

# Cariboo Chilcotin Land Use Plan

## Integration Information Sessions - Questions and Answers

April 22, 1999

The following are the Implementation Committee's responses to questions received at and following the information sessions held in 1998. This document is intended to provide additional clarification of the Integration Report to agency and industry planners. There is no intent to have this document endorsed by either the IAMC or the RRB and as such it is not provided as management direction.

It should be noted that many of the questions we received relate to the operational implementation of the integration report rather than to the integration report itself. The Implementation Committee can only respond to queries on the latter and any questions regarding the application of operational planning direction should be referred to the appropriate Statutory Decision Makers (SDMs).

### Mule Deer Winter Range

1. **There appears to be a contradiction in the definition of a fir stand between the MDWR Strategy (> 40% fir) and the Biodiversity Strategy (> 20% fir). How will this be resolved?**

The MDWR definition is intended to identify stands that contain sufficient fir that will provide the structural and forage attributes required for mule deer winter range. The biodiversity definition is concerned with the pine/fir group of stands and separates those stands in the IDF that are likely to naturally climax in Douglas Fir from those that will remain as pine.

1. **Fir stand is > 40% pine with fir coming up - what to do with the fir?**

Silvicultural prescriptions are not addressed in the Integration Report. It is expected that MDWR management plans will provide guidance to operational planners on prescription preparation.

2. **In determining if a stand is greater than 40 % fir, is the measurement based on stem count or by volume?**

The Integration Report used the volume information from the inventory data base.

3. **Could low crown closure areas needed for recruitment to high/moderate have an impact on woodlots?**

Crown closure objectives will have an impact on the availability of timber from MDWR. MoF and MELP are working on a process that will manage the impact on existing woodlots. The SDMs may consider less constraining objectives on existing woodlot areas .

4. **Immature Douglas Fir in low crown closure - where does it go when it matures?**

MDWR management plans will provide detailed information on where the crown closure objectives will be met by winter range. A low crown closure area may be targeted to provide moderate or high crown closure objectives as the fir component matures over time. In other cases, where the area currently of low crown closure is assigned a low crown closure objective, the maturing fir may be available for harvest.

5. **Are there MDWR's where there is no opportunity to harvest?**

Section 4.1 of the Integration Report includes the following commitment: "the overall level of timber access (but not the location in most cases) proposed under the STTAA to be available within the following types in order of priority:

- ➔ MDWR which have achieved crown closure objectives and show timber availability under the MDWR Strategy.
- ➔ non-fir stands and areas to be managed for low crown closure. It is anticipated that these stands will support much of the short term harvest on MDWRs.
- ➔ age Class 5 Douglas fir stands where commercial thinning would provide benefits to MDWR values.
- ➔ high or moderate crown closure where selective logging can be done without impacting the crown closure class. The application of this approach includes winter ranges which have not yet achieved overall crown closure objectives.

Note that this is a zonal access level only and access on individual winter ranges will vary substantially from that proposed under the STTAA.

7. **Crown closure - How is it measured?**

Crown closure information has been taken largely from the inventory database and is available from the MDWR committee.

**7. When will MDWR management plans be completed?**

Section 6.1 of the Integration Report states that "the objective is to complete at least 50% of the MDWR plans by 2001 with the balance completed no later than 2006, subject to availability of resources."

**8. Could the MDWR management planning process determine some areas aren't really MDWR?**

Yes, this could happen and areas currently outside MDWR could be included based on the detailed work. Any boundary adjustments will be referred to IAMC.

**7. High crown closure - What about areas in Quesnel District where 250 year rotation can't meet high crown closure?**

The Integration Report recommends that MDWR management plans be completed. Specific tasks to be addressed in the management plans include:

- ➔ the examination of moving to a more attribute based approach to MDWR management and the use of basal area as a surrogate for crown closure; and,
- ➔ addressing the management requirements of wetbelt fir.

Through these and other components of completed MDWR plans it is expected that existing crown closure objectives will be reviewed to ensure they are deliverable.

**7. Low crown closure - can they be harvested now or not until later?**

Section 4.1 of the Integration Report lists the stand types, on a priority basis, that are available for harvesting. Included in this list are MDWR that have achieved crown closure objectives and non-fir stands and areas to be managed for low crown closure. Harvesting of low crown closure stands in the short term, that are not required for recruitment to meet high and moderate crown closure objectives, is consistent with the Integration Report.

**7. In a 70% fir/30% other stand, could all other be taken in one pass?**

There are no MDWR constraints in the Integration Report to the timing of the removal of all other species in a fir leading stand. The Integration Report however, is one of several sources of information and direction that the SDMs will consider when assessing a harvesting proposal. A portion of the 30% other species may be constrained in order to meet other CCLUP objectives or FPC requirements.

**8. Roads, trails, and landings - Do they contribute to crown closure class?**

Roads trails and landings within the boundary of a stand are included in the assessment of crown closure.

**9. What gets planted after the non-fir is harvested?**

Silvicultural prescriptions are not addressed in the Integration Report. It is expected that MDWR management plans will provide guidance to operational planners on prescription preparation.

**10. Do the constraints apply to areas adjacent, but not inside the MDWR?**

The integration process assumed that MDWR management constraints would be limited to the mapped mule deer winter ranges. The application of modified harvest techniques, within the rotation, to address mule deer values outside of mapped MDWR would be consistent with the Integration Report.

**11. MDWR contribution to old biodiversity; Is the 25% contribution only in high and mod crown closure? Is it after the 1<sup>st</sup> entry to a stand that hasn't been harvested before?**

See Integration Report - Page 40, 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> bullets. The contribution of MDWR to old and mature seral requirements is based on the development of a harvesting prescription that allows 25% of fir-leading stands in MDWR to meet old seral stage and 25% of fir-leading stands within MDWR to meet mature seral stage following the first and subsequent entries. The selection of these stands should be based on stand attributes and addressed through the MDWR management plans. The achievement of old and mature seral stages is based on a combination of stand age and presence of the necessary attributes. Mule Deer

Winter Ranges with little or no harvest history may be able to make a substantive contribution to old and mature seral targets.

**12. Unmapped MDWR's - How will they be handled?**

Both the Tatlayoko and Cottonwood River MDWR have now been mapped. The direction contained in the Integration Report will apply to these areas. Any additional MDWR proposed will be referred to the IAMC and will require adjustments to other strategies in order to meet the timber access targets.

**13. Partial cutting methods - group selection or single tree selection?**

The Integration Report addresses the impact on timber access of a partial cut mule deer prescription. Detailed recommendations on silvicultural systems are included in the Regional MDWR Strategy and the Handbook for Timber and Mule Deer Management Co-ordination on Winter Ranges in the Cariboo Region. The SDMs may provide further direction on this issue.

## **Biodiversity**

**1. How will the 60% riparian/old overlap in Old 1 meet the requirements or attributes of interior forest? Does the overlap apply where there is no old seral representation or attributes in the riparian areas?**

The 60% riparian/old overlap was an assumption used in the Integration analysis process. It is a regional estimate of the proportion of old seral requirements that can be met in riparian reserve zones over the long term. The biodiversity guidebook provides guidance on the proportion of old seral areas that should exhibit interior forest attributes. The overlap assumption is not intended to be direction. For any stand to be considered as meeting a portion of the old requirements, it must exhibit the required old attributes.

**2. It appears the confirmation of the results of the Final Integration Report of 1996 does not take into account harvesting since Jan. 1/96. Therefore, might old and mature be constraining in more than a few draft landscape units?**

Yes it is possible that harvesting activities between 1996 and 1998 have resulted in additional landscape units that, due to seral requirements, do not contain significant harvesting opportunities. In assessing harvesting proposals, each draft landscape unit must be looked at in the context of its current seral stage condition.

**3. Old overlaps with P.A.'s and parks - over the longterm, was all productive forest in parks assumed to be old and contribute to old?**

Yes, in the long term analysis, in cases where within a draft landscape unit, a NDT/BEC combination was intersected by a park boundary, that portion of the NDT/BEC within the park was assumed to be old and able to contribute to meeting old requirements outside the park over the long term. In situations where a NDT/BEC combination is entirely within a park boundary there is no contribution to meeting old requirements outside the park.

**4. OGMA's - Why was old growth treated as a set aside?**

The integration analysis indicated that the alternative, managing a forested landbase to provide for old recruitment, has a higher impact on timber access.

**5. Landscape Level biodiversity - Can a surplus of old in one L.U. NDT/BEC combination be applied to other NDT/BEC combinations?**

In general no, but a surplus of old in an NDT/BEC combination can be applied to meeting the requirements in a second NDT/BEC combination where that second combination is less than 5,000 Ha in size and not a valley bottom unit.

**6. Old attributes - Is there better information as to what they are and how they can be achieved?**

Research is ongoing to better inventory the old attributes and characteristics in the IDF. Similar work is required in other forest types so that over time we can move from stand age based to attribute based management.

**7. Draft Landscape Units - How will these apply at the fdp/operational level?**

The SDMs have indicated in their directions to licensees how the draft landscape units and emphasis options should be considered at the operational planning level.

**8. Landscape level - was the actual spatial distribution of old/mature looked at in the analysis?**

Spatial assessment was limited to a cursory examination of selected draft biodiversity units. (see pages 29 and 30 of the Integration Report)

**9. Drawdowns of old - Is there going to be more direction from IAMC?**

The IAMC has notified the SDMs in writing that additional direction on application of the drawdown described in the Integration Report will not be provided at this time. SDMs will address this matter in updated operational planning direction.

If, through application of the Integration Report, implementation issues arise regarding the old seral drawdown or other direction contained in the Integration Report, it is expected that the statutory decision makers will bring the matter to IAMCs attention for further advice.

**10. Old drawdown - doesn't it have to be used right now to meet targets?**

The adjustment of old seral targets in the IRMZ and the ERDZ made in the integration process were required to balance all of the targets over the long term. The short term analysis indicated that old requirements are not a constraint to meeting timber access targets in the short term at the zonal level. The drawdown is available to SDMs to meet short term timber access targets that may become apparent, at the landscape unit level, through more detailed analysis.

**11. Deputies' letter speaks to the ability to not apply the mature component of mature plus old seral targets in some NDT's - the Integration Report applied it and met a balance of targets - Should they be applied operationally?**

The results of the integration process indicated that, while there is a impact to managing for mature requirements, a draw down of mature would not be required to balance the CCLUP targets.

**12. Old requirements in non-valley bottom NDT/BEC units < 5000 ha - does it have to be found outside of the small unit?**

The old target for non-valley bottom NDT/BEC units less than 5,000 Ha does contribute to the landscape unit old objective. This requirement can be met in the NDT/BEC unit that generated the requirement or in an adjacent unit. Typically, the old requirement from an NDT/BEC unit less than 5,000 Ha would be combined with the requirement in an adjacent NDT/BEC unit and the total requirement met in the combined NDT/BEC units.

**13. Is early seral a constraint?**

Early seral was not applied as a constraint or target in the integration process.

**14. Seral Stage targets - Over what time frame do these targets need to be achieved?**

The intent is that the seral stage targets as adjusted by the Integration Report will be achieved immediately and, in cases where a drawdown is applied, the biodiversity guidebook targets will be met in the second rotation.

**15. Landscape Unit transition strategies - Does the Integration Report speak to this? Yes, the Integration Report (page 56, 1<sup>st</sup> bullet) states that "development of a comprehensive transition strategy for achievement of objectives is required." Achievement of old seral requirements in the second rotation in the low emphasis landscape units within the ERDZ and IRMZ and OGMA establishment and management are important aspects of this transition strategy.**

**16. Is there a difference between poplar and coniferous in meeting old growth/OGMA requirements?**

There is no specific old target for deciduous species and the integration analysis did not address species requirements for OGMA's. The Biodiversity Guidebook provides recommendations on species composition when designing and locating OGMA's..

**17. Will there be "old & mature" targets?**

The Biodiversity Guidebook is referenced in the Higher Level Plan Order and forms the basis for the old and mature seral targets. These targets have been adjusted by the Biodiversity Conservation Strategy and the Integration Report. The adjustments made are consistent with the flexibility identified in both the Biodiversity Guidebook and the FPC implementation advice from the Deputy Ministers of MOF and MELP.

**18. OGMA's - are they forever?**

The intent of OGMA's is to capture old attributes consistent with Landscape Unit objectives for old representation. Landscape unit plans are expected to define recruitment strategies that may involve the harvesting of an old stand as other stands develop the required old attributes. See also response #20 below.

**19. OGMA's - can the numbers from the Biodiversity Strategy be used to calculate and find OGMA areas?**

The strategy includes an estimate of the area by draft landscape unit that contains old attributes but does not spatially identify the stands. In addition, the Biodiversity Strategy results utilise seral stage information that was current as of 1996 and does not include the effect of harvesting over the last two years.

**20. OGMA's - in the short term, if the productive forest area in a park (or other area that potentially could contribute to meeting old objectives) is all immature, do you have to establish OGMA's outside the park?**

The intent is to meet old requirements immediately. If the current seral condition within a park does not meet old attributes, then there will be a greater requirement for OGMA's outside the park in the short term until stands within the park are able to contribute to meeting old requirements. A transition strategy is recommended in this instance that will detail how, over the long term, the park will contribute to meeting old objectives.

**21. OGMA's - is 10% of the no harvest available for harvest in the short term?**

It may be available in the short term due to natural disturbances but would be up to the SDM based on specific situations.

**22. OGMA's - isn't the 10% area available guaranteed even if no natural disturbances take place?**

Section 4.6 of the Integration Report includes the following: "over a rotation it is assumed that 10% of the OGMA area outside of constrained areas will be subject to severe natural disturbance and the remaining timber within these areas will be salvaged. The designation of the areas for salvage should be by the DM and DEO since not all natural disturbance will compromise the old seral values."

**23. WTP's - should they contribute to the old requirement, when they are old, before the establishment of OGMA's?**

Yes, provided they contain the required attributes and are greater than 2 hectares in size.

**24. WTP's - when can part or all be harvested?**

The Integration Report assumed that 50% of WTP's would be available for harvesting over one rotation. It is unlikely they will become available in the short term as WTP's are only now being established. The SDMs may consider other information, including the Biodiversity Guidebook, when providing additional guidance on this issue.

**25. Stand level - WTP's - Does "only now being established" mean over the last couple of years?**

Yes.

**26. WTP's - where did the 2% timber access impact come from? Is it in trees/patches?**

The Integration Report assumed that L.U.'s and objectives would be in place over the longterm and therefore utilized table 20(a) of the Biodiversity Guidebook. The analysis also assumed that WTP's would be managed over a double rotation, effectively making 50% of the WTP area available over one rotation.

## **Tourism/Recreation**

- 1. The visual quality map does not include many currently inventoried visually sensitive areas. Why were these inventories not used in determining targets in the CCLUP and will these targets be amended to reflect these and future inventories?**

The Integration Report is consistent with the targets, objectives and strategies of the CCLUP 90 Day Report. It is doubtful that the CCLUP targets will be amended to incorporate the additional visually sensitive areas. The Integration Report provides in Section 5.3 information on addressing targets not included in the integration process.

- 2. The CCLUP targets for modified harvest may be too low when considering that any block design to accommodate visual concerns are considered modified. Is there any consideration to changing the definition of modified in light of the visual constraints?**

The results of the Integration process indicate that there is sufficient area of modified harvest by sub-unit to accommodate the identified targets. IAMC will be monitoring the implementation of the targets and should an issue arise, further direction will be provided.

- 3. Lakes Classification - will the timber targets be reduced as the results of lakes classification become known?**

No, the results of Lakes Classification processes will be considered by SDM's in meeting the balance of CCLUP targets

- 4. Tourism - are the tourism establishments used in the integration analysis the "official" sites to be managed for under CCLUP?**

The sites are from a map supplied by Ministry of Small Business, Culture and Tourism and are a snapshot in time for analysis purposes. Actual viewsheds for the sites were not mapped but will be determined through Sustainable Resource Management Plans (SRP's) and operational plans reviewed by SDM's.

- 5. Where does Partial Retention apply for visuals and how does it apply, by area access or volume?**

The integration analysis assumed that visual quality objectives can be met based on an average VQO of partial retention and used partial retention as the basis for estimating the impact of meeting CCLUP visual targets. Maintaining an average VQO over a visually sensitive area identified in the CCLUP could include a mix of retention, partial retention and modification. The intent is that VQOs will be established for visually sensitive areas. Identification of these visually sensitive areas should be guided by the CCLUP and addressed through the SRP process.

- 6. Key Lakes and Quality Lakes - are they the same?**

The CCLUP Higher Level Plan Order declaration states that the term "key lakes" as used in the CCLUP corresponds to "quality lakes" as used in the Draft Cariboo Forest Region Lakeshore Guidebook.

- 7. Tourism visual quality - does modelling assumption of "partial retention in residual area" for tourism override earlier CCLUP direction for a "mix of partial retention and retention"?**

The *Government Clarification of Key Components of the Cariboo Chilcotin Land Use Plan* dated September 27, 1996 includes the following interpretation of maintaining visual quality. "For existing tourism operations, it is government's expectation that there will be a range of sensitivity of the visual quality of these facilities. The sensitivity will be a function of the location of the facilities, topography, vegetation cover, type of tourism product and operation, pattern of surrounding use land use and customers expectations and perceptions. The appropriate VQO may be a mix of retention and partial retention."

The expectation is that a mix of partial retention and retention can be applied to existing tourism facilities and still meet an overall average VQO of partial retention for the combined recreation and tourism visual areas outlined in the Integration Report.

- 8. What is the status of the 2 km radius around tourism establishments?**

Strictly a modelling assumption due to the lack of available detail and not an operational directive. The intent is that VQOs will be established for visually sensitive areas, including tourism establishments. Identification of these visually sensitive areas should be guided by the CCLUP and addressed through the SRP process.

- 9. Is there any additional "no harvest" available for visual management?**

The results of the integration process did not include any unallocated no harvest area. Section 5.3 of the Integration Report provides direction on how targets not included in the Integration Report analysis can be addressed.

- 10. Where did the 10% reduction come from?**

The 10% reduction to the impact attributable to visual management, as well as the adjustments to the other strategies, was derived through the integration process as a means of balancing all of the targets.

**11. What should occur when a district has identified lots more visual area than what CCLUP identified?**

As outlined above, it is expected that visual management will be addressed through SRPs. A visual management area in excess of that identified in the CCLUP can be addressed through overlap with other issues or utilizing modified harvesting techniques that do not extend the rotation beyond normal.

**12. Is there a timeline to better define backcountry?**

It is expected that SRP tables, through the planning process, will provide information and recommendations to the IAMC that will assist in the clarification of this target.

**Riparian**

**1. Does the 6% riparian overlap refer to reserves and management areas or just reserves?**

The 6% figure used in the long term analysis is an estimate of the impact of applying the Riparian Management Guidebook and is intended to cover the impact on timber access of both reserve and management zones.

**1. How does the 25 metre reserve assumption for all riparian areas apply to areas that are not fish bearing?**

The sub-unit test applied a 25 meter buffer to all streams, lakes and wetlands that appear on the forest cover map base as opposed to the 6% assumption used in the long term analysis. The adjustment was made to better estimate the impact of riparian requirements. The use of a 25 meter buffer is not intended to be management direction.

**2. Does the 6% riparian overlap(based on FPC minimum's) preclude management zones and practices that exceed the minimum's (ie expanded reserves and/or management zones)? What is 6% assumption based on?**

The 6% figure used in the long term analysis is an estimate of the impact of applying the provisions of the Riparian Guidebook. It is not intended to be a maximum at the landscape level nor preclude the application of management zones, however exceeding a 6% impact at the zonal level could require the adjustment of other targets in order to meet the zonal timber access targets. The 6% figure was based on a several sources including the Chief Forester's Code impact analysis.

**Other Wildlife**

**1. Were species like grizzly bear, bull trout considered in the Quesnel SRDZ ?**

No. The integration analysis addressed only those targets that were expected to have a significant timber access impact at the regional level. The Quesnel Lake resource targets outlined in Appendix 3 of the CCLUP 90 Day Report includes the following:

"To manage for grizzly bear, moose, furbearer, species at risk and other sensitive habitats within the areas identified as riparian buffers, recreation areas, caribou habitat, mule deer winter range and lakeshore management zones and throughout the polygon under the biodiversity conservation strategy."

This objective was not specifically addressed in the integration analysis but is part of the HLP and requires consideration in the development of operational plans.

**Monitoring**

**1. Overlaps - what monitoring process is in place should overlaps not work out**

Should an issue develop at the operational or SRP level the expectation is that it will be raised to the IAMC who, in consultation with the RRB, will provide additional direction. The IAMC and the RRB are jointly developing a monitoring strategy to track delivery of the CCLUP targets.

**Eastern and Itcha Ilgachuz Caribou**

**1. Western Caribou - the very small blocks are a regeneration concern and flexibility is desirable - how are planners to deal with this?**

The Caribou Committee, as part of the ongoing research, will be making recommendations on silvicultural systems. As part of this task, the issue of site regeneration will be examined. The Caribou Strategy Update provides interim advice on this issue and operational planners are encouraged to discuss alternatives with MoF and MELP staff.

**2. Identified habitat outside 65/35 deferral area - what happens with them?**

The Integration Report assumed there would not be any impact on timber access outside of the 65/35 area. The Caribou Strategy does include recommendations on applying a modified harvesting prescription in areas that are outside the caribou deferral boundary. In addition, there may be other low elevation sites identified as requiring a management approach other than conventional harvesting in order to address caribou values.

**3. Is the 10% of the no harvest area made available in the Integration Report specifically for forest health reasons?**

No, the 10% reduction in the impact of the Caribou no-harvest area may be delivered through a combination of:

- salvage harvesting following natural disturbance;
- revisions to the modified harvesting prescription;
- reducing the no-harvest area; and,
- developing a modified harvesting prescription for areas within the no-harvest area.

(see section 1.5.3 of the Integration Report)

Further information will be available as the Caribou Strategy is finalized

**1. Eastern Caribou - what about other species concerns that were captured in the caribou deferral area?**

The intent is that the caribou prescription should be sufficient to address the requirements of other species. Modification of the caribou prescription may be possible to better meet the requirements of other species on a site specific basis.

**1. Is there a high correlation between high quality caribou habitat and high timber value?**

While the caribou committee has not examined this issue in any detail, as part of the determination of the caribou modified harvesting areas they will be addressing the issues of operability and merchantability.

**2. Will the 25% available from 2000 to 2016 be identified for planners?**

An initial identification of the location of the modified harvesting areas, sufficient to meet timber access commitments to the year 2005, has been completed and is outlined in the Caribou Strategy Update. The final designation of the areas will be completed by June 30, 2000. The Integration Report states that timber access will be on an even flow basis, with the provision that 25% of the eastern and 27% of the Itcha Ilgachuz modified area will be available in the 16 years between 2000 and 2016.

**3. East Caribou - harvesting prescription - are there more options available than only group selection?**

The Caribou Committee will continue to assess the effectiveness of various harvesting prescriptions in maintaining caribou habitat. The results of the ongoing research will continue to refine the current prescription and may produce additional options that maintain the required forest attributes while meeting the timber access targets

**4. Western Caribou - what about modified harvest outside the deferral area?**

The Caribou Strategy includes areas that will be managed under the modified harvesting prescription that are outside the caribou deferral boundary.

**CCLUP Targets/HLP Amendments**

**1. Community Stability - does the Integration Report speak to locations like Horsefly and its specific needs?**

The Integration Report does not directly address the issue of community stability however, the 90 Day Report considered community stability in the development of the CCLUP targets and the Integration Report is consistent with that document.

**1. Harvest shifts suggested by meeting targets - has any work been done on this?** - The Integration Report did not address the issue of impacts by administrative areas such as licensee operating areas.

**2. Timber targets - will ERDZ and IRMZ timber access targets be included in the Higher Level Plan amendment?**

The IAMC, in consultation with the RRB, is assessing the need for and scope of an amendment to the Higher Level Plan. .

**3. Can no harvest be traded for modified and vice versa?**

Any adjustment to the modified and no-harvest targets at the Sustainable Resource Management Planning level would require a rebalancing of the targets in other parts of the region to ensure that the zonal targets are met.

**4. There are some inconsistencies between direction in various documents - what takes precedence?**

In terms of the implementation of the CCLUP, direction to SDMs is outlined in the CCLUP Higher Level Plan Order. The Integration Report has been provided to the SDMs as advice and the strategy documents are additional information. The IAMC, in consultation with the RRB, is currently reviewing the existing HLP and examining options regarding its possible amendment to reflect the results of the Integration Report.

**5. No harvest - is it excluded from harvest forever?**

No Harvest is defined in the CCLUP 90 Day Report as follows: "The portion of the total forest that, due to other resource values, is not presently available for harvest under current forest management regimes. Some of these areas are expected to become available in the future provided that retention of the other resource values, particularly wildlife, can be ensured." (page 11, CCLUP 90 Day Report).

**6. New targets - if the no harvest went down for an SRDZ, where did the area go, to modified unextended or conventional?**

Through the integration of the strategy documents, the sub-unit specific targets were adjusted to reflect the actual distribution of the strategy areas and the impact of the respective prescriptions across the region. In the case of the SRDZ modified and no harvest targets, the integration process adjusted the numbers in two ways:

within a sub-unit, area has shifted between modified and no-harvest ; and,  
modified and no harvest areas have moved between sub-units.

The net effect of these shifts is that while the sub-unit modified and no harvest targets identified in Appendix 3 of the 90 Day Report have changed, the overall no harvest equivalent for the SRDZ remains at 30%.

## **Fisheries**

**1. What is the status of the Dobson report?**

The report has been received by IAMC and the RRB and forwarded to SDM's and SRPs as information. The report will be useful in determining which portions of the watersheds may require further assessment in operational planning. The SDMs are providing direction on this issue.

**2. What about the use of different curves to derive ECA - what is the approved method for measuring ECA?**

The integration process used a linear formula to represent the relationship between stand age and hydrologic recovery to estimate equivalent clearcut area (ECA) over time. It is expected that more detailed watershed assessments will follow the ECA analysis outlined in the Interior Watershed Assessment Procedure.

**3. The fisheries assessment was done in 1996- what amount of disturbance was looked at?**

The Fisheries Target Risk Assessment examined the current (1996) level of risk and estimated the level of risk that would occur following an additional 20 years of harvest. The current level of risk was based on the 1996 seral stage information and the estimate of risk in year 2016 was based on block proposal contained in the Short Term Timber Availability Assessment. It should be noted that the STTAA was prepared for strategic analysis purposes only and does not represent operational intent.

## **Integration Assumptions**

### **1. Rotation Ages - do harvest planners have to look at harvesting at 80/120 yr rotations?**

No, these ages were used for analysis of impact purposes only and are not management direction to operational planning nor do they constrain operational planners in their preparation of SPs. IAMC expects that the normal rotation ages of 80 and 120 years will be utilized by SRPs in assessing impacts to timber access of non-timber strategies.

### **2. Were impacts calculated by tree species?**

For some of the strategies the calculated impact was based on species. Examples include Eastern Caribou, assumed to be mostly "other" species, Itcha Ilgachuz Caribou, assumed to be exclusively pine, and MDWR where the impact is based on Douglas fir only.

### **3. EEA concept - where did it come from?**

The concept was developed through the integration process as a method of tying rotation age to area based access targets.

### **4. CCLUP landbase - are things like inoperable, steep slopes netted out?**

No, the targets contained in the CCLUP are based on the productive forest land base which is defined on page 151 of the 90 Day Report and included as Appendix X in the Integration Report.

### **5. What about the volume/ha in extended rotations from the strategies?**

The targets contained in the CCLUP are area based and the integration analysis did not address volume implications of access to area decisions. Volume implications are more appropriately assessed through the Timber Supply Review process.