forest	4-6 natural forest	4-6 harvested forest	1-3 natural forest	1-3 harvested forest
% of total forest area	70	3	10	0	1	15

Tree species distribution in natural old/mature (age class 7-9) and natural immature (age class 4-6) as a % of the total natural old/mature and natural immature forest cover respectively [Source: VRIMS 2008]

Species	Ac	At	Bl	Cw	Ep	Fd	Hw	Pl	Sx
% of total natural old/mature (age class 7-9) forest cover	1	0	17	29	1	1	18	1	32
% of total natural immature (age class 4-6) forest cover	2	14	11	4	18	4	4	5	38

Forest management practices of the 1960's to present have resulted in stands more often dominated by hybrid white spruce, lodgepole pine and Douglas-fir as compared to western redcedar and western hemlock. No western hemlock is planted so it has been relegated to the naturally regenerated understory of the plantations.

% species composition of post-harvested stands [Source: RESULTS 1988-2007]

Species	Bl	Cw	Fd	Hw	Pl	Sx	Hardwoods
% of harvested area	3	11	5	7	11	45	18

Author: C. DeLong (March 2011)