

BC Coastal Windthrow Recommended Prescription FORM 4 – Side A

ADMINISTRATIVE				
Location	Opening ID	Block #	Examiner/Date	Segment/Portion

FIELD RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TREATMENT MODIFICATIONS	
FOR CLEARCUT AND PATCH/STRIP RETENTION EDGES:	
<p>General:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No treatment modifications prescribed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Allow windthrow – plan salvage</p>	Specific Comments
<p>Layout changes – either:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adjust boundary or boundaries</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Larger/wider patches or strips.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Reduce fetch.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Change to a multi-pass silvicultural system.</p>	
<p>Windfirming treatments – either:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Top or prune.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Feather.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Feather and top/prune.</p>	
FOR UNIFORM PARTIAL CUTTING (thinning, dispersed retention, or seed tree, shelterwood, selection silvicultural systems):	
<p>General:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No treatment modifications prescribed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Allow windthrow – plan salvage.</p>	Specific Comments
<p>Modify leave tree parameters:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Change leave tree criteria.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Change density of dispersed leave trees.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Windfirm - top or prune.</p>	
<p>Change layout design to alter approach to silvicultural system considering instead:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Several small clearcuts.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Patch/strip retention.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Multi-pass group/strip removal systems.</p>	

BC Coastal Windthrow Consequences Reference FORM 4 – Side B

DIAGNOSTIC QUESTIONS – Use to Rank Potential Consequences
Gullies, escarpments, and slopes with questionable stability, or banks of active fluvial streams
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the potential for windthrow to have a significant impact on the slope, gully, escarpment, bank? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consider potential for initiation of mass-wasting or debris flows (Geotech input?)</i> • <i>Also consider downstream or other indirect impacts from such events.</i>
Reserves for an identified feature
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the sensitive feature? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>E.g., cultural (First Nations, other), habitat, recreational, private ownership?</i> 2. How important is the feature at this location? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Rarity, significance, value?</i> 3. How might windthrow damage or impair the feature? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consider both direct (to the feature) and indirect (around the feature).</i>
Visual landscape quality objectives
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How important is the viewscape in which the block is embedded? 2. Does windthrow have a strong potential to significantly impact visual quality objectives? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consider viewpoints, visual absorption capacity, features to be hidden such as roadcuts.</i> 3. How long might windthrow affect visual quality objectives?
Retention for biodiversity
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the retention intended to be long term or short term? 2. What function does the retention serve? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>E.g., remnant old growth patch, connectivity function, special or unique habitat, vertical habitat diversity?</i> 3. Is there a legal requirement for this retention? If so, what is it? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>E.g., riparian reserve, red-listed ecosystem, protected habitat, or part of a legal requirement for representation or retention (if so, can other areas be substituted)?</i>
Timber management objectives
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How much <u>timber value</u> could potentially be lost to windthrow in the proposed block? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Amount, tree species, sizes and potential grades? Also consider indirect losses – bark beetles?</i> 2. If anticipated windthrow occurs, how easy would it be to successfully salvage? 3. Can an alternative approach be used that will cost-effectively reduce timber losses to windthrow? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>E.g., moving the edge, alter criteria for leave trees, change fetch distances, conduct crown treatments?</i>
Public safety and corporate or professional damages
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is there a potential for a significant safety issue to arise for the public (i.e., windthrow on trails or other frequently used areas)? 2. Is there a potential for the following to happen to BCTS – lawsuits, significant damage to corporate image or stakeholder relationships that could impact future planning, management and harvesting. 3. Is there a potential for the following to happen to professionals involved in this block – lawsuits, significant damage to professional credibility or professional relationships.