

**Vanderhoof LRMP and Mountain Pine Beetle
Risk Assessment of Objectives/Strategies and Options of Action Plans
DRAFT
October 2004**

I..Scope of Project:

As part of the Provincial Mountain Pine Beetle Action Plan, a review of 4 Land Use Plans are currently underway in the Prince George, Vanderhoof, Burns Lake and Quesnel forest districts. Each Resource Management Zone (RMZ) that is affected by the Mountain Pine Beetle is being assessed as to the "risk of compromise" to the values and objectives established in the LRMP's. Based on the risk assessment, a range of options for actions are recommended for pursual.

II. Risk Assessment Methodology

The main focus of the exercise was to initially identify which interests (values) in the Vanderhoof LRMP RMZ's are in jeopardy as a result of the MPB epidemic, accelerated harvesting and future salvage operations in a concentrated timeframe. To provide guidance and consistency to the risk assessment, the following questions were asked:

1. What is the level of risk to the LRMP objective resulting from accelerated and increased harvesting of MPB killed stands in the past and future?
2. What is going to be different due to the MPB infestation and increased level of harvesting (i.e. age class distribution, ecological impacts from MPB, old growth attributes, sustainable cut, impact to value, dead standing timber)?
3. How much has RMZ objectives been compromised based on the level of MPB epidemic and forest harvesting activity (current situation)?
4. Are there any constraints to harvesting that should be removed given the economic implications of the MPB epidemic?

In August of 2004, individuals from the Ministry of Forests, Water Land and Air Protection and the Ministry of Sustainable Resource Management did an initial review of all the objectives and strategies in the Vanderhoof LRMP to assign risk and possible action options. This initial review was very high-level, comprehensive and strategic in nature, that will be more detailed once additional input from LRMP stakeholders, First Nations and forest industry has been collected.

The Vanderhoof LRMP objectives and strategies in each RMZ were assigned a rating as per the guidelines in Table 1, supported with a rationale for the rating and assigned a

range of action options. This Master Risk Assessment document is available to interested parties on request.

Table 1: Risk Rating and Priority for Possible Actions Guidelines

<i>Risk Rating to Objective</i>	<i>Priority of Possible Actions</i>
Nil - No known risk	No Act (N) - No action needed
??? - Unknown risk	Possible (P) - Action may be needed, but more assessment or review is needed
Low (L) - Low risk	Definite (D) - Action definitely needed, but may not be required immediately
Mod (M) - Moderate risk	Urgent (U) - Action needed ASAP
High (H) - High risk	

III. Initial Draft Assessment Results

The information provided in this document is a summary of Risk Assessment from highest to lowest risk. To assist with understanding the risk rating, only a few key objectives were noted in this document. Possible actions options along with comments have been suggested that require review and revision based on input received from LRMP stakeholders, First Nations and industry.

There are a total of 1080 strategies in the Vanderhoof LRMP for specific values/interests. Based on the initial risk assessment results, approximately 461 strategies have been given a high to moderate risk rating.

Comprehensive List of Possible Action Items:

1.0 Amendment of LRMP objectives and strategies

- Reflect the current situation and state of landbase due to MPB epidemic and accelerated/intense harvesting (i.e shift in age class distribution, facilitate future harvesting and rehabilitation needs, impact to mid term timber supply)
- This would be done in consultation with the LRMP Monitoring Committee and will strive to engage First Nations

- 2.0 Reaffirm implementation of LRMP objective(s) / strategy(ies) in forest development**
- LRMP objective/strategy has not been heavily compromised and every opportunity should be taken with all forest licenses to consider these values in the future (awareness and communication)
- 3.0 Establishment of Legal Land Use Objectives through the *Forest Practises Code Act, Forest and Range Practices Act* and *Land Act***
- Specific objectives for old forest, natural forest areas, stand level retention, connectivity/corridor management, access management, road density indices, UWR, species at risk, identified wildlife, community watershed, lakeshore classification, temperature sensitive streams, Sensitive Area Designation may need to be established
- 4.0 Spatial Identification of biodiversity reserves and non-pine polygons for future timber supply certainty**
- Identify large intact patches on MPB killed stands to protect specific values from harvesting and rehabilitation that will not be legally established, but known information
- 5.0 Best Management Practises**
- Provide advice and guidance for specific values that need consideration (i.e gradients of harvesting opportunity based on shelf-life, operability, hydrology/watershed values, sensitive soils, deactivation of roads)
- 6.0 Review of LRMP Implementation Plans currently in place to maintain relevancy and reflect current state of the landbase**
- Amend existing plans such as the Access Management Plan, Scenic Area Plan, Lakeshore Classification, Crownland Plan, Regional Douglas Fir Strategy
 - This may include altering specific LRMP designated areas (i.e Access Management Areas, Scenic Areas) to better suited areas on the landscape that would better manage these values
- 7.0 Coordination with other on-going initiatives and processes**
- Link to processes such as SFMP Certification, SARA, Vanderhoof Dry Wood Strategy, WLAP Stand Level Retention Pilot Project that are indirectly implementing and monitoring LRMP values
- 8.0 Establish a formal effectiveness monitoring process to ensure that LRMP values are being considered and managed**
- 9.0 Forest and Range Practised Act Implementation that will directly manage for some LRMP values**
- Onus and responsibility with licensees to achieve resultant strategies (i.e stakeholder consultation, sensitive soils, riparian reserve zones, wildlife tree retention)
- 10.0 Other Possible Action Items**

VI. Summary of Risk Rating and Action for Priority

Priority #1: (H) - High Risk to objectives/strategies (U) - Urgent Action Required Immediately

NOTE: These values were assessed "High Risk" with "Urgent Action Required" due to the level that the LRMP objectives compromised from the MPB epidemic and the accelerated levels harvesting that may or may not have considered these values. Additionally, government agencies have indicated that these are stewardship issues that need to be addressed immediately in response to the 2004 AAC uplift in the Vanderhoof Forest District.

1.a. Biodiversity (ID# 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 28)

RMZ: General Management Direction

Relevant Strategies (not all are listed):

- Manage timber harvesting to reflect the seral stage distribution
- Maintain a significant component of the landscape unit in communities with plant species composition similar to that found through natural dynamics and succession.
- Mimic the natural pattern of connectivity by establishing Forest Ecosystem Networks (FEN) to provide for movement corridors and special areas (
- Maintain structural forest attributes such as coarse woody debris, wildlife tress, large organic debris, green-trees, etc. on harvest blocks.

Possible Actions (Biodiversity)	Comments
1.0 Amend LRMP to reflect PG TSA Biodiversity Objectives especially around patch size distribution	-Reflect current landbase situation that has social support/endorsement -Time consuming process to produce guidance that does not have to be considered
2.0 Strive to achieve LRMP objective in future	- Easier and faster than amending LRMP or setting legal objectives - Lack of awareness and communication with new forest tenures - Lack of certainty that LRMP direction will be considered -Lack of monitoring process
3.0. Biodiversity Objectives for the PG TSA to be established by MSRM	- Almost completed - an immediate result/action - Non-spatial objectives so the location and quality of retention will not be locatable on the landbase
3.0 and 4.0 Spatial location of live old forest and young natural forest that will not be harvested or rehabilitated	- Provide certainty for stakeholders that biological values are being conserved in the FRPA framework - Acceptability among stakeholders and industry - Operational constraints/impact on salvage harvesting - Would be legally binding thus lack of operational flexibility for industry
3.0. Establish legal objectives for stand level retention, CWD, connectivity	- Provide certainty - Process for establishment is time consuming - Additional constraints/impacts that may impede timely salvage of dead timber - Additional costs to industry
5.0 Best Management Practice for stand level retention, CWD, connectivity	- Greater operational flexibility - Guidance that does not have to be considered

Possible Actions (Biodiversity)	Comments
7.0 Link to SFMP criteria and indicator monitoring, Vanderhoof Dry Wood Strategy, WLAP Stand Level Retention Strategy Pilot Proj	- Coordinated effort that has an outcome that is mutually beneficial
8.0 Effectiveness Monitoring	- certainty that the intent of legal biodiversity objectives are being met - Lack of direction (who is responsible?) - Agency capacity and ability to resource effort (staffing and funding)

1.b. Wildlife

RMZ's: GMD, Stuart River, Upper Sutherland, Nechako West (Targe Creek), Crystal Lake, Vanderhoof South, Kluskus, Lucas Lake, Davidson Creek, Laidman Lake, Upper Blackwater

ID#: 69, 71, 72, 252, 297, 298, 299, 507, 572, 652, 573, 730, 776-778, 853, 908-916

Objectives (not all are listed):

- Endorse avoiding construction of permanent roads in riparian habitats or critical habitat areas
- To maintain or enhance grizzly populations and habitat
- Maintain elk populations and habitat
- Maintain all wildlife habitat values over the long term i.e ecosystem dynamics.
- Manage for general biodiversity with an emphasis on caribou.
- Protect primary feeding & travel corridors for wildlife

Possible Actions	Comments
2.0 Strive to achieve LRMP objective in future	- Easier and faster than amending LRMP or setting legal objectives - Lack of awareness and communication with new forest tenures - Lack of certainty that LRMP direction will be considered -Lack of monitoring process
3.0 and 4.0 Spatial location of live old forest and young natural forest that will not be harvested or rehabilitated	- Provide certainty for stakeholders that biological values are being conserved - Acceptability among stakeholders and industry - Operational constraints/impact on salvage harvesting - Lac k of operational flexibility
3.0. Establish legal objectives for, connectivity, access management	- Provide certainty - Process for establishment is time consuming - Additional constraints/impacts that may impede timely salvage of dead timber (additional cost to industry)
5.0 Best Management Practice for road deactivation, access management	- Greater operational flexibility - Guidance that does not have to be considered
6.0 Review and revision to Access Management Plan	- Provide updated and relevant management direction that will mitigate impact of increased road density - Additional constraints/impacts that may impede timely salvage of dead timber - Additional costs to industry - MoF mandate may not support access control for wildlife values - Agency capacity and ability to resource effort (staffing and funding)
7.0 Link to WLAP Species at Risk, SARA	- Coordinated effort that is mutually beneficial -Additional impacts to industry

1.c Timber Harvesting, Silviculture & Forest Health

RMZ's: General Management Direction Vanderhoof North (Stuart River Loop), Upper Sutherland, Nechako West, Crystal Lake, Vanderhoof South, Kluskus, Lucas Lake, Chedakuz, Davidson Creek, Laidman Lake, Upper Blackwater

ID#: 237, 309-313, 485, 576, 595, 599, 600-604, 661, 737, 780-783, 803-814, 815-832, 822-829, 831, 865-868, 880, 922-947

Relevant Objectives (not all area listed)

- Harvest timber while minimizing adverse effects on wildlife, fisheries and scenic values
- Carry out silviculture without adverse affects on wildlife habitat and enhance habitat wherever possible.
- Maintain older aged forests at a prescribed level to maintain the high value of riparian areas for wildlife.
- Ensure a steady and predictable flow of timber utilizing the whole spectrum of harvesting levels (low-general and high intensity) at a sustainable rate.

Possible Actions	Comments
2.0 Strive to achieve LRMP objective in future	- Easier and faster than amending LRMP or setting legal objectives - Lack of awareness and communication with new forest tenures - Lack of certainty that LRMP direction will be considered -Lack of monitoring process
3.0. Biodiversity Objectives for the PG TSA to be established by MSRM	- Almost completed - an immediate result/action - Non-spatial objectives so the location and quality of retention will not be locatable on the landbase
3.0 and 4.0 Spatial location of live old forest and young natural forest that will not be harvested or rehabilitated	- Provide certainty for stakeholders that biological values are being conserved - Acceptability among stakeholders and industry - Operational constraints/impact on salvage harvesting - Lack of operational flexibility for industry
3.0. Establish legal objectives for stand level retention, connectivity	- Provide certainty - Process for establishment is time consuming - Additional constraints/impacts that may impede timely salvage of dead timber - Additional costs to industry
5.0 Best Management Practice for harvesting gradients, connectivity	- Greater operational flexibility - Guidance that does not have to be considered
9.0 FRPA implementation	-Need to design resultant strategies around FRPA objectives will indirectly consider LRMP values

1.d Access Management

RMZ's: General Management Direction, Vanderhoof North (Stuart River Loop), Upper Sutherland, Crystal Lake, Vanderhoof South (Nulki Hills), Chedakus, Kluskus, Davidson Creek, Laidman Lake, Upper Blackwater

ID#: 134-136, 139, 140, 141, 240,319-323, 614-622, 685, 677-681, 834-839, 845-885, 949-967, 1024-1033

Objectives (not all are listed):

- Full rehabilitation (site recontouring, preparation, and vegetation) of block spur roads is generally encouraged in all zones.
- Loop roads are acceptable within the plan area with site-specific limitations.
- Manage access to minimize impacts on fish and wildlife while maintaining recreational and resource development opportunities
- Managed with consideration for other values.
- Manage access for wildlife habitat enhancement and decreased soil erosion.
- Maintain wildlife populations and protect caribou, grizzly and moose habitat.
- Retain the current state of primitive access.

Possible Actions	Comments
1.0 Amendment of LRMP	-Update Access Management Areas to reflect current landbase situation that has social support/endorsement - Time consuming - Only guidance that does not have to be considered
2.0 Strive to achieve LRMP objective in future	- Easier and faster than amending LRMP or setting legal objectives - Lack of awareness with new forest tenures - Lack of certainty that LRMP direction will be considered (deactivation) -Lack of monitoring process
3.0. Establish legal objectives for, connectivity, access management, road density index, deactivation	- Provide certainty - Process for establishment is time consuming - Additional constraints/impacts that may impede timely salvage of dead timber - Additional costs to industry
5.0 Best Management Practice for road deactivation, access management	- Greater operational flexibility - Guidance that does not have to be considered
6.0 Review and revision to Access Management Plan	- Provide updated and relevant management direction that will mitigate impact of increased road density - Additional constraints/impacts that may impede timely salvage of dead timber - Additional costs to industry - Agency madates - MoF mandate may not support access control for wildlife values - Agency (staffing and funding)
7.0 Link to WLAP Species at Risk, SARA	- Coordinated effort that is mutually beneficial --WLAP may not have capacity or legislative mandate for access control

1.e. Trapping and Guiding

RMZ's: General Management Direction,

ID#: 117, 118, 119, 10, 121, 122, 123

Relevant Objectives:

- Where available, retain or consider enhancing coarse woody debris to optimize fur-bearer habitat.
- Work toward stable, longer-term forest development planning to assist trappers and guides to integrate and plan their operations.
- Consider the seral stage habitat required by different fur-bearers and ensure available habitat for healthy populations of fur-bearers throughout the harvesting rotation
- Consider designing road allowances to provide crossings for dispersal of marten and other fur-bearing species which typically avoid open areas. Retaining mature timber in various locations on at least one side along a main haul road is preferable. Narrowing the cleared right of way may also be considered where safety is not an issue.
- Evaluate wildlife values found in large burns (200 ha and over) before planning silvicultural activities. Consider a strategy to reduce salvage, thinning, planting and weeding in areas of high-value fur-bearer/wildlife values.

Possible Actions	Comments
2.0 Strive to achieve LRMP objective in future	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Easier and faster than amending LRMP or setting legal objectives - Lack of awareness with new forest tenures - Lack of certainty that LRMP direction will be considered (RoW, CWD)
3.0. Biodiversity Objectives for the PG TSA to be established by MSRM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Almost completed - an immediate result/action - Non-spatial objectives so the location and quality of retention will not be locatable on the landbase
3.0 and 4.0 Spatial location of live old forest and young natural forest that will not be harvested or rehabilitated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide certainty for stakeholders that biological values are being conserved - Acceptability among stakeholders and industry - Operational constraints/impact on salvage harvesting - Lack of operational flexibility for industry
3.0. Establish legal objectives for stand level retention, CWD, connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide certainty - Process for establishment is time consuming - Additional constraints/impacts that may impede timely salvage of dead timber - Additional costs to industry
5.0 Best Management Practice for stand level retention, CWD, connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Greater operational flexibility - Guidance that does not have to be considered
7.0 Link to SFMP criteria and indicator monitoring, WLAP Stand Level Retention Strategy Pilot Proj	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coordinated effort that has an outcome that is mutually beneficial

**Priority #2: (H) - High Risk to objectives/strategies
(D) - Action Definitely Needed, but may not be
required immediately**

NOTE: These RMZ's were assessed High Risk with Definite Action Required due to the resultant effects of the MPB epidemic (i.e aesthetic values, age class) and the intense/accelerated levels of past and future harvesting/road density) that may or may not have considered these values. However, there are still areas within some RMZ's where the visual integrity is still intact and there is an opportunity for proactive management to maintain this value.

2.a. Recreation and Tourism

RMZ's: Vanderhoof North, Nechako West, Francois North, Crystal Lake, Kluskus, Lucas Lake, Chedakus, Davidson Creek, Laidman Lake

ID#: 162-165, 218,223, 463-468,484, 393,394, 565,568, 772, 788, 847-851, 904-907

Objectives (not all are listed):

- Maintain scenic quality in sensitive viewscapes and corridors.
- Maintain or enhance cross country ski areas close to Vanderhoof
- Maintain Scenic Areas and Visually Sensitive Areas
- Maintain or enhance existing opportunities for hunting, angling, hiking, and ecotourism
- Maintain visual quality for tourism operators

Possible Actions	Comments
1.0 Amendment of LRMP objectives and strategies	-Update LRMP Scenic Areas to reflect current landbase situation that has social support/endorsement - Time consuming - Only guidance that does not have to be considered
2.0 Strive to achieve LRMP objective in future	- Easier and faster than amending LRMP or setting legal objectives - Lack of awareness with new forest tenures - Lack of certainty how LRMP direction will be considered for visual values in the future
3.0. Establish legal objectives for VQO's	- Provide certainty - Process for establishment is time consuming
5.0 Best Management Practice for scenic area management	- Greater operational flexibility - Guidance that does not have to be considered
6.0 Review and revision to Access Management Plan	- Provide updated and relevant management direction that will mitigate impacts to viewscapes - Additional constraints/impacts that may impede timely salvage of dead timber-
7.0 Link to SFMP criteria and indicator monitoring	- Coordinated effort that is mutual

2.b. Timber Harvesting, Silviculture & Forest Health

RMZ: Nechako West

ID#: 497

Objective:

- Ensure a steady and predictable flow of timber with intensive timber harvesting at a sustainable level.

Possible Actions	Comments
1.0 Amendment of LRMP objectives and strategies	-Update LRMP to reflect current landbase situation that has social support/endorsement - Time consuming - Only guidance that does not have to be considered
3.0. Establish legal objectives to spatially locate non-pine polygons that would not be harvested immediately (as per Delong's suggestions)	- Provide certainty for mid-term timber supply - Process for establishment is time consuming -Would be legally binding
5.0 Best Management Practice for to guide harvesting (gradients)	- Greater operational flexibility -faster result than amending the LRMP - Guidance that does not have to be considered
7.0 Link to SFMP criteria and indicator monitoring for sustainable timber flow	- Coordinated effort that has an outcome that is mutually beneficial

**Priority #3: (H) - High Risk to objectives/strategies
(P) - Action may be needed, but more assessment or
review is needed**

NOTE: These RMZ's were assessed "High Risk" with "Possible Action Required" due to the effects of the MPB epidemic (i.e loss of live trees, hydrological effects, defoliation that will effect temperature of streams) and the accelerated levels of past and future harvesting that may or may not have considered the LRMP direction. The combination of MPB killed stands, intense harvesting and road density will have a cumulative impact at the landscape level (i.e lack of road deactivation to facilitate the need for salvage and rehabilitation, hydrological effects, increase in equivalent clear cut areas, riparian reserve integrity, increased stream crossings).

If high standards were maintained in forest development (i.e road building, stream crossing, watershed assessments), then the risk is reduced. Additionally, due to the intensity of the future harvest expected in the district, these values need to be considered and assessed in future development

3.a Water

RMZ: General Management Direction, Vanderhoof North (Stuart River Loop), Upper Sutherland, Nechako West, Vanderhoof South, Davidson Creek, Laidman Lake

ID#: 31-38, 145-146, 286, 287, 447-451, 632, 633, 840, 841, 842, 894

Objectives (not all are listed):

- Key objectives for incorporating water quality into management plans include minimizing soil disturbance and sedimentation and maintaining natural hydrological regimes (water quality and timing)
- Reduce soil erosion and maintain the quality of existing fresh water source
- Maintain water quality and hydrological stability
- Maintain trout, sockeye, steelhead and kokanee spawning habitat in the Sutherland River System
- Manage to prevent soil erosion and maintain the quality of existing fresh water sources
- Revegetate all ditches, landings, gravel pits, and winter roads to minimize surface soil erosion, provide forage, and be visually acceptable.
- Endorse monitoring hydrological regimes, geomorphic processes and sediment loading levels.
- Semi-permanently deactivate all new block roads, or existing block roads with potential for soil erosion

Possible Actions (Water)	Comments
1.0 Amendment of LRMP objectives and strategies	-Update LRMP to reflect current landbase situation that has social support/endorsement - Time consuming - Only guidance that does not have to be considered
3.0. Establish legal objectives for temperature sensitive streams, lakeshore classification, species at risk, community watersheds, etc	- Provide certainty for mid-term timber supply - Process for establishment is time consuming -Would be legally binding
5.0 Best Management Practice to guide watershed assessment, road building, sensitive soils, terrain stability, hydrology factors	- Greater operational flexibility -faster result than amending the LRMP - Guidance that does not have to be considered
6.0 Review and revision to Lakeshore Classification Plan to determine if there is a need to elevate to legal objectives	- Provide updated and relevant management direction that will mitigate impacts to lakeshores - Additional constraints/impacts that may impede timely salvage of dead timber - Guidance that does not have to be considered
7.0 Link to SFMP criteria and indicator monitoring for water quality, riparian management	- Coordinated effort that has an outcome that is mutually beneficial
8.0 Effectiveness Monitoring	- certainty that values are being considered and appropriately managed - Lack of direction (who is responsible?) - Agency capacity and ability to resource effort (staffing and funding)
9.0 FRPA Implementation	-Need to design resultant strategies around FRPA objective will indirectly consider LRMP values - Unsure what the resultant strategies for these values will be managed in Forest Stewardship Plans

3. b. Fisheries & Lakeshore Management

RMZ: General Management Direction, Vanderhoof North (Stuart River Loop), Upper Sutherland, Nechako Valley, Nechako West, Upper Nechako River, Crystal Lake, Vanderhoof South, Laidman Lake, Upper Blackwater

ID#: 42-55, 154, 229-231, 328-342, 453-457, 515, 519, 521, 557-562, 634, 635,639, 895,897,901, 968-977

Objectives:

- The LRMP working group recommends maintaining the physical and biological diversity of fish and aquatic habitats in accordance with the Forest Practices Code.
- Conserve, restore and/or enhance the abundance and diversity of naturally occurring fish stock and their habitats, including rare and endangered species
- Maintain fish stocks and habitat
- Manage for salmon values in the Nechako River
- Manage for fisheries values in the Stellako River
- Recommend Watershed Assessments (min. Level 1)., assess existing culverts and bridges.

Possible Action Items:

Refer to 3.a. "Water" Action Item table

3. c. Timber Harvesting, Silviculture & Forest Health

General Management Direction

ID#: 101

Objective:

- To attempt to enhance or maintain a steady wood supply near current harvest levels

Possible Actions	Comments
1.0 Amendment of LRMP objectives and strategies	-Update LRMP to reflect current landbase situation that has social support/endorsement - Time consuming - Only guidance that does not have to be considered
3.0. Establish legal objectives to spatially locate non-pine polygons that would not be harvested immediately (as per Delong's suggestions)	- Provide certainty for mid-term timber supply - Process for establishment is time consuming -Would be legally binding
5.0 Best Management Practice for to guide harvesting (gradients)	- Greater operational flexibility -faster result than amending the LRMP - Guidance that does not have to be considered
7.0 Link to SFMP criteria and indicator monitoring for sustainable timber flow	- Coordinated effort that is mutually beneficial

3. d. Wildlife

RMZ: General Management Direction, Nechako West, Kluskus, Chedakus, Vanderhoof North, Stuart River, Vanderhoof South

ID#: 65, 66, 68, 168, 171-175, 250, 472-475, 647 - 650, 729, 790

Objective:

- Maintain existing wildlife populations, specifically deer and grizzly
- Manage habitat for optimal diversity,
- To manage high suitability moose winter range in the Barlow Creek/Blue Mountain area
- Lessen effects of timber harvesting on fur-bearers
- Consider leaving coarse woody debris in cutblock planning.

Possible Actions (Wildlife)	Comments
2.0 Strive to achieve LRMP objective in future	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Easier and faster than amending LRMP or setting legal objectives - Lack of awareness and communication with new forest tenures - Lack of certainty that LRMP direction will be considered -Lack of monitoring process
3.0 and 4.0 Spatial location of live old forest and young natural forest that will not be harvested or rehabilitated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide certainty for stakeholders that biological values are being conserved - Acceptability among stakeholders and industry - Operational constraints/impact on salvage harvesting - Lack of operational flexibility
3.0. Establish legal objectives for, connectivity, access management, CWD, UWR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide certainty - Process for establishment is time consuming - Additional constraints/impacts that may impede timely salvage of dead timber - Additional costs to industry
5.0 Best Management Practice for road deactivation, access management, management of moose habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Greater operational flexibility - Guidance that does not have to be considered
6.0 Review and revision to Access Management Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide updated and relevant management direction that will mitigate impact of increased road density - Additional constraints/impacts that may impede timely salvage of dead timber - Additional costs to industry - Agency mandates - MoF mandate may not support access control for wildlife values - Agency capacity and ability to resource effort (staffing and funding)
7.0 Link to WLAP Species at Risk, SARA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coordinated effort that has an outcome that is mutually beneficial -Additional impacts to industry - WLAP may not have resource capacity

3. e. Recommended Sensitive Area

RMZ: Kluskus

ID#: 752, 758, 759, 756, 761

Objective:

- Maintain integrity of the unique ecosystem associated with the south facing slopes above the Euchiniko River.
- Selective single tree or small group harvesting in the larger coniferous patches on the north side of the river. No harvesting of small patch coniferous within grassland or deciduous slopes outside of riparian reserve zones
- Permanent access should not be constructed across grassland slopes to harvest timber (avoid degradation on any slopes in the sensitive zone).

Possible Actions (Recommended Sensitive Areas)	Comments
2.0 Strive to achieve LRMP objective in future	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Easier and faster than amending LRMP or setting legal objectives - Lack of awareness and communication with new forest tenures - Lack of certainty that LRMP direction will be considered -Lack of monitoring process
3.0 and 4.0 Spatial location of live old forest and young natural forest that will not be harvested or rehabilitated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide certainty for stakeholders that biological values are being conserved - Acceptability among stakeholders and industry - Operational constraints/impact on salvage harvesting - Lack of operational flexibility
3.0. Establish legal objectives for, Sensitive Area, connectivity, access management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide certainty - Process for establishment is time consuming - Additional constraints/impacts that may impede timely salvage of dead timber - Additional costs to industry

DRAFT

**Priority #4: (M) - Moderate Risk to objectives/strategies
(P) - Action may be needed, but more assessment or review is needed**

NOTE: These values were rated lower based on the assumption that Aspen and Douglas Fir are not being harvested (past and future). If this assumptions is incorrect, then the risk to these objectives is elevated.

4. a Jobs and Community Stability

RMZ: General Management Direction
ID#: 12

Objectives:

- To diversify the local economy, the LRMP recommends promoting Crown Land development through the Land Act and B.C. Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks programs

Possible Actions (Jobs and Community Stability)	Comments
1.0 Amendment of LRMP objectives and strategies	-Update LRMP to reflect current landbase situation that has social support/endorsement -would require discussion around the value of dead for agriculture purposes - Time consuming - Only guidance that does not have to be considered - Harvesting of MPB trees on ADA lands in an outstanding issue with respect to stumpage, MoF policy that would not be change with LRMP amendment
2.0 Strive to achieve LRMP objective in future and follow the MoF Standard Operating Procedure for harvesting on ADA lands	- Easier and faster than amending LRMP or setting legal objectives - Lack of awareness and communication with new forest tenures - Lack of certainty that LRMP direction will be considered -Lack of monitoring process
3.0. Establish legal objectives for, Agriculture Development Area's (ADA's) as per the Crown Land Plan	- Provide certainty - Process for establishment is time consuming - Additional constraints/impacts that may impede timely salvage of dead timber - Additional costs to industry
5.0 Best Management Practice for harvesting on ADA lands	- Greater operational flexibility - Guidance that does not have to be considered
6.0 Review and revision Vanderhoof Crownland Plan	- Provide updated and relevant management direction that will mitigate impact of MPB killed wood and loss of revenue - Additional constraints/impacts that may impede timely salvage of dead timber --ADA designation is based on arable lands/soil so review of plan may not assist with loss of revenue to support agriculture development

Possible Actions (Jobs and Community Stability)	Comments
	- Agency capacity and ability to resource effort (staffing and funding)
8.0 Effectiveness Monitoring (is MoF SoP is being considered)	- certainty that values are being managed - Lack of direction (who is responsible?) - Agency capacity and resourcing
10. Multi-agency committee (MAFF, MoF, LWBC, MSRM) to make recommendations on how to deal with issues of agriculture and MPB	- First meeting held on Oct 13 th , 2004 - Agreement to write information notes about ADA's and Community Paste Development

4.b . Biodiversity

RMZ: General Management Direction

ID#: 23, 25, 29

Objectives

Relevant Strategies:

- Old growth management strategies are met primarily by maintaining mature and seral stage requirements as outlines in the Biodiversity Guidebook for NDT3 and NDT2, with a particular emphasis on maintaining the distribution and abundance of Douglas fir
- Retain some mature Douglas-fir or tamarack in stands where they constitute a minor component of the stand.
- Recommend that the proportion and distribution of deciduous (broadleaf) trees should be maintained in managed forests at similar levels to those in non-managed forests within the landscape unit.

Possible Actions (Biodiversity)	Comments
2.0 Strive to achieve LRMP objective in future	- Easier and faster than amending LRMP or setting legal objectives - Lack of awareness and communication with new forest tenures - Lack of certainty that LRMP direction will be considered -Lack of monitoring process
3.0. Establish legal objectives to spatially locate non-pine polygons that would not be harvested immediately (as per Delong's suggestions)	- Provide certainty for mid-term timber supply and maintenance of biological values - Process for establishment is time consuming -Would be legally binding
5.0 Best Management Practice for to guide harvesting (gradients)	- Greater operational flexibility -faster result than amending the LRMP - Guidance that does not have to be considered
6.0 Review and revision of Regional Douglas Fir Strategy	- Provide updated and relevant management direction - Additional constraints/impacts that may impede timely salvage of dead timber - Agency capacity and ability to resource effort (staffing and funding)
8.0 Effectiveness Monitoring (is MoF SoP is being considered)	- certainty that values are being managed - Lack of direction (who is responsible?)

4.c . Recreation and Tourism and Access

RMZ: General Management Direction, Upper Sutherland, Nechako West, Upper Nechako River, Crystal Lake, Chedakus

ID#: 55, 294, 295, 466, 527, 529, 530-532, 540,541, 542, 549, 566, 621, 622, 787

Objectives:

- To provide opportunities for growth in the tourism industry, the LRMP recommends following the framework provided in the Backcountry Recreation Policy.
- Maintain existing opportunities for hunting, angling, hiking and ecotourism
- Ensure public safety on the Kenney Dam Road

Possible Actions	Comments
2.0 Strive to achieve LRMP objective in future	- Easier and faster than amending LRMP or setting legal objectives -need to determine if MPB killed stands area desirable for recreation resources - Lack of awareness and communication with new forest tenures - Lack of certainty that LRMP direction will be considered -Lack of monitoring process
8.0 Effectiveness Monitoring (is MoF SoP is being considered)	- certainty that values are being managed - Lack of direction (who is responsible?) - Agency capacity and resourcing
9.0 FRPA Implementation	-Need to design resultant strategies around FRPA objective will indirectly consider LRMP values - Unsure what the resultant strategies for these values will be managed in Forest Stewardship Plans, especially stakeholder consultation

4.d . Agriculture and Grazing

RMZ: General Management Direction

ID#: 84, 114

Objectives:

- Consider the potential arability when selecting silvicultural systems prior to agreement of localized land use. After Agricultural Development Areas have been agreed upon, silvicultural systems should consider the arable potential.

Possible Action Items:

Refer to 4.a. Jobs and Community Stability Action Item Table

4.e . Timber Harvesting, Silviculture & Forest Health

RMZ: General Management Direction

ID#: 107

Objectives:

-

Relevant Strategies:

- Tree species considered critical for the maintenance of biodiversity have been identified for further study through this LRMP. This information will aid the Chief Forester when determining appropriate harvesting levels.

Possible Action Items:

Refer to 4.b. Biodiversity Action Item Table

4.f . Wildlife

RMZ: Vanderhoof North, Francois North, Vanderhoof South (Cobb Lake Zone)

ID#: 176, 177, 178, 236, 396-399, 683, 689

Objectives:

- Maintain Douglas-fir wildlife habitat
- Maintain elk populations and habitat
- Identify and map key habitat areas for elk (i.e. along the Stuart/Nechako corridor)

Possible Action Items:

Refer to 4.b. Biodiversity Action Item Table

4.g . Heritage and Culture

RMZ: Vanderhoof North, Nechako Valley, Nechako West, Francois North, Crystal Lake, Vanderhoof South (Cobb Lake Zone), Lucas Lake, Chedakuz, Davidson Creek, Laidman Lake

ID#: 159, 161, 344, 447, 449, 451, 392, 564, 641, 686, 765, 766, 767, 785, 786, 846, 903

Objectives:

- Inventory and recognize heritage trail routes where they are identifiable.
- Manage impacts to archaeological sites
- Mark, designate and maintain the route of the Omineca Trail, and the Fraser Lake to Stuart Lake pack trail, develop interpretive sites and produce long-term management plans which consult all affected parties.
- Preserve Native camp and trails in Rum Cache Creek area

Possible Actions	Comments
2.0 Strive to achieve LRMP objective in future	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Easier and faster than amending LRMP or setting legal objectives -need to determine if MPB killed stands area desirable for cultural resources - Lack of awareness and communication with new forest tenures - Lack of certainty that LRMP direction will be considered -Lack of monitoring process
6.0 Review of Alexander Mackenzie Heritage Trail Plan, policy on CMT and preservation of cultural values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a review would reflect the current situation on the landbase and would be desired by most stakeholder -Uncertain as the agency responsible -Agency capacity (staff and funding)
8.0 Effectiveness Monitoring (is SoP, agency policy being considered)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - certainty that values are being managed - Lack of direction (who is responsible?) - Agency capacity and resources
9.0 FRPA Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Need to design resultant strategies around FRPA objective will indirectly consider LRMP values - Unsure what the resultant strategies for these values will be managed in Forest Stewardship Plans, especially First Nation consultation

4.h . Trapping and Guiding

RMZ: Nechako West

ID#: 499, 510

Objectives:

- Maintain guide-outfitting and trapping opportunities

Possible Action Items:

Refer to 1.e. Trapping and Guiding Table

IV. Draft Communication Plan

Sector	Action	Planned Date
1. IAMC	introduce this document	October 19, 2004
2. Sub-Committee of the Minister's MPB Public Advisory Committee	introduce this document	October, 2004
3. Other Agencies	introduce this document	October, 2004
4. First Nations	introduce this document	October, 2004
5. Forest Licensees	introduce this document	October, 2004
6. LRMP Monitoring Committee	introduce this document	November 25th, 2004
7. Broader Public	introduce this document	Open House on November 6 th , 2004
8. Incorporate comments and input		December, 2004

Please let us know if you would like to add something or suggest a change.

Priority	Value	Possible Action	Comment

NAME:

CONTACT:

Provide Comments to:

Traci Leys-Schirok
 Ministry of Sustainable Resource Management
 3rd Floor, 1011 - Fourth Avenue
 Prince George, B.C. V2L 3H9
 250-565-4471 (phone)
 250-565-6629 (fax)
 Traci.Leysschirok@gems1.gov.bc.ca

DRAFT