APPENDIX III

TARGET ANALYSIS

Analysis Scenarios

The South Chilcotin Sub-Regional Plan (SCSRP) Table was to develop management objectives which would provide guidance for development activities within the plan area. Various targets had been established by the Cariboo-Chilcotin Land-Use Plan (CCLUP) for the area covered by the SCSRP. The key targets used for comparison purposes were the no harvest percentages. The no harvest target for the South Chilcotin Special Resource Development Zone (SRDZ) portion of the SCSRP area is 16% and for the Gaspard Enhanced Resource Development Zone (ERDZ) portion of the SCSRP it is 14%. The no harvest target for the Gaspard portion is an estimate because only a small piece of the Gaspard ERDZ falls within the boundaries of the SCSRP area (~ 3%). The no harvest target for the South Chilcotin SRDZ is the one established by the CCLUP because it falls completely within the SCSRP area. The cumulative No Harvest impact of any combination of management objectives and strategies proposed by the SCSRP Table were to meet these targets.

A variety of analysis scenarios were developed by the Technical Analysis Committee to model how closely a specific combination of management objectives and strategies proposed by the SCSRP Table came to meeting the established targets. Analysis assumptions were developed for each scenario. These analysis assumptions were used as the input criteria for the model, which would then test the impacts of the individual management objectives and strategies towards achieving the targets. The analysis approach adopted by the Technical Analysis Committee is one that is similar to the methodology used to develop the Cariboo-Chilcotin Land-Use Plan Integration Report (April 6, 1998).

To allow the Technical Analysis Committee to keep track the information collected by the SCSRP process and detail the changes made for each analysis scenario, a Data Book was compiled. For each identified issue or piece of information, the Data Book contains the following information:

- a description of the item,
- the detailed analysis assumptions used for each scenario (if any),
- an area summary detailing the number of hectares,
- a description of the digital information available and a log of changes made to the digital information (the metadata) and
- a map showing the location and size of the specific item.

Management objectives were developed for some items, which were not mappable at the scale used for the SCSRP. These *non-spatial* items are included in the Data Book, but do not have an area summary, a metadata or a map.

To ensure that the analysis had a consistent base for comparison purposes, the SCSRP Table agreed that information to be used for the analysis was cut-off as of September 30, 1998. This would allow for valid comparisons between the results of the various scenarios. New information, whether spatial or non-spatial, introduced after this date would be recognised by the SCSRP process, but would not be incorporated into the analysis.

Five analysis scenarios, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5a and 5b were run as "Information" scenarios. The purpose of these runs was to test the sensitivity of the no harvest percentage result obtained by scenario 4 and scenario 5. This was done by altering only one or two key assumptions. The results of these "Information" scenarios were then reviewed and, depending on the validity of the assumptions used, the Technical Analysis Committee would decide whether or not to recommend the particular approach to the SCSRP Table for consideration.

One of the key modelling assumptions borrowed from the CCLUP Integration process is that various constraints can "overlap". This allows any one specific hectare of land to fulfil several purposes. For example, if an Old Growth Management Area and an area of critical Moose Habitat were mapped as overlapping, then the area within the Old Growth Management Area would contribute to management of the Moose Habitat area. This is because the Old Growth Management Area is managed as 100% no harvest and the Moose Habitat area is managed on a 160 year extended rotation. Thus the more restrictive strategy will overlap with a value with a less restrictive strategy.

Another key feature borrowed from the Integration process was the Equivalent Excluded Area (EEA) calculation. This calculation allows the no harvest impact of a management assumption, which results in an extended rotation, to be assessed. The EEA formula used is:

EEA = 1-(normal rotation/strategy rotation)

Where <u>normal rotation</u> is 80 years for lodgepole pine (Pl)
and 120 years for all other species (Douglas fir, spruce, balsam, cedar and hemlock) and

<u>strategy rotation</u> is a the rotation age, in excess of the normal rotation age, which results from the constraints due to managing for a specific objective.

For areas, which were modelled with a recommended Visual Quality Objective (VQO), the following assumptions were used to derive the EEA's and thus calculate the no harvest impact. For polygons with a recommended mix of VQO's (i.e. 50% R, 50% PR) a proportional EEA was calculated.

Unless otherwise noted, the following distribution of tree species for a particular area are assumed to be as follows:

Lodgepole pine (Pl):	90%
Douglas fir/Other (Fd/Other):	10%

For modelling purposes, the maximum allowable percentage alteration of a viewshed area when viewed from above (i.e. planimetric view) for each recommended Visual Quality Objective (VQO) was assumed to be as follows:

Retention (R)	5%	
Partial Retention (PR)	15%	
Modification (M)	25%	(non-constraining over the normal rotation)

For modelling purposes, visually effective green-up was assumed to occur in 20 years.

Scenario - "Base Case"

The "Base Case" scenario was developed as the baseline to which all the other analyses could be compared. The "Base Case" scenario was run using all information collected up to the September 30th cut-off date. This scenario would provide a mechanism to assess progress towards achievement of the targets established by the Cariboo-Chilcotin Land-Use Plan for the South Chilcotin Sub-Regional Plan area.

The "Base Case" analysis assumptions were designed to include the most constraining interpretation of the various management objectives. Each issue was dealt with on an individual basis, with only the naturally occurring overlaps being captured in this analysis. This approach was described at the SCSRP Table as the "full bucket" approach.

The following items where included in the "Base Case" analysis:

ITEM	NO HARVEST	COMMENTS
Big Basin	100%	Natural overlaps with Mule Deer Winter Range, Sheep Corridor
East Basin	100%	Natural overlaps with Mule Deer Winter Range, Sheep Corridor
Little Basin	100%	Natural overlaps with Mule Deer Winter Range, Sheep Corridor
Lakeshore Management Zone – Class 'A' Lakes	100%	One Class 'A' lake – Roaster Lake proposed by the Williams Lake Forest District Lakes Classification process
Lakeshore Management Zone – Class 'B' Lakes	EEA= 0.60 for Pl = 0.40 for Fd/Others	Impact based on proposed Harvesting Guidelines from the Williams Lake Forest District Lakes Classification process: 10 percent removal, 20 year green-up
Moose Habitat	100%	
Mule Deer Winter Ranges	EEA= 0.52 for Fd	Manage Fd on a 250 year rotation Manage Pl & Other on normal rotation Target low crown closure stands deducted
Old Growth Management Areas	100%	
Sheep Corridor	100%	Natural overlaps with Big, East and Little Basins and Mule Deer Winter Range
Riparian Reserve Zones	100%	For streams, wetlands and lakes
Riparian Management Zones	100% for 50% of the area of S1-S3 100% for 25% of the area of S4-S5 100% for 40% of the area of wetlands in ESSF and MS	No Harvest impacts based on "Best Practices" for streams and wetlands in the Interior, from the Riparian Management Area Guidebook, Dec. 1995
Big Creek Trail Viewshed	EEA= 0.80 for Pl = 0.70 for Fd/Others	Manage foreground view from the trail to a VQO of Retention.
Lake Viewsheds	EEA (R)= 0.80 for Pl = 0.70 for Fd/Others EEA(PR)= 0.40 for Pl = 0.10 for Fd/Others	Lakes with recommended VQO's Koster, Roaster and Swartz Lakes
Recreation Corridor Viewsheds	EEA= 0.40 for Pl = 0.10 for Others	Manage Recreation Corridor Viewsheds based on a recommended VQO of PR
Wildlife Tree Patches	2.94%	Used 7% requirement for all landscape units. 50% overlap with Riparian Reserve Zones. Modelled as 100% No Harvest.
Bull Trout Habitat	1.00%	Based on direction contained in the "Cariboo-Chilcotin Land-Use Plan, 90-Day Implementation

		Process, Final Report – Feb. 1995”

The “Base Case” scenario results were:

Zone	Target %	Scenario %	Difference
South Chilcotin SRDZ	16.00	29.21	+ 13.21
Gaspard ERDZ	14.00	23.33	+ 9.33
South Chilcotin SRP	15.82	28.69	+ 12.87

Analysis of the “Base Case” scenario indicted that more work was required to achieve the targets for the SCSRP area.

Scenario - 1

Scenario 1 was developed as a refinement to the "Base Case" scenario. This scenario would utilize some of the recommendations from the CCLUP Integration report to begin to maximise the potential for "overlaps".

The Scenario 1 analysis assumptions were designed to carry over some of the most constraining interpretations of the key issues and to begin to utilize some of the management direction from the CCLUP Integration report. Items for which changes occurred from the previous scenario are hi-lighted by being in **bold**.

The following items where included in the Scenario 1 analysis:

ITEM	NO HARVEST	COMMENTS
Big Basin	100%	Natural overlaps with Mule Deer Winter Range, Sheep Corridor
East Basin	**0%**	**Identified values will be met through overlaps with the Sheep Corridor, Mule Deer Winter Range and interior dry-belt Douglas fir management**
Little Basin	**0%**	**Identified values will be met through overlaps with the Sheep Corridor, Mule Deer Winter Range and interior dry-belt Douglas fir management**
Lakeshore Management Zone – Class 'A' Lakes	**100%**	**Two Class 'A' lakes – Roaster Lake and Fish Lake proposed by the Williams Lake Forest District Lakes Classification process. Fish Lake classification added October 30, 1998.**
Lakeshore Management Zone – Class 'B' Lakes	**EEA= 0.50 for Pl** **= 0.25 for Fd/Others**	**Impact based on proposed Harvesting Guidelines from the Williams Lake Forest District Lakes Classification process assuming harvesting will be 100% partial cutting systems. Rotation age equals 160 years**
Moose Habitat	**EEA= 0.38 for all species**	**Moose Habitat areas revised. Harvesting permitted based on a 160 year rotation. No Harvest impact calculated based on assuming a equal distribution of tree species.**
Mule Deer Winter Ranges	**EEA= 0.33 for Fd**	**Manage Fd on a 180 year rotation** **Manage Pl & Other on normal rotation** **Target low crown closure stands deducted**
Old Growth Management Areas	100%	
Sheep Corridor North	**EEA= 0.33 for all species**	**Sheep Corridor split into North and South. Harvesting permitted based on a 120 year rotation.**
Sheep Corridor South	**100%**	**Sheep Corridor split into North and South.**
Riparian Reserve Zones	100%	For streams, wetlands and lakes
Riparian Management Zones	100% for 50% of the area of S1-S3 100% for 25% of the area of S4-S5 100% for 40% of the area of wetlands in ESSF and MS	No Harvest impacts based on "Best Practices" for streams and wetlands in the Interior, from the Riparian Management Area Guidebook, Dec. 1995
Big Creek Trail Viewshed	**0%**	**Manage foreground view from the trail using partial cutting, single tree selection and small patch cutting systems.**

Lake Viewsheds	**EEA (R)= 0.80 for Pl** **= 0.70 for Fd/Others** **EEA(PR)= 0.40 for Pl** **= 0.10 for Fd/Others**	**Lakes with recommended VQO's Koster, Roaster and Swartz Lakes. Swartz Lake viewshed increase in size based of recommendations made by Ministry of Forests Recreation staff.**
Recreation Corridor Viewsheds	**EEA= 0.40 for Pl** **= 0.10 for Others**	**Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd.. Manage Recreation Corridor Viewsheds based on a recommended VQO of PR**
Wildlife Tree Patches	2.94%	Used 7% requirement for all landscape units. 50% overlap with Riparian Reserve Zones. Modelled as 100% No Harvest.
Bull Trout Habitat	1.00%	Based on direction contained in the "Cariboo-Chilcotin Land-Use Plan, 90-Day Implementation Process, Final Report – Feb. 1995"

The Scenario 1 results were:

Zone	Target %	Scenario %	Difference from Targets	Difference from "Base Case"
South Chilcotin SRDZ	16.00	25.67	+ 9.67	- 3.54
Gaspard ERDZ	14.00	21.25	+ 7.25	- 2.08
South Chilcotin SRP	15.82	25.28	+ 9.46	- 3.41

Analysis of the Scenario 1 results indicated that significantly more work was required to achieve the targets for the SCSRP area.

Scenario - 2

Scenario 2 was developed as a further refinement to scenario 1. This scenario utilised more of the recommendations from the CCLUP Integration report. Additional potentials for overlapping issues was further investigated.

The Scenario 2 analysis assumptions were designed to pursue the potential for overlapping of issues. To achieve this some of the management objectives and strategies were reviewed and revised. Specifically, the management objectives and strategies for the Recreation Corridor Viewshed polygons were reviewed and revised to reflect the priority assigned to each polygon. Items for which changes occurred from the previous scenario are hi-lighted by being in **bold**.

The following items where included in the Scenario 2 analysis:

ITEM	NO HARVEST	COMMENTS
Big Basin	100%	Natural overlaps with Mule Deer Winter Range, Sheep Corridor
East Basin	0%	Identified values will be met through overlaps with the Sheep Corridor, Mule Deer Winter Range and interior dry-belt Douglas fir management
Little Basin	0%	Identified values will be met through overlaps with the Sheep Corridor, Mule Deer Winter Range and interior dry-belt Douglas fir management
Lakeshore Management Zone – Class 'A' Lakes	100%	Two Class 'A' lakes – Roaster Lake and Fish Lake proposed by the Williams Lake Forest District Lakes Classification process. Fish Lake classification added October 30, 1998.
Lakeshore Management Zone – Class 'B' Lakes	**EEA= 0.50 for Pl** **= 0.25 for Fd/Others**	Impact based on proposed Harvesting Guidelines from the Williams Lake Forest District Lakes Classification process assuming harvesting will be 100% partial cutting systems. Rotation age equals 160 years.
Moose Habitat	**EEA= 0.50 for Pl** **= 0.25 for Fd/Others**	**Moose Habitat areas revised. Harvesting permitted based on a 160 year rotation. No Harvest impact calculated based on the actual distribution of tree species.**
Mule Deer Winter Ranges	EEA= 0.33 for Fd	Manage Fd on a 180 year rotation Manage Pl & Other on normal rotation Target low crown closure stands deducted.
Old Growth Management Areas	100%	
Sheep Corridor North	EEA= 0.33	Sheep Corridor split into North and South. Harvesting permitted based on a 120 year rotation.
Sheep Corridor South	**EEA= 0.33**	**Sheep Corridor split into North and South. Harvesting permitted based on a 120 year rotation.**
Riparian Reserve Zones	100%	For streams, wetlands and lakes
Riparian Management Zones	100% for 50% of the area of S1-S3 100% for 25% of the area of S4-S5 100% for 40% of the area of wetlands in ESSF and MS	No Harvest impacts based on "Best Practices" for streams and wetlands in the Interior, from the Riparian Management Area Guidebook, Dec. 1995
Big Creek Trail Viewshed	0%	Manage foreground view from the trail using partial cutting, single tree selection and small patch cutting systems.

Lake Viewsheds	**EEA(PR)= 0.40 for Pl** **= 0.10 for Fd/Others**	**Lakes with recommended VQO's Koster, Roaster and Swartz Lakes. Swartz Lake viewshed increase in size based of recommendations made by Ministry of Forests Recreation staff.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-A	**EEA= 0.58 for all species**	**Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-A based on a recommended VQO of 50% R and 50% PR.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-B	**EEA= 0.38 for all species**	**Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-B based on a recommended VQO of 25% R, 50% PR and 25% M.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-C	**EEA= 0.38 for all species**	**Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-C based on a recommended VQO of 20% R, 60% PR and 20% M.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-D	**EEA= 0.28 for all species**	**Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-D based on a recommended VQO of 15% R, 45% PR and 40% M.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-E	**EEA= 0.37 for all species**	**Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-E based on a recommended VQO of 100% PR.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-F	**EEA= 0.09 for all species**	**Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-F based on a recommended VQO of 25% PR and 75% M.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-G	**EEA= 0.18 for all species**	**Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-G based on a recommended VQO of 50% PR and 50% M.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-H	**0%**	**Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-H based on a recommended VQO of 100% M.**
Wildlife Tree Patches	**1.33%**	**Used 7% requirement for all landscape units. 50% overlap with Riparian Reserve Zones. Access to Wildlife Tree Patches is modelled based on a double rotation.**
Bull Trout Habitat	**0.50%**	**Assume that there is a 50% overlap with Wildlife Tree Patch requirements. Based on direction contained in the "Cariboo-Chilcotin Land-Use Plan, 90-Day Implementation**

		Process, Final Report – Feb. 1995"

The Scenario 2 results were:

Zone	Target %	Scenario %	Difference from Targets	Difference from "Base Case"
South Chilcotin SRDZ	16.00	20.94	+ 4.94	- 8.27
Gaspard ERDZ	14.00	18.45	+ 4.45	- 4.88
South Chilcotin SRP	15.82	20.72	+ 4.90	- 7.97

Review of the Scenario 2 results indicated that the possibilities for maximising overlaps required further investigation. Particularly maximising the potential for overlaps between Bull Trout and Visuals, Wildlife Tree Patches and Visuals, and Wildlife Tree Patches and the Old requirements (OGMA's) was to be investigated. The Technical Analysis Committee thought that this would allow the next scenario to come much closer to achieving the targets for the SCSRP area.

Scenario - 3

Scenario 3 was developed as a further refinement to scenario 2. This scenario was to maximise the potential for overlaps and test the impacts of the added Recreation Corridor Segments and the revised Recreation Corridor Viewshed polygons.

The Scenario 3 analysis assumptions were designed to maximise the potential for overlaps with OGMA's, Wildlife Tree Patches and Bull Trout. Items for which changes occurred from the previous scenario are hi-lighted by being in **bold**.

The following items where included in the Scenario 3 analysis:

ITEM	NO HARVEST	COMMENTS
Big Basin	100%	Natural overlaps with Mule Deer Winter Range, Sheep Corridor
East Basin	0%	Identified values will be met through overlaps with the Sheep Corridor, Mule Deer Winter Range and interior dry-belt Douglas fir management
Little Basin	0%	Identified values will be met through overlaps with the Sheep Corridor, Mule Deer Winter Range and interior dry-belt Douglas fir management
Lakeshore Management Zone – Class 'A' Lakes	100%	Two Class 'A' lakes – Roaster Lake and Fish Lake proposed by the Williams Lake Forest District Lakes Classification process. Fish Lake classification added October 30, 1998.
Lakeshore Management Zone – Class 'B' Lakes	EEA= 0.50 for Pl = 0.25 for Fd/Others	Impact based on proposed Harvesting Guidelines from the Williams Lake Forest District Lakes Classification process assuming harvesting will be 100% partial cutting systems. Rotation age equals 160 years.
Moose Habitat	EEA= 0.50 for Pl = 0.25 for Fd/Others	Moose Habitat areas revised. Harvesting permitted based on a 160 year rotation. No Harvest impact calculated based on the actual distribution of tree species.
Mule Deer Winter Ranges	EEA= 0.33 for Fd	Manage Fd on a 180 year rotation Manage Pl & Other on normal rotation Target low crown closure stands deducted.
Old Growth Management Areas	**100%**	**Old Growth Management Areas revised to capture requirements and maximise overlaps.**
Sheep Corridor North	EEA= 0.33	Sheep Corridor split into North and South. Harvesting permitted based on a 120 year rotation.
Sheep Corridor South	EEA= 0.33	Sheep Corridor split into North and South. Harvesting permitted based on a 120 year rotation.
Riparian Reserve Zones	100%	For streams, wetlands and lakes
Riparian Management Zones	100% for 50% of the area of S1-S3 100% for 25% of the area of S4-S5 100% for 40% of the area of wetlands in ESSF and MS	No Harvest impacts based on "Best Practices" for streams and wetlands in the Interior, from the Riparian Management Area Guidebook, Dec. 1995
Big Creek Trail Viewshed	0%	Manage foreground view from the trail using partial cutting, single tree selection and small patch cutting systems.
Lake Viewsheds	EEA(PR)= 0.40 for Pl = 0.10 for Fd/Others	Lakes with recommended VQO's Koster, Roaster and Swartz Lakes. Swartz Lake viewshed increase in size based of recommendations made by Ministry of Forests Recreation staff.

Recreation Corridor Segments	**EEA= 0.80 for Pl = 0.70 for Fd/Others**	**The Recreation Committee added the Recreation Corridor Segments on December 18, 1998. Manage based on a recommended VQO of R.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-A	EEA= 0.58 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-A based on a recommended VQO of 50% R and 50% PR.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-B	EEA= 0.38 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-B based on a recommended VQO of 25% R, 50% PR and 25% M.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-C	EEA= 0.38 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-C based on a recommended VQO of 20% R, 60% PR and 20% M.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-D	EEA= 0.28 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-D based on a recommended VQO of 15% R, 45% PR and 40% M.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-E	EEA= 0.37 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-E based on a recommended VQO of 100% PR.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-F	EEA= 0.09 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-F based on a recommended VQO of 25% PR and 75% M.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-G	EEA= 0.18 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-G based on a recommended VQO of 50% PR and 50% M.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-H	0%	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-H based on a recommended VQO of 100% M.
Wildlife Tree Patches	1.33%	Used 7% requirement for all landscape units. 50% overlap with Riparian Reserve Zones. Access to Wildlife Tree Patches is modelled based on a double rotation.
Bull Trout Habitat	0.50%	Assume that there is a 50% overlap with Wildlife Tree Patch requirements. Based on direction contained in the "Cariboo-Chilcotin Land-Use Plan, 90-Day Implementation Process, Final Report – Feb. 1995"

The Scenario 3 results were:

Zone	Target %	Scenario %	Difference from Targets	Difference from "Base Case"
South Chilcotin SRDZ	16.00	21.16	+ 5.16	- 8.05
Gaspard ERDZ	14.00	20.60	+ 6.60	- 2.73
South Chilcotin SRP	15.82	21.11	+ 5.29	- 7.58

Review of the Scenario 3 results held some surprises for the Technical Analysis Committee. It was generally anticipated that Scenario 3 would result in an additional ~2% reduction in the No Harvest numbers derived from Scenario 2. Instead the No Harvest numbers increased by 0.22% for the South Chilcotin SRDZ and 2.15% for the Gaspard ERDZ for an overall increase of 0.39%. This result indicated to the Technical Analysis Committee that the overlap model being used contained many complex interactions, which makes it difficult to predict the results of any one scenario.

A portion of the upwards pressure on the No Harvest percentage resulted from additional Old Growth Management Areas being added to Landscape Units which did not yet met the Biodiversity Guidebook requirements.

Scenario - 4

Scenario 4 was developed to revise the assumptions that went into scenario 3 to attempt to get the No Harvest percentage closer to the targets. This scenario was to further maximise the potential for overlaps and review and revised management objectives and strategies for the Recreation Corridor Viewshed polygons.

The Scenario 4 analysis assumptions were designed to fine-tune and continue to maximise the potential for overlaps with OGMA's, Wildlife Tree Patches and Bull Trout. The management objectives and strategies for the Recreation Corridor Viewsheds polygons were revised to reflect the priority assigned to each polygon. Items for which changes occurred from the previous scenario are hi-lighted by being in **bold**.

The following items where included in the Scenario 4 analysis:

ITEM	NO HARVEST	COMMENTS
Big Basin	100%	Natural overlaps with Mule Deer Winter Range, Sheep Corridor
East Basin	0%	Identified values will be met through overlaps with the Sheep Corridor, Mule Deer Winter Range and interior dry-belt Douglas fir management
Little Basin	0%	Identified values will be met through overlaps with the Sheep Corridor, Mule Deer Winter Range and interior dry-belt Douglas fir management
Lakeshore Management Zone – Class 'A' Lakes	100%	Two Class 'A' lakes – Roaster Lake and Fish Lake proposed by the Williams Lake Forest District Lakes Classification process. Fish Lake classification added October 30, 1998.
Lakeshore Management Zone – Class 'B' Lakes	EEA= 0.50 for Pl = 0.25 for Fd/Others	Impact based on proposed Harvesting Guidelines from the Williams Lake Forest District Lakes Classification process assuming harvesting will be 100% partial cutting systems. Rotation age equals 160 years.
Moose Habitat	EEA= 0.50 for Pl = 0.25 for Fd/Others	Moose Habitat areas revised. Harvesting permitted based on a 160 year rotation. No Harvest impact calculated based on the actual distribution of tree species.
Mule Deer Winter Ranges	EEA= 0.33 for Fd	Manage Fd on a 180 year rotation Manage Pl & Other on normal rotation Target low crown closure stands deducted.
Old Growth Management Areas	**100%**	**Old Growth Management Areas revised to capture requirements and maximise overlaps. Requirement for Old Growth Management Areas revised to reflect assumption that 50% of the area in Wildlife Tree Patches contribute towards the Old targets.**
Sheep Corridor North	EEA= 0.33	Sheep Corridor split into North and South. Harvesting permitted based on a 120 year rotation.
Sheep Corridor South	EEA= 0.33	Sheep Corridor split into North and South. Harvesting permitted based on a 120 year rotation.
Riparian Reserve Zones	**100%**	**The amount of wetlands mapped on the 1:20,000 Forest Cover maps for the area west of Churn Creek is overestimated. The amount of wetlands requiring reserve zone was reduced by 92%, except for Hungry Valley where it was**

		reduced by 65%. Streams and lakes remained the same.
Riparian Management Zones	**100% for 50% of the area of S1-S3 100% for 25% of the area of S4-S5 100% for 40% of the area of wetlands in ESSF and MS**	**No Harvest impacts based on "Best Practices" for streams and wetlands in the Interior, from the Riparian Management Area Guidebook, Dec. 1995. The amount of wetlands mapped on the 1:20,000 scale Forest Cover maps for the area west of Churn Creek is overestimated. The amount of wetlands requiring management zones was reduced by 80%.**
Big Creek Trail Viewshed	0%	Manage foreground view from the trail using partial cutting, single tree selection and small patch cutting systems.
Lake Viewsheds	**EEA(PR)= 0.40 for Pl = 0.10 for Fd/Others**	**Lakes with recommended VQO's Koster, Roaster and Swartz Lakes. Swartz Lake viewshed increase in size based of recommendations made by Ministry of Forests Recreation staff. Corrections were made to the map tp reflect the actual recommended VQO's.**
Recreation Corridor Segments	EEA= 0.80 for Pl = 0.70 for Fd/Others	The Recreation Committee added the Recreation Corridor Segments on December 18, 1998. Manage based on a recommended VQO of R.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-A	**EEA= 0.60 for Pl = 0.40 for Fd/Others**	**No Harvest impact calculated based on actual species distribution with in the polygon. Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-A based on a recommended VQO of 50% R and 50% PR.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-B	EEA= 0.38 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-B based on a recommended VQO of 25% R, 50% PR and 25% M.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-C	EEA= 0.38 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-C based on a recommended VQO of 20% R, 60% PR and 20% M.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-D	EEA= 0.28 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-D based on a recommended VQO of 15% R, 45% PR and 40% M.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-E	EEA= 0.37 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-E based on a recommended VQO of 100% PR.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-F	EEA= 0.09 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-F based on a recommended VQO of 25% PR and 75% M.

Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-G	EEA= 0.18 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-G based on a recommended VQO of 50% PR and 50% M.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-H	0%	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-H based on a recommended VQO of 100% M.
Wildlife Tree Patches	**1.76%**	**Based on Table 20a of the Biodiversity Guidebook 50% overlap with Riparian Reserve Zones Access to the Wildlife Tree Patches is modelled based on a double rotation for Landscape Unit with no Old requirement and No Harvest for Landscape Units with an Old requirement..**
Bull Trout Habitat	**0%**	**Assume that Bull Trout Habitat requirements will be addressed by the FPC**

The Scenario 4 results were:

Zone	Target %	Scenario %	Difference from Targets	Difference from "Base Case"
South Chilcotin SRDZ	16.00	18.28	+ 2.28	- 10.93
Gaspard ERDZ	14.00	17.51	+ 3.51	- 5.81
South Chilcotin SRP	15.82	18.21	+ 2.39	- 10.48

The results for Scenario 4 were further revised to capture the following estimated changes.

<u>wetlands adjustment:</u>
For wetlands located west of Churn Creek, which would require a riparian reserve zone and /or riparian management zone, an adjustment is required. For the purposes of the overlap table, these wetland areas have been deleted from the analysis. Thus, to estimate the No Harvest impact of these areas an adjustment is required to the No Harvest percentage. This is an estimate of impact and is a non-spatial adjustment.

<u>visuals/WTP overlap adjustment:</u>
To capture the assumption that WTP's contribute to managing for visuals, an adjustment to the No Harvest percentage is required. This is due to the assumption that for the purposes of this analysis, WTP's are non-spatial and the No Harvest impact is based on an arithmetic calculation. The adjustment is made based on the assumption that 50% of the WTP requirement for any one visual polygon contributes to managing for visuals. Thus the area of the visual polygon is reduced by this amount.

10% salvage of OGMA adjustment:

To capture the assumption that 10% of the total old requirement within OGMA's and outside mule deer and riparian requirements will become available for harvest over the course of a rotation, an adjustment to the No Harvest percentages is required. This assumption is consistent with the recommendations of the CCLUP Integration Report (April 6, 1998). This availability is intended to capture salvage due to severe natural disturbance and/or development of innovative approaches to meeting old requirements. This is an estimate of impact and is a non-spatial adjustment.

	SRDZ	ERDZ	SCSRP
• wetland adjustment	+ 0.43	+ 0.67	+ 0.44
• visuals/WTP overlap	- 0.13	- 0.11	- 0.13
• 10% salvage of OGMA	- 0.50	- 0.57	- 0.50
Total	- 0.20	- 0.02	- 0.19

Thus the revised results for Scenario 4 are:

Zone	**Target %**	**Scenario %**	**Difference from Targets**	**Difference from "Base Case"**
South Chilcotin SRDZ	16.00	18.08	+ 2.08	- 11.13
Gaspard ERDZ	14.00	17.50	+ 3.50	- 5.83
South Chilcotin SRP	15.82	18.03	+ 2.21	- 10.66

Review of the revised Scenario 4 indicated that further work was still required to achieve the targets. Issues discussed included adjusting the moose habitat rotation ages to remove the No Harvest impact, increasing the percentage contribution of WTP's to Old targets, combining the Old requirements in the Upper Big Creek and Dash Landscape Units and revising the recommended management direction for the Recreation Corridor Viewsheds.

To assess the impacts of these various assumptions on the results of Scenario 4 the Technical Analysis Committee agreed to run three "Information" scenarios.

Scenario 4a would test the impact of increasing the contribution of WTP's to Old targets from 50% to 75%.

Scenario 4b would test the impact of combining the Upper Big Creek and Dash Landscape Units to meet the Old requirements.

Scenario 4c would test the impacts of revisions proposed by the Licensee participants to the management objectives and strategies for the Recreation Corridor Viewshed polygons.

Scenario - 4a - Information

Scenario 4a was developed to test the impact on the results of scenario 4 of increasing the contribution of WTP's to Old targets from 50% to 75%. This would result in a decrease in the requirement for Old Growth Management Areas.

The scenario 4 analysis assumptions were used as the base for the analysis. The key analysis assumption changes made are indicated below:

ITEM	NO HARVEST	COMMENTS
Old Growth Management Areas	100%	Requirement for Old Growth Management Areas revised to reflect assumption that 75% of the area in Wildlife Tree Patches contribute towards the Old targets.
Wildlife Tree Patches	1.76%	Based on Table 20a of the Biodiversity Guidebook 50% overlap with Riparian Reserve Zones Access to the Wildlife Tree Patches is modelled based on a double rotation for Landscape Unit with no Old requirement and No Harvest for Landscape Units with an Old requirement.

The Scenario 4a results were:

Zone	Target %	Scenario %	Difference from Targets	Difference from Scenario 4
South Chilcotin SRDZ	16.00	17.67	+ 1.67	- 0.61
Gaspard ERDZ	14.00	14.88	+ 0.88	- 2.64
South Chilcotin SRP	15.82	17.42	+ 1.60	- 0.79

The results for Scenario 4a were further revised to capture the following changes:

<u>wetlands adjustment:</u>
For wetlands located west of Churn Creek, which would require a riparian reserve zone and /or riparian management zone an adjustment is required. For the purposes of the overlap table, these wetland areas have been deleted from the analysis. Thus, to estimate the No Harvest impact of these areas an adjustment is required to the No Harvest percentage. This is an estimate of impact and is a non-spatial adjustment.

<u>visuals/WTP overlap adjustment</u>:
To capture the assumption that WTP's contribute to managing for visuals, an adjustment to the No Harvest percentage is required. This is due to the assumption that for the purposes of this analysis, WTP's are non-spatial and the No Harvest impact is based on an arithmetic calculation. The adjustment is made based on the assumption that 50% of the WTP requirement for any one visual polygon contributes to managing for visuals. Thus the area of the visual polygon is reduced by this amount.

10% salvage of OGMA adjustment:

To capture the assumption that 10% of the total old requirement within OGMA's and outside mule deer and riparian requirements will become available for harvest over the course of a rotation, an adjustment to the No Harvest percentages is required. This assumption is consistent with the recommendations of the CCLUP Integration (April 6, 1998). This availability is intended to capture salvage due to severe natural disturbance and/or development of innovative approaches to meeting old requirements. This is an estimate of impact and is a non-spatial adjustment.

	SRDZ	ERDZ	SCSRP
• wetland adjustment	+ 0.43	+ 0.67	+ 0.44
• visuals/WTP overlap	- 0.14	- 0.12	- 0.14
• 10% salvage of OGMA	- 0.43	- 0.28	- 0.41
Total	- 0.14	+ 0.27	- 0.11

Thus the revised results for Scenario 4a are:

Zone	**Target %**	**Scenario %**	**Difference from Targets**	**Difference from Scenario 4**
South Chilcotin SRDZ	16.00	17.53	+ 1.53	- 0.75
Gaspard ERDZ	14.00	15.15	+ 1.15	- 2.37
South Chilcotin SRP	15.82	17.42	+ 1.50	- 0.89

A review of the revised Scenario 4a results by the Technical Analysis Committee resulted in agreement that the analysis assumptions used were supported by all. The Technical Analysis Committee forwarded a recommendation to the SCSRP Table that the Scenario 4a results are adopted as the base of comparison for future analysis runs since the targets were not yet achieved.

Scenario - 4b - Information

Scenario 4b was developed to test the impact on the results of scenario 4 of combining the Upper Big Creek and Dash Landscape Units to meet the Old requirements. This will result in a reduction in the hectares of Old Growth Management Areas required in these Landscape Units. This is due to the excess of Old credits contributed by the Big Creek Park to the Upper Big Creek Landscape Unit.

The Scenario 4 analysis assumptions were used as the base for the analysis. The key analysis assumption changes made are indicated below:

ITEM	NO HARVEST	COMMENTS
Old Growth Management Areas	100%	Requirement for Old Growth Management Areas reduced to reflect the assumption that the Old requirements for the Upper Big Creek and Dash Landscape Units are to be met over the combined area of the Landscape Units.

The Scenario 4b results were:

Zone	Target %	Scenario %	Difference from Targets	Difference from Scenario 4
South Chilcotin SRDZ	16.00	17.58	+ 1.58	- 0.70
Gaspard ERDZ	14.00	12.50	- 1.50	- 5.02
South Chilcotin SRP	15.82	17.13	+ 1.31	- 1.08

The results for Scenario 4b were further revised to capture the following changes:

<u>wetlands adjustment:</u>
For wetlands located west of Churn Creek, which would require a riparian reserve zone and /or riparian management zone an adjustment is required. For the purposes of the overlap table, these wetland areas have been deleted from the analysis. Thus, to estimate the No Harvest impact of these areas an adjustment is required to the No Harvest percentage. This is an estimate of impact and is a non-spatial adjustment.

<u>visuals/WTP overlap adjustment</u>:
To capture the assumption that WTP's contribute to managing for visuals, an adjustment to the No Harvest percentage is required. This is due to the assumption that for the purposes of this analysis, WTP's are non-spatial and the No Harvest impact is based on an arithmetic calculation. The adjustment is made based on the assumption that 50% of the WTP requirement for any one visual polygon contributes to managing for visuals. Thus the area of the visual polygon is reduced by this amount.

10% salvage of OGMA adjustment:
To capture the assumption that 10% of the total old requirement within OGMA's and outside mule deer and riparian requirements will become available for harvest over the course of a rotation, an adjustment to the No Harvest percentages is required. This assumption is consistent with the recommendations of the CCLUP Integration Report (April 6, 1998). This availability is intended to capture salvage due to severe natural disturbance and/or development of innovative approaches to meeting old requirements. This is an estimate of impact and is a non-spatial adjustment.

	SRDZ	ERDZ	SCSRP
• wetland adjustment	+ 0.43	+ 0.67	+ 0.45
• visuals/WTP overlap	- 0.14	- 0.04	- 0.12
• 10% salvage of OGMA	- 0.41	0.00	- 0.37
Total	- 0.12	- 0.63	- 0.04

Thus the revised results for Scenario 4b are:

Zone	Target %	Scenario %	Difference from Targets	Difference from Scenario 4
South Chilcotin SRDZ	16.00	17.46	+ 1.46	- 0.82
Gaspard ERDZ	14.00	13.13	- 0.87	- 4.39
South Chilcotin SRP	15.82	17.08	+ 1.25	- 1.14

A review of the revised Scenario 4b results by the Technical Analysis Committee and based on feedback from the IAMC, it was recommended that this approach be set aside at this time. Adjusting Landscape Unit targets could have regional impacts and implications. The Technical Analysis Committee forwarded a recommendation to the SCSRP Table that the Scenario 4b results be set aside and this approach be viewed as one of the "options of last resort" to achieving the targets.

Scenario - 4c - Information

Scenario 4c was developed to test the impact on the results of Scenario 4 of revisions proposed by the Licensee participants to the management objectives and strategies for the Recreation Corridor Viewshed polygons. Licensees propose to manage key visual areas through completion of visual landscape designs. The designs will be based on achieving the management objectives for each unique polygon. The completed designs would be submitted to the District Manager for review and approval and would provide the template for all development activities in the area.

The Scenario 4 analysis assumptions were used as the base for the analysis. The key analysis assumption changes made are indicated below:

ITEM	NO HARVEST	COMMENTS
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-A	EEA= 0.60 for Pl = 0.40 for Fd/Others	No Harvest impact calculated based on actual species distribution with in the polygon. Recreation Corridor Viewshed management objectives have been revised. To aid in achieving the objectives manage Polygon 1-A based on a recommended VQO of 50% R and 50% PR.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-B	EEA= 0.20 for Pl	Recreation Corridor Viewshed management objectives have been revised. Managing to the revised objectives will constrain harvest access to Pl only.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-C-a	EEA= 0.00	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shape split and relabelled to capture a unique area. Recreation Corridor Viewshed management objectives have been revised. Visual values will largely be meet through overlaps with Moose Habitat areas and OGMA's.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-C-b	EEA= 0.15 for Pl	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shape split and relabelled to capture a unique area. Recreation Corridor Viewshed management objectives have been revised. Managing to the revised objectives will constrain harvest access to Pl only.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-D	EEA= 0.00	Recreation Corridor Viewshed management objectives have been revised. Managing to the revised objectives will not constrain harvest access to timber.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-E-a	EEA= 0.00	Recreation Corridor Viewshed management objectives have been revised. Managing to the revised objectives will not constrain harvest access to timber.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-E-b	EEA= 0.15 for Pl	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shape split and relabelled to capture a unique area. Recreation Corridor Viewshed management objectives have been revised. Managing to the revised objectives will constrain harvest access to Pl only.

The Scenario 4c results were:

Zone	Target %	Scenario %	Difference from Targets	Difference from Scenario 4
South Chilcotin SRDZ	16.00	14.73	- 1.27	- 3.55
Gaspard ERDZ	14.00	17.53	+ 3.53	+ 0.01
South Chilcotin SRP	15.82	14.98	- 0.85	- 3.24

These results were not further adjusted.

Licensee participants and Ministry of Environment staff proposed that the results of scenario 4c be closely reviewed. Both parties propose that the over achievement on the No Harvest target could be used to review and revise adjustments made to wildlife and habitat management objectives and strategies. The impacts on the core Backcountry Area polygons would also require further review. No agreement was reached by the Technical Analysis Committee as to recommendations to be made to the SCSRP Table relating to scenario 4c.

Scenario - 5

Scenario 5 was developed to be the final full scenario run by the Technical Analysis Committee. It would capture all the gains made by scenarios 4 and 4a and would reflect further changes made to the objectives and strategies for the Recreation Corridor Viewshed polygons. The purpose of these revisions was to "fine-tune" the assumptions and achieve a No Harvest impact result as close as possible to the targets.

The Scenario 5 analysis assumptions were based on a combination of the assumptions used for scenario 4 and 4a. Additional changes were made to reflect the revisions made to the management objectives and strategies for the Recreation Corridor Viewsheds polygons and Moose Habitat areas. The Recreation Corridor Viewshed polygon shapes and labels are the same as for scenario 4c. Additionally, the recommended VQO's for Koster and Swartz Lake have been revised. Items for which changes occurred compared to scenario 4 and 4a are hi-lighted by being in **bold**.

The following items where included in the Scenario 5 analysis:

ITEM	NO HARVEST	COMMENTS
Big Basin	100%	Natural overlaps with Mule Deer Winter Range, Sheep Corridor
East Basin	0%	Identified values will be met through overlaps with the Sheep Corridor, Mule Deer Winter Range and interior dry-belt Douglas fir management
Little Basin	0%	Identified values will be met through overlaps with the Sheep Corridor, Mule Deer Winter Range and interior dry-belt Douglas fir management
Lakeshore Management Zone – Class 'A' Lakes	100%	Two Class 'A' lakes – Roaster Lake and Fish Lake proposed by the Williams Lake Forest District Lakes Classification process. Fish Lake classification added October 30, 1998.
Lakeshore Management Zone – Class 'B' Lakes	EEA= 0.50 for Pl = 0.25 for Fd/Others	Impact based on proposed Harvesting Guidelines from the Williams Lake Forest District Lakes Classification process assuming harvesting will be 100% partial cutting systems. Rotation age equals 160 years.
Moose Habitat	**EEA= 0.50 for Pl** **= 0.25 for Fd/Others**	**Moose Habitat areas revised to reflect overlaps with Recreation Corridor Viewshed polygons 1-A and 1-C-a. Harvesting permitted in the un-overlapped portion of the Moose Habitat area based on a 160 year rotation. No Harvest impact calculated based on the actual distribution of tree species.**
Mule Deer Winter Ranges	EEA= 0.33 for Fd	Manage Fd on a 180 year rotation Manage Pl & Other on normal rotation Target low crown closure stands deducted
Old Growth Management Areas	100%	Requirement for Old Growth Management Areas revised to reflect assumption that 75% of the area in Wildlife Tree Patches contribute towards the Old targets.
Sheep Corridor North	EEA= 0.33	Sheep Corridor split into North and South. Harvesting permitted based on a 120 year rotation.
Sheep Corridor South	EEA= 0.33	Sheep Corridor split into North and South. Harvesting permitted based on a 120 year rotation.

Riparian Reserve Zones	100%	The amount of wetlands mapped on the 1:20,000 Forest Cover maps for the area west of Churn Creek is overestimated. The amount of wetlands requiring reserve zones was reduced by 92%, except for Hungry Valley where it was reduced by 65%. Streams and lakes remained the same.
Riparian Management Zones	100% for 50% of the area of S1-S3 100% for 25% of the area of S4-S5 100% for 40% of the area of wetlands in ESSF and MS	No Harvest impacts based on "Best Practices" for streams and wetlands in the Interior, from the Riparian Management Area Guidebook, Dec. 1995. The amount of wetlands mapped on the 1:20,000 scale Forest Cover maps for the area west of Churn Creek is overestimated. The amount of wetlands requiring management zones was reduced by 80%.
Big Creek Trail Viewshed	0%	Manage foreground view from the trail using partial cutting, single tree selection and small patch cutting systems.
Lake Viewsheds	**EEA (R)= 0.80 for Pl** **= 0.70 for Fd/Others** **EEA(PR)= 0.40 for Pl** **= 0.10 for Fd/Others**	**The viewshed for Swartz Lake has been removed from the Lake Viewshed coverage and is now called "Swartz Lake Viewshed"(Jan. 20, 1999). Lakes with recommended VQO's are now Koster and Roaster Lakes. All R VQO polygons around Koster Lake have been changed to PR.**
Swartz Lake Viewshed	**EEA= 0.54 for all species**	**Manage the viewshed for Swartz Lake based on a recommended VQO of 40% R and 60% PR.**
Recreation Corridor Segments	EEA= 0.80 for Pl = 0.70 for Fd/Others	The Recreation Committee added the Recreation Corridor Segments on December 18, 1998. Manage based on a recommended VQO of R.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-A	EEA= 0.60 for Pl = 0.40 for Fd/Others	No Harvest impact calculated based on actual species distribution with in the polygon. Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-A based on a recommended VQO of 50% R and 50% PR.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-B	**EEA= 0.19 for all species**	**Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-B based on a recommended VQO of 15% R, 20% PR and 65% M.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-C-a	**EEA= 0.38 for all species**	**Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes further revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-C-a based on a recommended VQO of 20% R, 60% PR and 20% M.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-C-b	**EEA= 0.38 for all species**	**Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes further revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-C-b based on a recommended VQO of 20% R, 60% PR and 20% M.**

Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-D	**EEA= 0.08 for all species**	**Manage Polygon 1-D based on a recommended VQO of 10% R and 90% M.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-E-a	**EEA= 0.37 for all species**	**Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes further revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-E-a based on a recommended VQO of 100% PR.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-E-b	**EEA= 0.00**	**Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes further revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-E-b based on a recommended VQO of 100% M.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-F	EEA= 0.09 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-F based on a recommended VQO of 25% PR and 75% M.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-G-a	**EEA= 0.07 for all species**	**Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes further revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-G-a based on a recommended VQO of 20% PR and 80% M.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-G-b	**EEA= 0.37 for all species**	**Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes further revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage the portion of Polygon 2-G-b south of the trail based on a recommended VQO of 100% PR.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-G-c	**EEA= 0.00**	**Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes further revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-G-c based on a recommended VQO of 100% M.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-G-d	**EEA= 0.00**	**Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes further revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-G-d based on a recommended VQO of 100% M.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-G-e	**EEA= 0.00**	**Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes further revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-G-e based on a recommended VQO of 100% M.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-H	EEA= 0.00	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-H based on a recommended VQO of 100% M.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-I	**EEA= 0.00**	**Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-I**

		based on a recommended VQO of 100% M.

Wildlife Tree Patches	1.77% SRDZ 2.28 % ERDZ	Based on Table 20a of the Biodiversity Guidebook 50% overlap with Riparian Reserve Zones Access to the Wildlife Tree Patches is modelled based on a double rotation for Landscape Unit with no Old requirement and No Harvest for Landscape Units with an Old requirement.
Bull Trout Habitat	0%	Assume that Bull Trout Habitat requirements will be addressed by the FPC

The Scenario 5 results were:

Zone	**Target %**	**Scenario %**	**Difference from Targets**	**Difference from "Base Case"**
South Chilcotin SRDZ	16.00	16.44	+ 0.44	- 12.77
Gaspard ERDZ	14.00	11.96	- 2.05	- 11.37
South Chilcotin SRP	15.82	16.04	+ 0.22	- 12.65

The results for Scenario 5 were further revised to capture the following changes:

<u>wetlands adjustment:</u>
For wetlands located west of Churn Creek, which would require a riparian reserve zone and /or riparian management zone an adjustment is required. For the purposes of the overlap table, these wetland areas have been deleted from the analysis. Thus, to estimate the No Harvest impact of these areas an adjustment is required to the No Harvest percentage. This is an estimate of impact and is a non-spatial adjustment.

<u>visuals/WTP overlap adjustment:</u>
To capture the assumption that WTP's contribute to managing for visuals, an adjustment to the No Harvest percentage is required. This is due to the assumption that for the purposes of this analysis, WTP's are non-spatial and the No Harvest impact is based on an arithmetic calculation. The adjustment is made based on the assumption that 50% of the WTP requirement for any one visual polygon contributes to managing for visuals. Thus the area of the visual polygon is reduced by this amount.

<u>10% salvage of OGMA adjustment</u>:
To capture the assumption that 10% of the total old requirement within OGMA's and outside mule deer and riparian requirements will become available for harvest over the course of a rotation, an adjustment to the No Harvest percentages is required. This assumption is consistent with the recommendations of the CCLUP Integration (April 6, 1998). This availability is intended to capture salvage due to severe natural disturbance and/or development of innovative approaches to meeting old requirements. This is an estimate of impact and is a non-spatial adjustment.

	SRDZ	ERDZ	SCSRP
• wetland adjustment	+ 0.43	+ 0.67	+ 0.45
• visuals/WTP overlap	- 0.15	- 0.04	- 0.13
• 10% salvage of OGMA	- 0.43	- 0.28	- 0.42
Total	- 0.15	+ 0.35	- 0.10

Thus the revised results for Scenario 5 are:

Zone	**Target %**	**Scenario %**	**Difference from Targets**	**Difference from "Base Case"**
South Chilcotin SRDZ	16.00	16.29	+ 0.29	- 12.92
Gaspard ERDZ	14.00	12.31	- 1.69	- 11.02
South Chilcotin SRP	15.82	15.94	+ 0.11	- 12.75

Review of the revised Scenario 5 results indicated to the Technical Analysis Committee that this analysis was very close to the targets for the South Chilcotin Sub-Regional Plan area. The Technical Analysis Committee agreed that the results of scenario 5 should be taken forward to the Table with the recommendation that this scenario be adopted as the final scenario.

Scenario - 5a - Information

Scenario 5a was developed as a contingency scenario to be closely reviewed if scenario 5 did not come close to meeting the targets

The Scenario 5a analysis assumptions were based on scenario 5 with the only adjustment being that the maximum allowable disturbance, measured in the planimetric view, for a Partial Retention VQO is increased to 20% from 15%. The key analysis assumption changes are indicated below:

ITEM	NO HARVEST	COMMENTS
Lake Viewsheds	EEA (R)= 0.80 for Pl = 0.70 for Fd/Others EEA(PR)= 0.20 for Pl = 0.00 for Fd/Others	The viewshed for Swartz Lake has been removed from the Lake Viewshed coverage and is now called "Swartz Lake Viewshed"(Jan. 20, 1999). Lakes with recommended VQO's are now Koster and Roaster Lakes. All R VQO polygons around Koster Lake have been changed to PR.
Swartz Lake Viewshed	EEA= 0.42 for all species	Manage the viewshed for Swartz Lake based on a recommended VQO of 40% R and 60% PR.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-A	EEA= 0.50 for Pl = 0.35 for Fd/Others	No Harvest impact calculated based on actual species distribution with in the polygon. Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-A based on a recommended VQO of 50% R and 50% PR.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-B	EEA= 0.15 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-B based on a recommended VQO of 15% R, 20% PR and 65% M.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-C-a	EEA= 0.27 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes further revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-C-a based on a recommended VQO of 20% R, 60% PR and 20% M.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-C-b	EEA= 0.27 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes further revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-C-b based on a recommended VQO of 20% R, 60% PR and 20% M.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-D	EEA= 0.08 for all species	Manage Polygon 1-D based on a recommended VQO of 10% R and 90% M.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-E-a	EEA= 0.18 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes further revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-E-a based on a recommended VQO of 100% PR.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-E-b	EEA= 0.00	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes further revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-E-b based on a recommended VQO of 100% M.

Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-F	EEA= 0.09 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-F based on a recommended VQO of 25% PR and 75% M.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-G-a	EEA= 0.04 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes further revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-G-a based on a recommended VQO of 20% PR and 80% M.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-G-b	EEA= 0.18 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes further revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage the portion of Polygon 2-G-b south of the trail based on a recommended VQO of 100% PR.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-H	EEA= 0.00	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-H based on a recommended VQO of 100% M.

The Scenario 5a results were:

Zone	**Target %**	**Scenario %**	**Difference from Targets**	**Difference from "Base Case"**
South Chilcotin SRDZ	16.00	14.12	- 1.88	- 15.09
Gaspard ERDZ	14.00	12.06	- 1.94	- 11.27
South Chilcotin SRP	15.82	13.94	- 1.89	- 14.75

The results for Scenario 5 were further revised to capture the following changes:

<u>wetlands adjustment:</u>
For wetlands located west of Churn Creek, which would require a riparian reserve zone and /or riparian management zone an adjustment is required. For the purposes of the overlap table, these wetland areas have been deleted from the analysis. Thus, to estimate the No Harvest impact of these areas an adjustment is required to the No Harvest percentage. This is an estimate of impact and is a non-spatial adjustment.

<u>visuals/WTP overlap adjustment:</u>
To capture the assumption that WTP's contribute to managing for visuals, an adjustment to the No Harvest percentage is required. This is due to the assumption that for the purposes of this analysis, WTP's are non-spatial and the No Harvest impact is based on an arithmetic calculation. The adjustment is made based on the assumption that 50% of the WTP requirement for any one visual polygon contributes to managing for visuals. Thus the area of the visual polygon is reduced by this amount.

10% salvage of OGMA adjustment:
To capture the assumption that 10% of the total old requirement within OGMA's and outside mule deer and riparian requirements will become available for harvest over the course of a rotation, an adjustment to the No Harvest percentages is required. This assumption is consistent with the recommendations of the CCLUP Integration Report (April 6, 1998). This availability is intended to capture salvage due to severe natural disturbance and/or development of innovative approaches to meeting old requirements. This is an estimate of impact and is a non-spatial adjustment.

	SRDZ	ERDZ	SCSRP
• wetland adjustment	+ 0.43	+ 0.67	+ 0.45
• visuals/WTP overlap	- 0.14	- 0.04	- 0.12
• 10% salvage of OGMA	- 0.43	- 0.28	- 0.42
Total	- 0.14	+ 0.35	- 0.09

Thus the revised results for Scenario 5a are:

Zone	**Target %**	**Scenario %**	**Difference from Targets**	**Difference from "Base Case"**
South Chilcotin SRDZ	16.00	13.98	- 2.02	- 15.23
Gaspard ERDZ	14.00	12.41	- 1.59	- 10.92
South Chilcotin SRP	15.82	13.84	- 1.98	- 14.85

A review of the revised Scenario 5a results indicated to the Technical Analysis Committee that the assumptions used in this analysis resulted in a significant over-achievement of the targets for the South Chilcotin Sub-Regional Plan area. The Technical Analysis Committee agreed that based on the results of scenario 5, these results should be set aside and treated as information only at this time

Scenario - 5b - Information

Scenario 5b was developed to address concerns expressed by Chris Hamilton – BC Parks about the management strategies for the foreground viewshed of the Big Creek Park Trail.

The Scenario 5b analysis assumptions were developed by Chris Hamilton – BC Parks and MOF Planning and Recreation staff based on the scenario 5 analysis assumptions. The Technical Analysis Committee members were presented with the scenario assumptions and results, after the scenario had been completed. The key analysis assumption changes are indicated below:

ITEM	NO HARVEST	COMMENTS
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-E-c	EEA= 0.22 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed polygon 1-E-a further subdivided to reflect revised management strategies for the Big Creek Park Trail foreground viewshed. Manage Polygon 1-E-c based on a recommended VQO of 60% PR and 40% M.
Big Creek Viewshed Polygon A	EEA= 0.80 for Pl = 0.70 for Fd/Others	The Big Creek Viewshed (foreground view) has been subdivided to reflect revised management strategies. Manage polygon A based on a recommended VQO of R.
Big Creek Viewshed Polygon B	EEA= 0.40 for Pl = 0.10 for Fd/Others	The Big Creek Viewshed (foreground view) has been subdivided to reflect revised management strategies. Manage polygon B based on a recommended VQO of PR.
Big Creek Viewshed Polygon C	EEA= 0.00	The Big Creek Viewshed (foreground view) has been subdivided to reflect revised management strategies. Manage polygon C based on a recommended VQO of PR. Use of partial cutting, single tree selection and small patch cutting systems will result in achieving a VQO of PR within a normal rotation.

The Scenario 5b results were:

Zone	**Target %**	**Scenario %**	**Difference from Targets**	**Difference from "Base Case"**
South Chilcotin SRDZ	16.00	16.60	+ 0.60	- 12.61
Gaspard ERDZ	14.00	11.96	- 2.04	- 11.37
South Chilcotin SRP	15.82	16.19	+ 0.37	- 12.50

The results for Scenario 5b were further revised to capture the following changes:

<u>wetlands adjustment:</u>
For wetlands located west of Churn Creek, which would require a riparian reserve zone and /or riparian management zone an adjustment is required. For the purposes of the overlap table, these wetland areas have been deleted from the analysis. Thus, to estimate the No Harvest impact of these areas an adjustment is required to the No Harvest percentage. This is an estimate of impact and is a non-spatial adjustment.

visuals/WTP overlap adjustment:
To capture the assumption that WTP's contribute to managing for visuals, an adjustment to the No Harvest percentage is required. This is due to the assumption that for the purposes of this analysis, WTP's are non-spatial and the No Harvest impact is based on an arithmetic calculation. The adjustment is made based on the assumption that 50% of the WTP requirement for any one visual polygon contributes to managing for visuals. Thus the area of the visual polygon is reduced by this amount.

10% salvage of OGMA adjustment:
To capture the assumption that 10% of the total old requirement within OGMA's and outside mule deer and riparian requirements will become available for harvest over the course of a rotation, an adjustment to the No Harvest percentages is required. This assumption is consistent with the recommendations of the CCLUP Integration Report (April 6, 1998). This availability is intended to capture salvage due to severe natural disturbance and/or development of innovative approaches to meeting old requirements. This is an estimate of impact and is a non-spatial adjustment.

	SRDZ	ERDZ	SCSRP
• wetland adjustment	+ 0.43	+ 0.67	+ 0.45
• visuals/WTP overlap	- 0.14	- 0.04	- 0.12
• 10% salvage of OGMA	- 0.43	- 0.28	- 0.42
Total	- 0.14	+ 0.35	- 0.09

Thus the revised results for Scenario 5b are:

Zone	**Target %**	**Scenario %**	**Difference from Targets**	**Difference from "Base Case"**
South Chilcotin SRDZ	16.00	16.46	+ 0.46	- 12.75
Gaspard ERDZ	14.00	12.31	- 1.69	- 11.02
South Chilcotin SRP	15.82	16.09	+ 0.27	- 12.60

The Technical Analysis Committee reviewed the results of scenario 5b and agreed that if the No Harvest impact of this scenario would be identical to scenario 5, then it would recommend to the Table to adopt this approach for managing the foreground view visible from the Big Creek Park trail. Thus, further work was required to adjust the No Harvest impact of this scenario downwards.

Scenario - 5 - Final

Scenario 5 – Final was developed to confirm the results of scenario 5.

The Scenario 5 –Final analysis assumptions were based on the assumptions used for scenario 5. Minor changes were made to incorporate the revisions to the management strategies for the Big Creek Park Trail Viewshed. Items for which changes occurred compared to scenario 5 are hi-lighted by being in **bold**.

The following items where included in the Scenario 5 - Final analysis:

ITEM	NO HARVEST	COMMENTS
Big Basin	100%	Natural overlaps with Mule Deer Winter Range, Sheep Corridor
East Basin	0%	Identified values will be met through overlaps with the Sheep Corridor, Mule Deer Winter Range and interior dry-belt Douglas fir management
Little Basin	0%	Identified values will be met through overlaps with the Sheep Corridor, Mule Deer Winter Range and interior dry-belt Douglas fir management
Lakeshore Management Zone – Class 'A' Lakes	100%	Two Class 'A' lakes – Roaster Lake and Fish Lake proposed by the Williams Lake Forest District Lakes Classification process. Fish Lake classification added October 30, 1998.
Lakeshore Management Zone – Class 'B' Lakes	EEA= 0.50 for Pl = 0.25 for Fd/Others	Impact based on proposed Harvesting Guidelines from the Williams Lake Forest District Lakes Classification process assuming harvesting will be 100% partial cutting systems. Rotation age equals 160 years.
Moose Habitat	EEA= 0.50 for Pl = 0.25 for Fd/Others (for un-overlapped portion only)	Moose Habitat areas revised to reflect overlaps with Recreation Corridor Viewshed polygons 1-A and 1-C-a. Harvesting permitted in the un-overlapped portion of the Moose Habitat area based on a 160 year rotation. No Harvest impact calculated based on the actual distribution of tree species.
Mule Deer Winter Ranges	EEA= 0.33 for Fd	Manage Fd on a 180 year rotation Manage Pl & Other on normal rotation Target low crown closure stands deducted
Old Growth Management Areas	100%	Requirement for Old Growth Management Areas revised to reflect assumption that 75% of the area in Wildlife Tree Patches contribute towards the Old targets.
Sheep Corridor North	EEA= 0.33	Sheep Corridor split into North and South. Harvesting permitted based on a 120 year rotation.
Sheep Corridor South	EEA= 0.33	Sheep Corridor split into North and South. Harvesting permitted based on a 120 year rotation.
Riparian Reserve Zones	100%	The amount of wetlands mapped on the 1:20,000 Forest Cover maps for the area west of Churn Creek is overestimated. The amount of wetlands requiring reserve zones was reduced by 92%, except for Hungry Valley where it was reduced by 65%. Streams and lakes remained the same.

Riparian Management Zones	100% for 50% of the area of S1-S3 100% for 25% of the area of S4-S5 100% for 40% of the area of wetlands in ESSF and MS	No Harvest impacts based on "Best Practices" for streams and wetlands in the Interior, from the Riparian Management Area Guidebook, Dec. 1995. The amount of wetlands mapped on the 1:20,000 scale Forest Cover maps for the area west of Churn Creek is overestimated. The amount of wetlands requiring management zones was reduced by 80%.
Big Creek Viewshed Polygon A	**EEA= 0.60 for Pl** **= 0.40 for Fd/Others**	**The Big Creek Viewshed (foreground view) has been subdivided to reflect revised management strategies. Manage polygon A based on a recommended VQO of PR with a 200 year rotation.**
Big Creek Viewshed Polygon B	**EEA= 0.56 for Pl** **= 0.33 for Fd/Others**	**The Big Creek Viewshed (foreground view) has been subdivided to reflect revised management strategies. Manage polygon B based on a recommended VQO of PR with a 180 year rotation.**
Big Creek Viewshed Polygon C	**EEA= 0.00**	**The Big Creek Viewshed (foreground view) has been subdivided to reflect revised management strategies. Manage polygon C based on a recommended VQO of PR. Use of partial cutting, single tree selection and small patch cutting systems will result in achieving a VQO of PR within a normal rotation.**
Lake Viewsheds	EEA (R)= 0.80 for Pl = 0.70 for Fd/Others EEA(PR)= 0.40 for Pl = 0.10 for Fd/Others	The viewshed for Swartz Lake has been removed from the Lake Viewshed coverage and is now called "Swartz Lake Viewshed"(Jan. 20, 1999). Lakes with recommended VQO's are now Koster and Roaster Lakes. All R VQO polygons around Koster Lake have been changed to PR.
Swartz Lake Viewshed	EEA= 0.54 for all species	Manage the viewshed for Swartz Lake based on a recommended VQO of 40% R and 60% PR.
Recreation Corridor Segments	EEA= 0.80 for Pl = 0.70 for Fd/Others	The Recreation Committee added the Recreation Corridor Segments on December 18, 1998. Manage based on a recommended VQO of R.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-A	**EEA= 0.60 for Pl** **= 0.40 for Fd/Others**	**Overlaps with critical wildlife areas. No Harvest impact calculated based on actual species distribution within the polygon using a 200 year rotation with 10% planimetric disturbance on a 20 year re-entry period. For visuals manage Polygon 1-A based on a recommended VQO of 50% R and 50% PR. Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-B	EEA= 0.19 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-B based on a recommended VQO of 15% R, 20% PR and 65% M.

Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-C-a	**EEA= 0.38 for all species**	**Overlaps with critical wildlife areas. No Harvest impact calculated based on a 135 year rotation with 15% planimetric disturbance on a 20 year re-entry period. Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes further revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-C-a based on a recommended VQO of 20% R, 60% PR and 20% M.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-C-b	**EEA= 0.38 for all species**	**Overlaps with critical wildlife areas. No Harvest impact calculated based on a 135 year rotation with 15% planimetric disturbance on a 20 year re-entry period. For visuals manage Polygon 1-C-b based on a recommended VQO of 20% R, 60% PR and 20% M. Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes further revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-D-a	**EEA= 0.08 for all species**	**Polygon 1-D subdivided into specific areas for management purposes. Manage Polygon 1-D-a based on a recommended VQO of 10% R and 90% M.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-D-b	**EEA= 0.08 for all species**	**Polygon 1-D subdivided into specific areas for management purposes. Manage Polygon 1-D-b based on a recommended VQO of 10% R and 90% M.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-E-a	EEA= 0.37 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes further revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-E-a based on a recommended VQO of 100% PR.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-E-b	EEA= 0.00	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes further revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 1-E-b based on a recommended VQO of 100% M.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 1-E-c	**EEA= 0.20 for all species**	**Recreation Corridor Viewshed polygon 1-E-a further subdivided to reflect revised management strategies for the Big Creek Park Trail foreground viewshed. Manage Polygon 1-E-c based on a recommended VQO of 55% PR and 45% M.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-F	EEA= 0.09 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-F based on a recommended VQO of 25% PR and 75% M.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-G-a	EEA= 0.07 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes further revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-G-a based on a recommended VQO of 20% PR and 80% M.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-G-b	EEA= 0.37 for all species	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes further revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by

		the Recreation Committee. Manage the portion of Polygon 2-G-b south of the trail based on a recommended VQO of 100% PR.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-G-c	EEA= 0.00	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes further revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-G-c based on a recommended VQO of 100% M.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-G-d	EEA= 0.00	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes further revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-G-d based on a recommended VQO of 100% M.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-G-e	EEA= 0.00	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes further revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-G-e based on a recommended VQO of 100% M.
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-H-a	**EEA= 0.00**	**Polygon 2-H subdivided into specific areas for management purposes. Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-H-a based on a recommended VQO of 100% M.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-H-b	**EEA= 0.00**	**Polygon 2-H subdivided into specific areas for management purposes. Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-H-b based on a recommended VQO of 100% M.**
Recreation Corridor Viewshed Polygon 2-I	EEA= 0.00	Recreation Corridor Viewshed shapes revised to reflect revisions to the work completed by Fritz Mueller, J.S. Hart and Associates Ltd. by the Recreation Committee. Manage Polygon 2-I based on a recommended VQO of 100% M.
Wildlife Tree Patches	1.77% SRDZ 2.28 % ERDZ	Based on Table 20a of the Biodiversity Guidebook 50% overlap with Riparian Reserve Zones Access to the Wildlife Tree Patches is modelled based on a double rotation for Landscape Unit with no Old requirement and No Harvest for Landscape Units with an Old requirement.
Bull Trout Habitat	0%	Assume that Bull Trout Habitat requirements will be addressed by the FPC

The Scenario 5 - Final results were:

Zone	Target %	Scenario %	Difference from Targets	Difference from "Base Case"
South Chilcotin SRDZ	16.00	16.44	+ 0.44	- 12.77
Gaspard ERDZ	14.00	11.96	- 2.04	- 11.37
South Chilcotin SRP	15.82	16.04	+ 0.22	- 12.65

The results for Scenario 5 - Final were further revised to capture the following changes:

wetlands adjustment:
For wetlands located west of Churn Creek, which would require a riparian reserve zone and /or riparian management zone an adjustment is required. For the purposes of the overlap table, these wetland areas have been deleted from the analysis. Thus, to estimate the No Harvest impact of these areas an adjustment is required to the No Harvest percentage. This is an estimate of impact and is a non-spatial adjustment.

visuals/WTP overlap adjustment:
To capture the assumption that WTP's contribute to managing for visuals, an adjustment to the No Harvest percentage is required. This is due to the assumption that for the purposes of this analysis, WTP's are non-spatial and the No Harvest impact is based on an arithmetic calculation. The adjustment is made based on the assumption that 50% of the WTP requirement for any one visual polygon contributes to managing for visuals. Thus the area of the visual polygon is reduced by this amount.

10% salvage of OGMA adjustment:
To capture the assumption that 10% of the total old requirement within OGMA's and outside mule deer and riparian requirements will become available for harvest over the course of a rotation, an adjustment to the No Harvest percentages is required. This assumption is consistent with the recommendations of the CCLUP Integration Report (April 6, 1998). This availability is intended to capture salvage due to severe natural disturbance and/or development of innovative approaches to meeting old requirements. This is an estimate of impact and is a non-spatial adjustment.

	SRDZ	ERDZ	SCSRP
• wetland adjustment	+ 0.43	+ 0.67	+ 0.45
• visuals/WTP overlap	- 0.14	- 0.04	- 0.12
• 10% salvage of OGMA	- 0.43	- 0.28	- 0.42
Total	- 0.14	+ 0.35	- 0.09

Thus the revised results for Scenario 5 - Final are:

Zone	**Target %**	**Scenario %**	**Difference from Targets**	**Difference from "Base Case"**
South Chilcotin SRDZ	16.00	16.30	+ 0.30	- 12.91
Gaspard ERDZ	14.00	12.31	- 1.69	- 11.02
South Chilcotin SRP	15.82	15.95	+ 0.12	- 12.74

A review of scenario 5 – Final confirmed the results of scenario 5. The Technical Analysis Committee recommends that the Table adopt scenario 5 – Final.