

Cultural Heritage Resource Value Resource Stewardship Monitoring

Form B Side 1 SITE FORM

Opening ID Feature ID(s) (from Form A)						
4. Site or Feature Description	☐ Individual Feature ☐ Composite Feature: Composite ID# (please assign)					
What type of feature(s) assessed?						
Cultural trail – designated	Burial site Nest (eagle, goshawk, other)					
Cultural trail – undesignated	Cremation site					
CMT(s)	Ceremonial site	Cave or oth	er Karst feature			
Traditional use site	Cedar bark strip area	Rock outcro	p			
Spiritual Site	Individual monumental cedar Other (describe):					
Cultural Depression monumental cedar						
Lithics Description of site or feature and location description:						
·						
Size of area influenced by site/feature area:	Width x L	ength m OR Area	a ha			
Is this CHR a registered archaeological site	? Yes No Borden	#:				
5. Location	UTM Coordinate: Zor	neE	N			
Check all that apply, if known:			de contra la la calc			
☐ In harvested area ☐ Adjacent to, or in close proximity to water ☐ Adjacent to block ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐						
6. Age Check all that apply: Pre-1846 Post -1846 Age unknown Historical use						
7. Management Planning	T	1	I			
Management Strategy	Recommendation(s) by First Nation(s)	Recommendation(s) in AIA or site alteration permit	Identified in site plan			
	No First Nations provided management recommendation	No permit issued Yes Permit #	No management strategies noted in site plan			
Modify block boundary to avoid the feature	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes			
Retain a buffer ofm around site or feature	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes			
Retain in harvest area – no buffer	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes			
Crown or stand modification	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes			
Conserve in rotational reserve type:	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes			
Conserve in temporary retention area type:	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes			
Date the feature	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes			
Stub (some/all) CMT(s) above scars	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes			
Stub (some/all) non-CMT(s)	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes			
Leave standing where safe to do so	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes			
Alter silviculture activities	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes			
Other:	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes			
Other:	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes	○ No ○ Yes			



Cultural Heritage Resource Value Resource Stewardship Monitoring

Form B Side 2 SITE FORM

8. Management Effectivenes	ss (field portion)		Unable	to locate the feature(s)		
For composite features:	One management strategy	y used for all features	Different managem	ent strategies used		
Check all that apply:						
No management of the site	or feature	Partially conserved in perm	nanent reserve	type:		
Modified block boundary to	avoid the feature	Fully conserved in perman	ent reserve	type:		
Retained a buffer of	m around site or feature	Partially conserved in temp	orary reserve	type:		
Completed crown or stand r	nodification	Fully conserved in tempora	ary reserve	type:		
Dated the feature		Retained in harvest area -	no buffer			
Left standing where safe to	do so	Stubbed (some/all) CMT(s) above scars			
Altered silviculture activities		Other:				
Q1 Is there evidence of dama	ge to the site or feature?	○ Yes ○ No				
Q2 Where damage has occur	red, what is the most likely cau	use?				
Harvesting activities	Recreation use Windth	nrow	Industrial use	Fire		
Silviculture activities	Road building Site me	odification for safety reasons	Livestock	Other		
Description of damage (where	applicable):					
O3 Has the feature been irrev	rersibly damaged or rendered	unsuitable for continued use?	Yes No	O Don't know		
If yes, explain in Q7	croibly damaged or remaded	anoanabio for continuou uco.	0 100 0 100	O Bon e mion		
Windthrow Management		retention area/trees windfirm?	○Yes ○ No			
		d % windthrow%				
		w management techniques appl		tention Buffer		
		g Pruning Feathering				
Trail Features	∐N/A	`	Yes () No			
With respect to management area		evidence of damage? (rail been made less passage?	Yes No			
area			-	nage: %		
Estimated % of trail length in or adjacent to the block with evidence of damage: % 6. Feature Summary Observations						
Q4 Were there operational factors that limited CHR management options for this feature? O Yes O No						
Q5 Were there management strategies and/or practices used for this feature that were particularly effective? O Yes O No						
Q6 Are there management strategies and/or practices that could have been used to reduce the impact on this CHR feature? Yes No						
O 163 O 140						
Q7 To what extent did practices for this feature maintain CHR value(s) given the recommendations and opportunities that were available?						
○ Very Poorly ○ Poorly ○ Moderately ○ Well ○ Very Well ○ Don't know						
Rationale:						

FS 1358B HFP 2016/07 PAGE 2