

# Okanagan – Shuswap LRMP

## *Draft Terms of Reference for the OGMA Advisory Committees*

July 5, 2001 (Draft #3)

### **Introduction**

As part of the Cabinet approved objectives and strategies contained in the Okanagan - Shuswap LRMP, stakeholder committees ("OGMA Advisory Committees") are to be established to provide the SDM (now District Manager and the Designated Environmental Official – expected to be MRSM RD in future) with advice on the placement of Old Growth Management Areas (OGMAs). Details on the specific priorities to be considered are also documented in the LRMP strategies. The intent is that these OGMA Advisory Committees would be organised by forest district and co-ordinated by the LRMP Implementation Monitoring Committee. They would involve local licensed stakeholders and other interested parties.

For clarity the SDMs are not bound by the advice of the OGMA Advisory Committees. If the final decision on placement varies from the advice of the OGMA Advisory Committees then a rationale will be provided.

Consistent with the Kamloops Regional Landscape Unit Planning Strategy, OGMA locations are to be declared by July 2002. A timeline is attached to the terms of reference.

### **Objectives**

The objective of the OGMA Advisory Committee is to deal with OGMA placement consistent with the objectives, strategies and intent statements (objectives 3 and 4) in the Ecosystem Management – Forests section of the LRMP.

For clarity once this is accomplished this will fulfil all biodiversity requirements (as set forth in the Landscape Unit Planning Guide) within the plan area for the life of the plan, or until it is replaced. (The plan has an expected term of ten years.)

### **Process**

#### ***Group Decision Making***

The intent is to provide SDMs with consensus recommendations within the timelines provided. Discussions will be interest based, and facilitated by a mutually agreeable neutral person where available.

### ***Group Dispute Resolution***

Where consensus cannot be achieved on advice to SDMs on OGMA placement the areas of disagreement will be documented, complete with rationale, and forwarded to the SDMs for final decision.

### ***Provincial Government Role in the Group***

Provincial government agencies will be represented and provide advisory and technical support to the OGMA advisory committee. This will include providing the data and GIS support required to make informed recommendations on OGMA placement.

The provincial government will supply meeting rooms.

### ***Provincial Government Funding Support for the Group***

Funding support for meetings, non-government participant travel, accommodations, and facilitation will be subject to available resources.

### ***OGMA Budget and Placement Priorities***

The biodiversity emphasis option (BEO) assignment for each Landscape Unit (LU) and the subzone variant old growth target are summarised in Appendix 1

OGMAs required to meet the timber harvesting land base (THLB) subzone variant old growth targets established for each Landscape Unit will be placed in a manner that is both biologically relevant (e.g., considers connectivity, age and spatial distribution etc.), while at the same time giving placement priority to areas that meet the following criteria, listed in no particular order (i.e., the order will be determined by the particular circumstances/needs of each Landscape Unit):

- rare ecosystems (high priority in most circumstances);
- caribou reserves;
- marten/fisher requirements;
- riparian reserves (statutory only) and management areas;
- Terrain Class 5;
- sensitive soils;
- Class A lakes (LMZs);
- wetlands;
- trail corridors;
- headwaters of streams;
- RMZ areas where, relative to other areas within the THLB, the objectives and/or strategies are more constraining on timber supply, timber availability and cost; and,
- considering representation to the site series or surrogate level (to be defined).

It is expected that the same criteria will be used for placement on the NTHLB.

## Timelines

Task	Responsibility	Date
Setup <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• base mapping (develop template)</li> <li>• overlays (develop as required)</li> <li>• compile datasets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Datasets (DSC)</li> <li>• Use August 2000 THLB/NTHLB and add this to a "new" LU file with updated FC and coverage's "edge" tied to the new (height of land) boundaries (TSA and District)</li> <li>• Scale 1:30,000 with forest cover labels as requested</li> </ul>	file available by June 30 <sup>th</sup>
Introductory OGMA Advisory Committee Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review draft terms of reference</li> <li>• Where we are at (analysis and information)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PST</li> </ul>	July 5, 2001
Base Mapping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to identify (map) current state of old growth. Specifically, determine current state of play in each LU given harvesting since LRMP dataset was created. Also need to know what area(s) are committed (CP/SP/Cat. A blocks). Potentially about 40,000 ha could be affected.</li> <li>• Complete "base map" of candidate stands.</li> </ul>	Districts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "tag" polygons meeting "candidate" status (checked for suitability using orthos/air photos/whatever)</li> <li>• NOTE: This is photo review and some field verification (&lt;5% visitation)</li> </ul> PST <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• table update at May meeting. Intention is for IMC and OAC meetings in September 2001</li> </ul>	late August 2001
"Candidate" stands available for OAC discussions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Base mapping and overlays provided to OACs</li> <li>• NOTE: Include all appropriate agencies in discussions (re: 45 day agency review period)</li> </ul>	by September 2001
"Candidate" stands identified for 2002 FDP process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Candidate" information provided at some time as "known resource information" package is released to licensees</li> </ul>	to DSC by mid-September 2001; to licensees by October 2001
Develop "potential" OGMA options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Districts in conjunction with OACs</li> </ul>	post-September 2001

Final draft OGMA's determined	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Districts in conjunction with OACs</li> <li>shapefiles of LU OGMA's to DSC who will merge and create a TSA coverage</li> </ul>	March 30, 2002
60 day public review period		April and May 2002
Review comments received during public review period		June 1 – 15, 2002
Locate final OGMA's and provide rationale for decisions		June 16 – 30, 2002

**Appendix 1**  
**OGMA Budget**



**Table 1: BEO Assignment for Each Landscape Unit**

LU Name	Final	Forest	THLB + Rip.	% of THLB
Anarchist	High	16,553	9,435	0.8%
Ashnola	High	65,081	23,107	1.9%
Seymour	High	67,669	48,618	3.9%
Upper Shuswap	High	62,921	38,771	3.1%
			119,932	9.7%
Anstey	Int	34,785	20,812	1.7%
Eagle River	Int	80,308	54,304	4.4%
Harris	Int	51,158	45,777	3.7%
Keremeos	Int	38,467	23,628	1.9%
Kingfisher	Int	72,439	56,232	4.5%
Mission	Int	86,966	63,358	5.1%
Ok West Side	Int	21,696	18,220	1.5%
Pennask	Int	45,282	39,780	3.2%
Penticton	Int	57,594	40,419	3.3%
Pukeashun	Int	49,497	38,945	3.1%
Salmon Arm	Int	77,501	64,744	5.2%
Trepanier	Int	50,336	35,515	2.9%
Trout	Int	86,346	64,474	5.2%
			566,207	45.6%
Anarchist-TFL	Low	44,353	37,237	3.0%
Anstey-TFL	Low	7,772	7,383	0.6%
Cherryville	Low	53,637	44,455	3.6%
Crowfoot	Low	26,780	20,228	1.6%
Eagle Riv-TFL	Low	33	32	0.0%
Kettle	Low	81,193	70,617	5.7%
Kettle-TFL	Low	3	-	0.0%
Mable	Low	66,086	58,612	4.7%
Ok West-TFL	Low	30,090	26,501	2.1%
Pennask-TFL	Low	3,180	2,953	0.2%
Penticton-TFL	Low	186	106	0.0%
Sal Arm-TFL	Low	25	21	0.0%
Trepanier-TFL	Low	41,176	35,451	2.9%
Trinity	Low	56,304	45,000	3.6%
U/Salmon-TFL	Low	62,744	56,743	4.6%
Upper Kettle	Low	70,189	64,114	5.2%
Upper Salmon	Low	42,165	33,766	2.7%
Vernon	Low	41,217	33,242	2.7%
White	Low	24,045	19,743	1.6%
			556,206	44.8%
	total	1,615,777	1,242,344	

**Table 2: Sub Zone Variant Old Growth Targets by Landscape Unit**

District	LU Name	BEC as One	Old THLB	Recruit THLB	Old NTHLB	Recruit NTHLB	THLB Increment from LRMP Table
Penticton	Anarchist	BG xh1	-	-	-	-	
Penticton	Anarchist	ESSF dc1	-	-	-	0	
Penticton	Anarchist	ESSF xc	40	7	10	0	
Penticton	Anarchist	IDF dk1	-	240	-	132	
Penticton	Anarchist	IDF dm1	9	117	-	277	
Penticton	Anarchist	IDF xh1	25	643	48	593	
Penticton	Anarchist	MS dm1	-	-	2	20	
Penticton	Anarchist	MS xk	120	15	10	10	
Penticton	Anarchist	PP xh1	-	-	8	821	100
Penticton	Anarchist-TFL	BG xh1	-	-	-	-	
Penticton	Anarchist-TFL	ESSF dc1	114	-	220	32	
Penticton	Anarchist-TFL	IDF dm1	-	-	18	447	
Penticton	Anarchist-TFL	IDF xh1	72	56	16	142	
Penticton	Anarchist-TFL	MS dm1	71	-	264	461	
Penticton	Anarchist-TFL	PP xh1	-	-	-	92	
Penticton	Ashnola	BG xh1	-	-	-	-	
Penticton	Ashnola	ESSF dc2	-	-	60	-	
Penticton	Ashnola	ESSF xc	-	-	6,162	-	
Penticton	Ashnola	IDF dk1	-	-	371	1,837	
Penticton	Ashnola	IDF dk2	7	11	3	95	
Penticton	Ashnola	IDF xh1	0	-	15	607	
Penticton	Ashnola	MS dm2	-	-	766	-	
Penticton	Ashnola	MS xk	-	-	3,405	-	
Penticton	Ashnola	PP xh1	-	-	-	3	
Penticton	Keremeos	BG xh1	-	-	-	-	
Penticton	Keremeos	ESSF xc	2	-	1,018	229	166.7
Penticton	Keremeos	IDF dk1	-	-	4	1,020	
Penticton	Keremeos	IDF dk2	-	-	-	283	
Penticton	Keremeos	IDF xh1	21	630	4	390	
Penticton	Keremeos	MS dm2	-	-	278	-	166.7
Penticton	Keremeos	MS xk	9	-	736	450	166.7
Penticton	Keremeos	PP xh1	-	-	-	83	90
Penticton	Kettle	ESSF dc1	-	-	989	-	
Penticton	Kettle	ESSF xc	-	-	508	-	
Penticton	Kettle	ICH mk1	35	-	155	-	
Penticton	Kettle	IDF dm1	-	-	56	438	
Penticton	Kettle	MS dm1	319	-	604	646	200
Penticton	Kettle-TFL	ESSF dc1	-	-	-	0	



District	LU Name	BEC as One	Old THLB	Recruit THLB	Old NTHLB	Recruit NTHLB	THLB Increment from LRMP Table
Penticton	Mission	BG xh1	-	-	-	-	
Penticton	Mission	ESSF dc1	966	-	1,556	375	
Penticton	Mission	ESSF xc	-	-	1,342	-	
Penticton	Mission	ICH mk1	439	-	492	1,510	250
Penticton	Mission	IDF dm1	-	-	-	347	
Penticton	Mission	IDF mw1	-	-	-	1,488	
Penticton	Mission	IDF xh1	-	-	-	426	150
Penticton	Mission	MS dm1	2,322	-	175	490	
Penticton	Mission	PP xh1	-	-	-	67	
Penticton	Pennask	ESSF dc2	336	-	24	-	
Penticton	Pennask	ESSF xc	1,013	-	254	411	
Penticton	Pennask	IDF dk1	-	12	-	0	
Penticton	Pennask	MS dm2	810	-	42	276	
Penticton	Pennask	MS xk	6	-	331	2,821	500
Penticton	Pennask-TFL	ESSF dc2	15	-	88	-	
Penticton	Pennask-TFL	ESSF xc	-	-	0	3	
Penticton	Pennask-TFL	MS dm2	-	-	43	-	
Penticton	Penticton	BG xh1	-	-	-	-	
Penticton	Penticton	ESSF dc1	720	-	133	1,057	
Penticton	Penticton	IDF dm1	-	-	2	1,722	
Penticton	Penticton	IDF xh1	-	-	-	792	800
Penticton	Penticton	MS dm1	1,109	-	291	1,555	
Penticton	Penticton	PP xh1	-	-	-	443	200
Penticton	Penticton-TFL	ESSF dc1	-	-	-	3	
Penticton	Penticton-TFL	IDF dm1	-	-	-	0	
Penticton	Penticton-TFL	IDF xh1	-	-	-	0	
Penticton	Penticton-TFL	MS dm1	-	-	-	6	
Penticton	Penticton-TFL	PP xh1	-	-	-	0	
Penticton	Trepanier	ESSF dc2	49	-	5	-	
Penticton	Trepanier	ESSF xc	33	-	10	59	
Penticton	Trepanier	IDF dk1	-	66	-	0	
Penticton	Trepanier	IDF dk2	-	702	-	1,870	
Penticton	Trepanier	IDF mw1	-	21	-	7	
Penticton	Trepanier	IDF xh1	19	534	-	324	
Penticton	Trepanier	MS dm2	1,606	-	884	242	
Penticton	Trepanier	MS xk	38	-	3	1	
Penticton	Trepanier	PP xh1	7	131	0	141	575

District	LU Name	BEC as One	Old THLB	Recruit THLB	Old NTHLB	Recruit NTHLB	THLB Increment from LRMP Table
Penticton	Trepanier-TFL	ESSF dc2	-	-	364	-	
Penticton	Trepanier-TFL	ESSF xc	-	-	110	-	
Penticton	Trepanier-TFL	IDF dk2	-	183	-	67	
Penticton	Trepanier-TFL	IDF mw1	-	-	-	128	
Penticton	Trepanier-TFL	IDF xh1	-	78	-	15	
Penticton	Trepanier-TFL	MS dm2	254	-	92	548	
Penticton	Trepanier-TFL	PP xh1	-	42	-	0	
Penticton	Trout	BG xh1	-	-	-	-	
Penticton	Trout	ESSF xc	113	-	1,325	223	
Penticton	Trout	IDF dk1	1	15	0	491	
Penticton	Trout	IDF dk2	122	975	62	1,810	
Penticton	Trout	IDF xh1	97	871	59	571	
Penticton	Trout	MS dm2	401	-	810	2,959	400
Penticton	Trout	MS xk	248	-	2	9	
Penticton	Trout	PP xh1	-	-	91	394	588
Salmon Arm	Anstey	ESSF wc2	-	-	485	1,466	
Salmon Arm	Anstey	ICH mw2	-	7	-	77	
Salmon Arm	Anstey	ICH mw3	107	-	1,894	57	
Salmon Arm	Anstey	ICH vk1	187	-	48	34	
Salmon Arm	Anstey	ICH wk1	584	-	88	215	
Salmon Arm	Anstey-TFL	ESSF wc2	-	74	4	14	
Salmon Arm	Anstey-TFL	ICH mw2	4	46	-	3	
Salmon Arm	Anstey-TFL	ICH mw3	105	-	-	-	
Salmon Arm	Anstey-TFL	ICH wk1	-	-	88	11	
Salmon Arm	Crowfoot	ESSF wc2	71	-	24	449	
Salmon Arm	Crowfoot	ICH mw2	-	-	-	-	
Salmon Arm	Crowfoot	ICH mw3	-	-	543	-	
Salmon Arm	Crowfoot	ICH wk1	38	61	5	156	150
Salmon Arm	Crowfoot	IDF mw2	-	-	-	25	
Salmon Arm	Eagle River	ESSF vc	-	-	2,775	491	
Salmon Arm	Eagle River	ESSF wc2	1,436	-	140	896	
Salmon Arm	Eagle River	ESSF wc4	85	-	18	181	
Salmon Arm	Eagle River	ICH mw2	-	30	59	10	
Salmon Arm	Eagle River	ICH mw3	83	-	2,004	-	
Salmon Arm	Eagle River	ICH vk1	47	-	816	192	
Salmon Arm	Eagle River	ICH wk1	1,129	-	1,384	669	
Salmon Arm	Eagle River-TFL	ESSF wc2	-	-	-	1	
Salmon Arm	Eagle River-TFL	ICH mw3	-	-	-	0	
Salmon Arm	Eagle River-TFL	ICH wk1	-	-	-	1	

District	LU Name	BEC as One	Old THLB	Recruit THLB	Old NTHLB	Recruit NTHLB	THLB Increment from LRMP Table
Salmon Arm	Kingfisher	ESSF vc	-	-	0	150	100
Salmon Arm	Kingfisher	ESSF wc2	1,671	-	73	2,630	
Salmon Arm	Kingfisher	ESSF wc4	30	-	45	144	100
Salmon Arm	Kingfisher	ICH mk1	161	-	13	100	
Salmon Arm	Kingfisher	ICH mw2	204	-	1,201	1,215	
Salmon Arm	Kingfisher	ICH mw3	-	-	47	-	
Salmon Arm	Kingfisher	ICH vk1	22	-	90	49	50
Salmon Arm	Kingfisher	ICH wk1	830	-	479	163	
Salmon Arm	Kingfisher	IDF mw1	-	-	21	432	
Salmon Arm	Kingfisher	IDF xh1	-	-	-	3	
Salmon Arm	Pukeashun	ESSF wc2	916	574	1,211	2,243	
Salmon Arm	Pukeashun	ICH mk2	27	-	100	-	
Salmon Arm	Pukeashun	ICH mw3	10	-	314	586	
Salmon Arm	Pukeashun	ICH wk1	710	395	135	451	
Salmon Arm	Pukeashun	IDF mw2	-	119	-	266	
Salmon Arm	Pukeashun	IDF xh2	-	-	-	12	
Salmon Arm	Salmon Arm-TFL	ESSF dc2	-	-	0	1	
Salmon Arm	Salmon Arm-TFL	IDF mw2	-	-	0	-	
Salmon Arm	Salmon Arm-TFL	MS dm2	-	-	0	0	
Salmon Arm	Salmon Arm	ESSF dc2	774	-	525	30	
Salmon Arm	Salmon Arm	ICH mk2	669	-	294	-	
Salmon Arm	Salmon Arm	ICH mw2	452	900	62	180	
Salmon Arm	Salmon Arm	ICH mw3	75	-	-	77	200
Salmon Arm	Salmon Arm	IDF dk2	-	363	-	267	
Salmon Arm	Salmon Arm	IDF mw1	28	312	-	112	
Salmon Arm	Salmon Arm	IDF mw2	72	185	-	2,372	
Salmon Arm	Salmon Arm	IDF xh1	-	9	-	24	
Salmon Arm	Salmon Arm	IDF xh2	-	26	-	145	
Salmon Arm	Salmon Arm	MS dm2	906	-	205	602	
Salmon Arm	Salmon Arm	PP xh2	-	-	-	0	
Salmon Arm	Seymour	ESSF vc	-	-	2,962	1,173	
Salmon Arm	Seymour	ESSF wc2	280	1,123	48	1,496	
Salmon Arm	Seymour	ICH mw3	1,544	-	1,280	921	
Salmon Arm	Seymour	ICH vk1	-	-	1,382	-	
Salmon Arm	Seymour	ICH wk1	2,294	-	694	293	
Salmon Arm	White	ESSF wc2	10	93	-	-	
Salmon Arm	White	ICH mw2	60	91	-	0	
Salmon Arm	White	ICH mw3	338	-	136	0	
Salmon Arm	White	ICH wk1	29	-	0	-	
Salmon Arm	White	IDF mw2	-	-	-	284	

District	LU Name	BEC as One	Old THLB	Recruit THLB	Old NTHLB	Recruit NTHLB	THLB Increment from LRMP Table
Vernon	Cherryville	ESSF dc1	-	-	138	-	
Vernon	Cherryville	ESSF wc4	-	-	244	459	
Vernon	Cherryville	ESSF xc	-	-	91	-	
Vernon	Cherryville	ICH mk1	148	-	89	405	
Vernon	Cherryville	ICH mw2	-	-	258	216	100
Vernon	Cherryville	IDF mw1	-	-	0	350	
Vernon	Harris	ESSF dc1	45	-	126	-	
Vernon	Harris	ESSF xc	-	-	1,696	-	
Vernon	Harris	ICH mk1	842	42	59	404	
Vernon	Harris	IDF mw1	66	794	-	795	
Vernon	Harris	IDF xh1	21	226	0	0	
Vernon	Harris	MS dm1	1,528	290	79	2	
Vernon	Mable	ESSF dc2	45	-	127	-	100
Vernon	Mable	ESSF wc2	-	-	86	1,225	400
Vernon	Mable	ICH mw2	439	-	244	292	
Vernon	Mable	ICH wk1	-	-	264	55	100
Vernon	Mable	IDF mw1	-	-	-	80	
Vernon	Ok West Side	ESSF dc2	103	166	-	-	
Vernon	Ok West Side	ESSF xc	-	48	-	-	
Vernon	Ok West Side	ICH mk1	273	-	0	0	
Vernon	Ok West Side	ICH mk2	242	-	57	-	
Vernon	Ok West Side	IDF dk1	-	81	-	100	
Vernon	Ok West Side	IDF mw1	26	693	-	464	
Vernon	Ok West Side	IDF xh1	-	202	-	27	300
Vernon	Ok West Side	MS dm2	178	75	29	146	
Vernon	Ok West Side	MS xk	-	-	-	6	
Vernon	Ok West-TFL	ESSF dc2	137	-	236	-	
Vernon	Ok West-TFL	ESSF xc	-	-	27	-	
Vernon	Ok West-TFL	ICH mk2	215	-	39	-	
Vernon	Ok West-TFL	IDF mw1	-	-	0	346	
Vernon	Ok West-TFL	IDF xh1	53	5	-	-	
Vernon	Ok West-TFL	MS dm2	86	-	57	174	
Vernon	Trinity	ESSF dc2	-	-	217	-	
Vernon	Trinity	ICH mk1	-	-	71	-	
Vernon	Trinity	ICH mw2	708	-	357	275	
Vernon	Trinity	IDF mw1	-	-	-	215	
Vernon	Trinity	IDF xh1	-	22	-	-	

District	LU Name	BEC as One	Old THLB	Recruit THLB	Old NTHLB	Recruit NTHLB	THLB Increment from LRMP Table
Vernon	U/Salmon-TFL	ESSF dc2	-	-	286	-	
Vernon	U/Salmon-TFL	ESSF xc	166	-	68	26	
Vernon	U/Salmon-TFL	IDF dk1	65	301	-	169	
Vernon	U/Salmon-TFL	IDF dk2	71	291	-	148	
Vernon	U/Salmon-TFL	IDF mw2	14	99	-	3	
Vernon	U/Salmon-TFL	IDF xh1	-	-	-	1	
Vernon	U/Salmon-TFL	IDF xh2	80	59	-	15	
Vernon	U/Salmon-TFL	MS dm2	546	-	95	0	
Vernon	U/Salmon-TFL	MS xk	13	-	40	270	
Vernon	Upper Kettle	ESSF dc1	-	-	823	-	
Vernon	Upper Kettle	ESSF wc4	1,151	-	60	351	
Vernon	Upper Kettle	ICH mk1	850	-	157	126	
Vernon	Upper Kettle	ICH mw2	-	-	78	30	
Vernon	Upper Salmon	ESSF dc2	100	-	58	0	
Vernon	Upper Salmon	ESSF xc	115	-	95	-	
Vernon	Upper Salmon	ICH mk1	3	11	0	0	
Vernon	Upper Salmon	ICH mk2	13	-	0	-	
Vernon	Upper Salmon	IDF dk1	-	-	-	241	
Vernon	Upper Salmon	IDF dk2	-	-	-	292	
Vernon	Upper Salmon	IDF mw1	-	103	-	39	
Vernon	Upper Salmon	IDF mw2	-	-	-	61	
Vernon	Upper Salmon	IDF xh1	-	-	-	13	
Vernon	Upper Salmon	IDF xh2	-	-	-	234	450
Vernon	Upper Salmon	MS dm2	-	-	84	151	100
Vernon	Upper Salmon	MS xk	-	-	11	269	200
Vernon	Upper Shuswap	ESSF wc2	995	839	113	776	
Vernon	Upper Shuswap	ESSF wc4	-	-	1,023	3,380	300
Vernon	Upper Shuswap	ICH mw2	1,281	-	349	495	
Vernon	Upper Shuswap	ICH vk1	-	-	951	-	
Vernon	Upper Shuswap	ICH wk1	1,944	-	809	309	

District	LU Name	BEC as One	Old THLB	Recruit THLB	Old NTHLB	Recruit NTHLB	THLB Increment from LRMP Table
Vernon	Vernon	ESSF dc2	8	-	-	16	
Vernon	Vernon	ESSF xc	38	-	-	17	
Vernon	Vernon	ICH mk1	103	-	411	53	100
Vernon	Vernon	ICH mw2	-	13	-	1	
Vernon	Vernon	IDF mw1	-	-	-	529	
Vernon	Vernon	IDF xh1	-	-	-	148	50
Vernon	Vernon	MS dm1	338	-	93	94	
Vernon	Vernon	PP xh1	-	-	-	1	

40,606	14,118	56,210	68,420	7,153
	54,724		124,629	7,153

	Total THLB	61,877
--	------------	--------