ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROGRAM
Rocky Mountain Trench

Forest Stewardship Plan
2013-2018

I certify that the work described herein fulfills the standards expected of a member of the Association of British Columbia Forest Professionals and that I did personally supervise the work.

Prepared by BJ Randall Harris R.P.F. #2609
February 7th 2013

Approved by _____ **Date:** 13-03-14
Ray Morello,
District Manager Rocky Mountain Forest District

Rocky Mountain Trench
Ecosystem Restoration Program
Forest Stewardship Plan 2013-2018

Table of Contents i
List of Tables ii

Text of Report
1.0 Introduction 1
1.1 Defining Forest Development Unit 1
1.2 Term of Plan 1
1.3 Interpretation 1
1.4 Application 2
1.5 Definitions 2

2.0 Five Year Plan Process 3
- 2.1 Referral to stakeholders 3
- 2.2 Consultation with First Nations (timelines and process) 3
- 2.3 Structure of this plan 3

3.0 Results and Strategies for Land Use Plan and FRPA Section 149 (1) Objectives
- 3.1 Timber 7
- 3.2 Riparian 8
- 3.3 Fishery Sensitive Watershed 10
- 3.4 Community Watersheds 11
- 3.5 Consumptive Use watersheds 13
- 3.6 Old Growth Management Areas 14
- 3.7 Biodiversity-Landscape Level 15
- 3.8 Biodiversity Stand Level 16
- 3.9 Wildlife 19
- 3.10 Soils 22
- 3.11 Visual Quality 23
- 3.12 Cultural and Heritage issues 24
- 3.13 Fire Maintained Ecosystems 25

4.0 Results and Strategies for FRPA Section 5 (1) (b) Objectives
- 4.1 Interpretive Forests Sites, Recreation Sites or Trails 26
- 4.2 Lakeshore Management Zones 31
- 4.3 Emergency Bark Beetle Management area 31
- 4.4 Areas with Significant watershed Sensitivity 31
- 4.5 Forest ecosystem Networks

5.0 Measures required under FPPR
- 5.1 Invasive Plants 32
- 5.2 Removing Natural Range Barriers 33

6.0 Stocking Standards 34

Appendix I Map of Forest Development Unit 38
Appendix II Summary of referral comments received 39

Appendix III Exemption approval letter from Rocky Mountain Resource District Manager for writing specific strategies contained in the Kootenay Boundary Land Use Plan 40

Appendix IV Rationale for Patch size, stocking standards and cutting rights 41

List of Tables

Table 2.1 Time table and Summary of referral and consultation process for Five Year Plan Ecosystem Restoration Program 4

Table 3.2.1 Definition and recommended management strategies for riparian areas by stream classes 9

Table 3.2.1 Definition and recommended management strategies for riparian areas by wetland classes 9

Table 3.2.3 Definition and recommended management strategies for riparian areas by lake classes 9

Table 3.4 List of Community Watersheds in Ecosystem Restoration Forest Development Unit 12

Table 3.8.1 Retention rate for Wildlife Tree Patches in Ecosystem Restoration Forest Development Unit 16

Table 3.9.1 Ungulate Winter Range Orders and Wildlife Habitat Areas (WHA) in Ecosystem Restoration FDU 20

Table 4.1 List of Interpretive Forest Sites, Recreation Sites and Recreational Trails and Associated Objectives applicable to the Ecosystem Restoration Program 27

Table 6 Summary of Stocking Standards for Ecosystem Restoration blocks 35

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Defining Forest Development Unit

No Forest Development Units are in effect on the date of submission of this FSP. Only one Forest Development Plan Unit is proposed for this plan as per the map in Appendix 1 and is called the "Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Program FDU". It includes high elevation (MSdk and ESSFdk) section of the Diorite Creek area to facilitate Bighorn sheep restoration projects.

1.2 Term of Plan

The term of this plan shall be five years from the date of approval.

1.3 Interpretation

In this Forest Stewardship Plan**;**

"**DM**" means the District Manager of the Rocky Mountain Resource District and is the holder of this FSP.

"**FPC**" means the *Forest Practices Code of British Columbia Act* 1996:

"**FPPR**" means the *Forest Planning and Practices Regulation* as amended from time to time;

"**FRPA**" means the *Forest and Range Practices Act* 2002 and the applicable regulations made there under and amended from time to time

"**FSP**" means a non-statutory plan for the Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Program, that meets the spirit and intent of the FRPA forest management regime, including results or strategies for government objectives (KBHLPO, FPPR, and FPC grandparented objectives), as well as measures to prevent the spread of invasive plants, measures to mitigate the loss of natural range barriers, and stocking standards.

"**GAR**" means *Government Action Regulation* as amended from time to time

"**Hydrological assessment**" means a professional level analysis of existing and potential forest development effects on water and water related resources conducted at the site or watershed level which may include:

- An overview of the watershed including stream morphology.
- A watershed snapshot or report card update by means of GIS analysis
- A review of cumulative effects of existing and proposed development or road construction activities.
- A hydrological risk assessment of proposed development
- Specific recommendations for hazard mitigation
- A drainage plan for roads and other related development

"**Qualified professional**" means with respect to an activity which requires a qualified professional, a person who has appropriate education and experience to carry out the activity and is a member of, or licensed by, a regulatory body in British Columbia that has the legislated authority to regulate the activity and its members or licensees performing the activity.

1.4 Application

This FSP applies to

1) All of the operations of The Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration program including
   a) Cutting authorities issued under section 52 (1) (b) of the *Forest and Range Practices Act*
   b) Activities authorised under section 52 (2) of the *Forest and Range Practices Act*
   c) The construction of roads to access project areas
   d) Forestry license to cut
   e) Fireguards constructed by the Ecosystem Restoration program

1.5 Definitions under the Acts

Unless otherwise expressly stated, term**s** used in this FSP shall have the same definition given to them in FRPA and the Forest Act and the regulation issued under them.

Chapter 2 Process of Plan Development and referral

2.1 Referral to stakeholders

All stakeholders were sent letters requesting their input to the plan. A list of stakeholders contacted and the timing for their response is summarised in Table 2.1. Letters sent to stakeholders offer a variety of input methodologies including; phone, email, field trips and evening meetings that can be held throughout the district.

The list of stakeholders, range licensees, forest licensees, guide outfitters, trappers, municipalities, community groups, utilities, conservation programs, and recreation organisations are noted in a list kept on file 22000-20/ERP FSP 2012. All comments and input received as a result of the referral process and the Ecosystem Restoration program's response to these comments are kept on the same file. These comments and responses are also summarised and presented in Appendix II of this FSP.

2.2 Consultation with First Nations

Consultation with First Nations proceeded after other stakeholders have completed their referral comments so that the First Nations are reviewed a final package. The Ecosystem Restoration program followed government guidelines and processes for these consultations and allowed 60 days for First Nations to respond. All comments and input received as a result of the referral process and the Ecosystem Restoration program's response to these comments are kept on the same file. These comments and responses are also summarised and presented in Appendix II of this FSP.

2.3 Structure of this Plan

This Forest Stewardship Plan lays out commitments to be met by the Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem restoration Program on Crown Land. The details of how this compliance will be carried out or measured is contained in the Forest Stewardship Plan Companion Document also found on the Rocky Mountain Resource District website under downloads. New blocks are proposed in an Annual Plan submitted each January for referral to stakeholders and consultation with First Nations. The Annual Plan, which is just a list of blocks with maps; the details of how resource values are dealt with is contained in the Companion document. These three planning documents replace the previous Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Program 5 Year Plans, the latest of which (2011 to 2016) will stay in effect until this Forest Stewardship Plan is signed by the Rocky Mountain Resource District Manager.

Table 2.1 Timetable and Summary of referral and consultation process for Ecosystem Restoration Program Forest Stewardship Plan

Activity	Group	Date	Location (and Media) with respect to Pubic Review	Comments Received Y/N	Date
First Nation Consultation	K'tunaxa Nation Council	July 30th 2012	Invitational letter	Yes See Appendix II	October 17th 2012
First Nation Consultation	Shuswap Band Council	July 30th 2012	Invitational letter	No, See Appendix II	
Stakeholder referrals					
Forest Licensees referral	Galloway Timber Company Ltd. BC Timber Sales Tembec Industries Ltd Canfor- Radium Division Nupqu Development Corporation NRFL Holders	November 2011	Referral letter all licensees	Yes, see Appendix II	
Range Licensees	All affected by proposals (see list Appendix II)	November 2011	Referral letters to affected ranchers	Yes, see Appendix II	
Utilities	BC Hydro and Power Authourity Trans Canada Transmission Ministry of Transportation and Highways Canadian Pacific Railway	November 2011	Referral letters	Yes, see Appendix II	

Activity	Group	Date	Location (and Media) with respect to Pubic Review	Comments Received Y/N	Date
Trappers	All affected by plans see Appendix II for total list	November 2011	Referral letters to affected trappers	No	
Guide Outfitters	All affected by plans see Appendix II for complete list	November 2011	Referral letters to affected guide outfitters	No	
Christmas Tree Permitees	All permitees, see Appendix II for complete list	November 2011	Referral letters to active Christmas Tree Permitees	No	
Local Governments	City of Cranbrook City of Kimberley District of Invermere Village of Radium Regional District of East Kootenay Interior Health-Health Protection Services	November 2011	Referral letters or emails to affected municipalities	Yes, see Appendix II	
Associations/ NGOs	The Nature Trust The Nature Conservancy of Canada The Land Conservancy East Kootenay Conservation Program Cranbrook Community Forest chair	November 2011	Referral letters or emails	Yes, see Appendix II	
Fire chiefs and concerned Citizens	See Appendix II for full list	November 2011	Referral Letters or emails sent to list	Yes, see Appendix II	

Activity	Group	Date	Location (and Media) with respect to Pubic Review	Comments Received Y/N	Date
Agencies	Kootenay National Park Integrated Land Management Bureau East Kootenay Community Heath Services	November 2011	Referral Letters or emails sent to list	No responses	
Advertisement	Invermere Upper Columbia Pioneer Invermere Valley Echo Kootenay News Advertiser	February 10, 2012 February 8, 2012 February 6, 2012	Once only week of February 6th 2012, review period to April 13, 2012	No response	
Approval	Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations, Director, Resource Mgt	October 29, 2012	Request for letter of authority for East Columbia Restoration unit	Approval granted on by November 20th, 2012	
Expected Approval	Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations, Rocky Mtn District Manager	October 29 2012	Plan submitted	Expected by November 9th, 2012, Denied, changes required	
Expected Approval	Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations, Rocky Mtn District Manager	Resubmitted February 7th, 2013	Plan submitted	Approval expected by February 28th, 2013	

Chapter 3 Results and Strategies for Land Use Plan and FRPA Section 149 (1) Objectives

This section describes the legal objectives established through legislation, specifically Section 149 of the *Forest and Range Practices Act*, the *Forest Planning and Practices Regulation* (FPPR) and the Kootenay Boundary Land Use Plan Order. To address these objectives, the Ecosystem Restoration Program has developed results, strategies and/or measures to achieve these government objectives. .

3.1. TIMBER:

3.1.1 Timber Objectives set by Higher Level Plan:

A request an exemption to write strategies for Objective 7 (enhanced timber management zone) and Objective 10 (Economic and social stability analysis) of the Kootenay Boundary Land Use Plan has been granted by the Rocky Mountain Resource District Manager in a letter dates September 12th 2012 (See Appendix III).

3.1.2 Timber Objectives set by government

The Objectives set by Government for Timber are as follows (Section 6 of Forest Practices and Planning Regulation)

6 The objectives set by government for timber are to

(a) Maintain or enhance an economically valuable supply of commercial timber from British Columbia's forests,

(b) ensure that delivered wood costs, generally, after taking into account the effect on them of the relevant provisions of this regulation and of the Act, are competitive in relation to equivalent costs in relation to regulated primary forest activities in other jurisdictions, and

(c) ensure that the provisions of this regulation and of the Act that pertain to primary forest activities do not unduly constrain the ability of a holder of an agreement under the *Forest Act* to exercise the holder's rights under the agreement.

3.1.3 Results and Strategies that relate to Timber:

3.1.3.3 The Ecosystem Restoration program is exempt from writing a result of strategy for section 6 of the FPPR as this objective is a government objective and no result or strategy is required as per section 12 (8) of the Forest Practices and Planning Regulation.

3.2 RIPARIAN

3.2.1 Riparian Objectives set by Higher Level Plan:

Currently there are no specific objectives of the Kootenay Boundary Land Use Plan that relate directly to riparian areas.

3.2.2 Riparian Objectives set by government

The Objectives set by Government for riparian areas are as follows (Section 8 of Forest Planning and Practices Regulation)

8 The objective set by government for water, fish, wildlife and biodiversity within riparian areas is, without unduly reducing the supply of timber from British Columbia's forests, to conserve, at the landscape level, the water quality, fish habitat, wildlife habitat and biodiversity associated with those riparian areas.

3.2.3 Results and Strategies that relate to Riparian Objective:

3.2.3.1 For the purposes of Section 8 of the FPPR, the holder of this FSP undertakes to comply with Section 47 to 51, 52(2) and 53 of the FPPR.

3.2.3.2 For the purposes of Section 12(3) of the FPPR, the holder when conducting operations in the Ecosystem Restoration Program Rocky Mountain Trench FDU, shall adopt as a result or strategy the following:

- **a.** All streams, wetlands and lakes within a treatment area within the Ecosystem Restoration Program Rocky Mountain Trench FDU shall be identified and classified, and the riparian management zone(s) shall be specified as per FPPR section 47 to 49 prior to the commencement of operations.
- **b.** Within each riparian management area:
  - i. Retain all understory shrubs, regen and advanced regen trees in all Riparian Management Areas except where provisions in sections 50 and 51 of the FPPR apply.
  - ii. Retain all dominant and co-dominant trees in all Riparian Reserve Zones, except where provisions in sections 50 and 51 of the FPPR apply (i.e. safety or road construction).
  - iii. On average when all riparian management zones are combined in a given Logical Burn Unit, the average retention levels as per tables 3.2.1, 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 will be achieved.
  - iv. Natural drainage pattern shall be maintained for classified and non classified drainages.
  - v. Removal of debris from streams is to be concurrent with operations and occur prior to spring freshet.

Table 3.2.1 Definition and recommended management strategies for riparian areas by stream class

Riparian Class	Size limits for riparian area in this class (width in metres)	Relevant Fish Community watershed status	Riparian Reserve Zone width (m)	Riparian Management Zone width (m)	Retention target for dominant- co-dominant trees in RMZ (expressed as % of pre treatment basal area)
S1A	> 100 m	Fish bearing, CW	0	100	50
S1A	>20 < 100	Fish bearing, CW	50	20	50
S2	>5 < 20m	Fish bearing, CW	30	20	50
S3	>1.5 <5 m	Fish bearing, CW	20	20	50
S4	< 1.5 m	Fish bearing, CW	0	30	25 (10m reserve preferred)
S5	> 3 m	Non fish	0	30	25
S6	< 3 m	Non Fish	0	20	10

Note that riparian classes and widths of riparian reserves and management zones for all lakes, streams and wetlands are set by the Forest Planning and Practices Regulation.

Table 3.2.2 Definition and recommended management strategies for riparian areas by wetland class

Riparian Class	Size limits for riparian area in this class (hectares)	Relevant Biogeoclimatic zone	Riparian Reserve Zone width (m)	Riparian Management Zone width (m)	Retention target for dominant- co-dominant trees in RMZ (% of pre treatment basal area)
W1	> 5 ha	IDFdm, MS	10	40	10
W2	> 1 ha	PP	10	20	25
W3	<5 >1 ha	IDFdm, MS	0	30	10
W4	< .25 > 1 ha	PP	0	30	25
W5	A wetland complex of over 5 ha size	All	10	40	25

Table 3.2.3 Definition and recommended management strategies for riparian areas by lake class

Riparian Class	Size limits for riparian area in this class (hectares)	Relevant Biogeoclimatic zone	Riparian Reserve Zone width (m)	Riparian Management Zone width (m)	Retention target for dominant- co-dominant trees in RMZ (% of pre treatment basal area)
L1A	>1000 ha	All	0		25
L1 B	5 to 1000 ha	All	10		25
L2	>1<5 ha	PP	10	20	25
L3	>1<5 ha	IDFdm, MS	0	30	10
L4A	>.25<1 ha	PP	0	30	25
L4B	>.5<1 ha	CDF, CWH dry	0	30	10

3.3 FISHERY SENSITIVEWATERSHED:

3.3.1 Fishery Sensitive Watershed Objectives set by Higher Level Plan:

Currently there are no specific objectives of the Kootenay Boundary Higher Level Plan Order that relate directly to Fishery Sensitive Watershed.

3.3.2 Fishery Sensitive Watershed Objectives set by government

The Objectives set by Government for Fishery Sensitive watershed are as follows (Section 8.1 of Forest Planning and Practices Regulation)

8.1 (1) In this section, **"fisheries sensitive watershed"** means an area identified in Schedule 2 of this regulation

(a) with significant downstream fisheries values continued under section 180 (f) of the Act and significant watershed sensitivity continued under section 180 (g) of the Act, and

(b) for which there is no fisheries sensitive watershed objective.

(2) Until December 31, 2005 the objective set by government for fish habitat in fisheries sensitive watersheds is to prevent to the extent described in subsection (3) the cumulative hydrological effects of primary forest activities in the fisheries sensitive watershed from resulting in a material adverse impact on the habitat of the fish species for which the fisheries sensitive watershed was established.

(3) The objective set by government under subsection (2) applies only to the extent that it does not unduly reduce the supply of timber from British Columbia's forests.

(4) If satisfied that the objective set out in subsection (2) is not required to provide special management, the minister responsible for the *Wildlife Act* must exempt a person from the requirement to specify a result or strategy in relation to the objective.

(5) If satisfied that the objective set out in subsection (2) is addressed, in whole or in part, by an enactment, the minister responsible for the *Wildlife Act* must exempt a person from the requirement to specify a result or strategy in relation to the objective set out in subsection (2) to the extent that the objective is already addressed.

3.3.3 Results and Strategies that relate to Fishery Sensitive Stream Objective:

The rivers currently listed in schedule 2 of FPPR as being both Fishery Sensitive and in Rocky Mountain District Nicole/ Upper Lussier, Coyote Creek, Thunder, Palliser River (above the confluence with the Albert River) and Bradford River. No fisheries sensitive watersheds are within the FDU that is associated with this plan, therefore no result or strategy is required.

3.4 COMMUNITY WATERSHED:

3.4.1 Community Watershed Objectives set by Higher Level Plan:

Currently there are no specific objectives of Kootenay Boundary Higher Level Plan Order Plan that relate directly to Community Watersheds.

3.4.2 Community Watershed Objectives set by government

The Objectives set by Government for Community watershed are as follows (Section 8.2 of Forest Planning and Practices Regulation)

8.2 (1) In this section, **"community watershed"** means a community watershed
(a) that is continued under section 180 (e) of the Act, and
(b) for which a water quality objective has not been
(i) continued under section 181 of the Act, or
(ii) established under the Government Actions Regulation.
(2) The objective set by government for water being diverted for human consumption through a licensed waterworks in a community watershed is to prevent to the extent described in subsection (3) the cumulative hydrological effects of primary forest activities within the community watershed from resulting in
(a) a material adverse impact on the quantity of water or the timing of the flow of the water to the waterworks, or
(b) the water from the waterworks having a material adverse impact on human health that cannot be addressed by water treatment required under
(i) an enactment, or
(ii) the licence pertaining to the waterworks.
(3) The objective set by government under subsection (2) applies only to the extent that it does not unduly reduce the supply of timber from British Columbia's forests.
(4) If satisfied that the objective set out in subsection (2) is not required to provide special management the minister responsible for the *Wildlife Act* must exempt a person from the requirement to specify a result or strategy in relation to the objective.
(5) If satisfied that the objective set out in subsection (2) is addressed, in whole or in part, by an enactment, the minister responsible for the *Wildlife Act* must exempt a person from the requirement to specify a result or strategy in relation to the objective set out in subsection (2) to the extent that the objective is already addressed.

3.4.3 Results and Strategies that relate to Community Watershed Objective:

The holder of this FSP shall adopt as a result or strategy Sections 59, 60 and 61 of the FPPR as those sections were on the date this FSP was submitted for approval, and shall review and be consistent with any watershed assessments completed by qualified professionals for the Community Watershed that it operates within. If there is conflict with existing assessments the ER program will seek the advice of qualified professionals before proceeding. If no applicable, valid watershed assessment is available, the ER program will complete a watershed assessment using qualified professionals and integrate recommendations into applicable prescriptions before initiating development activities.

Table 3.4 List of Community Watersheds in Ecosystem Restoration FDU

Community Watershed	Community	Range Unit
Mathew-Mark	Kimberley	St Mary's/ Cherry Tata
Miller	Grasmere	Grasmere
Reserve	Tobacco Plains	Grasmere
Joseph-Gold	Cranbrook	Alkali Lake, Upper Joseph Creek
Abel	Invermere	Westside
Coldspring	Fairmont Hot Springs	Windermere-Fairmont

3.4 CONSUMPTIVE USE WATERSHEDS:

3.51 Consumptive Use Watershed Objectives set by Higher Level Plan:

The Kootenay Boundary Higher Level Plan Order Objective number 6 establishes enhanced riparian protection around streams feeding into watersheds used for human consumption.

The Order reads:

(1) To reduce the impacts of forest development on streams licensed for human consumption, apply the following stream side management provisions to S5 and S6 streams that meet the stated conditions:

a) Stream side management provisions:

i. the stream side management zone will extend from the edge of the stream channel bank or the outer edge of the active floodplain, to a minimum distance of 30 metres on each side of the stream, or to the top of the inner gorge, whichever is greater; and specific measures to safeguard water licensed for human consumption must be described for activities in the stream side management zone.

b) The provisions apply to:

i. the segment of a stream between the water intake which is licensed for human consumption and the upstream point where stream order is reduced and, if the intake is located on a first-order stream, the entire stream length above the intake;

ii. a stream on which there is a water intake which is licensed for human consumption; and

iii. a stream on which the location of a water intake is shown on Map 6.1. (Intakes shown are licensed for human consumption.)

c) The provisions do not apply where:

i. the stream is within the Enhanced Resource Development Zones - Timber areas under objective 7 (Map 7.1); or

ii. it has been established that a licensed intake is not being utilized for human consumption.

3.5.2 Consumptive Use Watershed Objectives set by government

There are no further Objectives set by Government for Consumptive Use watersheds

3.5.3 Results and Strategies that relate to Consumptive Use Watershed Objective:

3.5.3.1 The holder of this FSP shall query government databases prior to treatment of sites to see if there are down-stream domestic water intakes as per KBHLPO Map 6.1.

3.5.3.2 Where downstream domestic water intakes or domestic water intakes within the treatment area are identified the holder of this FSP will ensure that operations occur upstream to the intake are designed to

a) Increase riparian tree retention in consumptive use watershed to levels above those specified in Table 3.2.1 and extend the streamside management zone to 30 metres from the high water mark of the stream or the top of an inner gorge

b) Maintain soil and stream bank stability

c) Comply with FPPR Sections 59 and 60.

3.6 OLD GROWTH MANAGEMENT AREAS (OGMA):

3.6.1 Old Growth and Mature Objectives set by Higher Level Plan:

The Kootenay Boundary Higher Level Plan Order Objective Number 1 establishes Biodiversity Emphasis Options for all landscape Units in the Rocky Mountain District

The Kootenay Boundary Higher Level Plan Order Objective Number 2 establishes targets for Old and Mature Forest Management Areas.

3.6.2 Old Growth Objectives set by government

There are no Objectives set by Government for Old Growth Management Areas.

3.6.3 Results and Strategies that relate to Old Growth and Mature Management Areas Objectives:

3.6.3.1 The holder of this FSP will plan operations in the Ecosystem Restoration Program Rocky Mountain Trench FDU to be consistent with the biodiversity emphasis assigned in objective 1 of the KBHLP Order.

3.6.3.2 The holder of this FSP shall plan operations in the Ecosystem Restoration Program Rocky Mountain Trench FDU to maintain the integrity of old forests as laid out by the Integrated Land Management Bureau (ILMB) in a map produced in 2006. The geographic locations of the old forests to be retained are stored in the data warehouse:
(WHSE_LAND_USE_PLANNING.RMP_OGMA_NON_LEGAL_CURRENT_SVW)

3.6.3.3 The holder of this FSP may thin and burn the understory trees in overstocked old growth management areas in the Ecosystem Restoration Program Rocky Mountain Trench FDU to re-establish and maintain stand function and health.

3.6.3.4 An exemption has been granted by the District Manager to the Ecosystem Restoration program (See Appendix III) to write a strategy to recruit Old Growth Management areas as per Objective 2 footnote “e” of the Kootenay Boundary Land Use Plan Order.

3.7 BIODIVERSITY- LANDSCAPE LEVEL:

3.7.1 Wildlife and Biodiversity Objectives set by Higher Level Plan:

The Kootenay Boundary Higher Level Plan Order Objective Number 4 establishes a relaxed green up height requirement for operations in the Kootenay Boundary area. An exemption to writing a strategy for this requirement has been granted by the Rocky Mountain Resource District Manager (see Appendix III).

The Kootenay Boundary Higher Level Plan Order Objective Number 5 establishes map 5.2 that refers to connectivity corridors.

3.7.2 Landscape Level Wildlife and Biodiversity Objectives set by government

The Objectives set by Government for wildlife and biodiversity at the landscape level are as follows (Section 9 of Forest Planning and Practices Regulation):

9 The objective set by government for wildlife and biodiversity at the landscape level is, without unduly reducing the supply of timber from British Columbia's forests and to the extent practicable, to design areas on which timber harvesting is to be carried out that resemble, both spatially and temporally, the patterns of natural disturbance that occur within the landscape.

3.7.3 Results and Strategies that relate to Landscape Level Wildlife and Biodiversity Objectives:

3.7.3.1 Grizzly bear portion of KBHLPO objective 5 is not in effect as no Grizzly bear habitat map is available, therefore no result or strategy is required.

The connectivity corridor portion of this objective is satisfied by the preferential location of old and mature forest into connectivity corridors as per the ILMB map referred to in the Old Growth Management Area section. The holder of this FSP shall plan operations in the Ecosystem Restoration Program Rocky Mountain Trench FDU to maintain the integrity of old and mature forests as laid out by the Integrated Land Management Bureau (ILMB) in the map produced in 2006.

3.7.3.2 For the purposes of Section 9 of the FPPR, the holder of this FSP when operating within the Ecosystem Restoration Program Rocky Mountain Trench FDU, shall design harvesting to be consistent with the structural characteristics and the temporal and spatial distribution of an opening that would result from a natural disturbance and ensure that the structural characteristics of the harvested areas after timber harvesting has been substantially completed resemble an opening that would result from a natural disturbance. Harvest units will focus on logical burn units of 60 to 700 hectares in size and will maintain a canopy meeting open forest and open range stocking characteristics as defined by the Cranbrook and Invermere Ungulate Winter Range Orders.

3.8 BIODIVERSITY -STAND LEVEL

3.8.1 Wildlife and biodiversity at the stand level, objective set by Higher Level Plan:
The Kootenay Boundary Higher Level Plan has no further objectives for stand level biodiversity.

3.8.2 Wildlife and biodiversity at the stand level, objectives set by government
The Objectives set by Government for Wildlife Tree Retention are as follows (Section 9.1 of Forest Planning and Practices Regulation):

9.1 The objective set by government for wildlife and biodiversity at the stand level is, without unduly reducing the supply of timber from British Columbia's forests, to retain wildlife trees.

3.8.3 Results and Strategies that relate to wildlife and biodiversity at the stand level Objectives:

3.8.3.1 For the purposes of Section 9.1 of the FPPR, the holder of this FSP when operating within the Ecosystem Restoration Program Rocky Mountain Trench FDU, shall meet wildlife tree retention levels stated in Table 3.8 for each logical burn unit treated under this plan.

Table 3.8 Retention for Wildlife Tree patches by Landscape Unit and Biogeoclimatic sub-zone in the Ecosystem Restoration Forest Development Unit

Landscape Unit Number	Landscape Unit Name	Range Units	Biogeoclimatic zone Variant	Wildlife Tree Patch Minimum Retention rate (%)
C02	Perry Moyie	Perry, Moyie	IDFdm2 MSdk	7.0 7.7
C10	Bloom Caven	Upper Gold Plumbob	IDFdm2 MSdk	8.3 8.6
C13	Galton Range	Wigwam, E Grasmere	IDFdm2 MSdk	3.8 1.5
C25	Sand Creek	Burton and Rosen Lake	IDFdm2 IDFdm2a MSdk	2.4 0.6 0
C29	Wildhorse Steeples	Wildhorse-Lewis, Powerplant	IDFdm2 MSdk	3.0 2.9
C30	Cranbrook	Alkali, Cranbrook-Fort Steele, Rampart-Mayook, Peavine, Patton,	IDFdm2 MSdk PPdh2	7.7 6.1 5.5

		Joseph		
C32	St Mary's Prairie	Cherry Tata, St Mary's Prairie	IDFdm2 MSdk PPdh2	7.7 6.5 8.4
C33	Wasa Picture Valley	Lewis-Wolf, Wildhorse-Lewis, Peckham's Lake, Powerplant	IDFdm2 PPdh2	5.9 4.8
C34	Jaffray- Baynes Lake	Colvalli North, Waldo, Pickering Hills, Burton Lake	IDFdm2 IDFdm2a MSdk PPdh2	8.0 7.4 5.2 6.9
C35	Tobacco Plains	West Grasmere	IDFdm2 PPdh2	6.8 7.5
C36	Mayook-Wardner	Rocky Chipka, Tokay Hills, Haha Creek, Baker	IDFdm2 MSdk PPdh2	6.8 6.6 5.7
C37	Linklater-Englishman	East Gold Plumbob, Newgate	IDFdm2 MSdk PPdh2	7.4 7.5 6.9
I03	Skookumchuck/ Torrent	Tata-Skookumchuck, Torrent	IDFdm2 MSdk PPdh2	6.5 3.1 4.8
I04	Premier/ Diorite	Sheep Creek North, Watson, Wolf-Sheep	IDFdm2 MSdk PPdh2	7.1 6.2 6.5
I11	Kootenay	East Columbia Lake	IDFdm2 MSdk	2.1 7.6
I12	Doctor/ Fir	Dutch- Findlay, Findlay Basin	IDFdm2 IDFxk MSdk	9.1 9.1 6.7
I13	East Columbia	East Columbia Lake, Windermere-Fairmont	IDFdm2 IDFxk MSdk	2.7 3.1 4.1
I18	Invermere	Toby-Horsethief, Westside	IDFdm2 IDFxk MSdk	7.8 5.1 7.7
I25	Shuswap/ Windermere	Windermere-Sinclair	IDFdm2 IDFxk MSdk	0.1 1.2 3.9
I29	Steamboat	Frances Creek	IDFdm2 IDFxk	9.0 2.1

			MSdk	8.0
I30	Kindersley Macauley	Luxor	IDFdm2 IDFxk	3.9 2.1

3.9 WILDLIFE

3.9.1 Wildlife Objectives set by Higher Level Plan:

The Kootenay Boundary Higher Level Plan Order Objective Number 3 establishes objectives for mountain caribou in the Rocky Mountain District.

The Kootenay Boundary Higher Level Plan Order Objective Number 5 establishes map 5.2 that refers to connectivity corridors.

3.9.2 Wildlife Objectives set by government

The Objectives set by Government for Wildlife are as follows (Section 7 of Forest Planning and Practices Regulation):

7 (1) The objective set by government for wildlife is, without unduly reducing the supply of timber from British Columbia's forests, to conserve sufficient wildlife habitat in terms of amount of area, distribution of areas and attributes of those areas, for

(a) the survival of species at risk,

(b) the survival of regionally important wildlife, and

(c) the winter survival of specified ungulate species.

(2) A person required to prepare a forest stewardship plan must specify a result or strategy in respect of the objective stated under subsection (1) only if the minister responsible for the *Wildlife Act* gives notice to the person of the applicable

(a) species referred to in subsection (1), and

(b) indicators of the amount, distribution and attributes of wildlife habitat described in subsection (1).

(3) If satisfied that the objective set out in subsection (1) is addressed, in whole or in part, by an objective in relation to a wildlife habitat area or an ungulate winter range, a general wildlife measure, or a wildlife habitat feature, the minister responsible for the *Wildlife Act* must exempt a person from the obligation to specify a result or strategy in relation to the objective set out in subsection (1) to the extent that the objective is already addressed.

(4) On or after December 31, 2004, a notice described in subsection (2) must be given at least 4 months before the forest stewardship plan is submitted for approval

3.9.2.1 Wildlife Objectives enabled by Regulation

The following Ungulate Winter Range Orders, Wildlife Habitat Areas, Grizzly Bear Specified Area Order (including maps and General Wildlife Measures) have been issued under sections 9(1), 9(2), 10(1), and/or 12(1) 7 of the Government Action Regulation as of July 25 2012, and pertain to the Ecosystem Restoration FDU. If other WHAs come into effect during the term of this FSP they will be followed as well.

Table 3.9.1 Ungulate Winter Range Orders and Wildlife Habitat Areas (WHA) in Ecosystem Restoration FDU

Species	Order Number	Area	Effective Date
White tailed deer, Mule deer, elk, bighorn sheep, moose, mountain goat	Ungulate Winter Range Order 4-006 (Cranbrook TSA)	402, 211	February 17, 2005
White tailed deer, Mule deer, elk, bighorn sheep, moose, mountain goat	Ungulate Winter Range Order 4-008 (Invermere TSA)	217,379	February 17, 2005
Lewis' Woodpecker	WHA 4-001 and 4-002 WHA 4-086 WHA 4-087	50.1 79.5 22.3	FPC grand parented July 29, 2005 December 18, 2006
Yellow Badger	WHA 4-088 through 4-092 WHA 4-102 and 4-103 WHA 4-106	744.7 68.4 37	December 18, 2006 December 18, 2006 April 1st 2009
Long billed curlew	WHA 4-065 through 4-069 WHA 4-070 through 4-075	280.8 639.3	December 1st 2005 September 15th 2005
Flammulated Owl	WHA 4-77 through 4-085 WHA 4-099 through 4-101	233.2 88	July 29, 2005 February 15, 2007
Western Screech Owl	WHA 4-114 through 4-115	206	May 19th 2011
Data sensitive	WHA 4-109 and 4-112	158	May 27th 2010
Williamson's Sapsucker	WHA 4-108 and 4-127 through129, and 4-136 through 4-144	72.8 To be Determined	November 6th 2008 July 11th 2011
Grizzly Bear	WHA 4-180	To be determined	May 19th 2011
Antelope-Brush/Bluebunch Wheatgrass	WHA 4-116, WHA 4-117, WHA 4-119	To be determined	July 7th 2011
Douglas-fir/Snowberry/Balsamroot	WHA 4-118, WHA 4-120	To be Determined	July 7th 2011

To date no Wildlife Habitat Features have been declared for protection or special management under the *Government Actions Regulation.*

3.9.3 Results and Strategies that relate to Wildlife Objectives:

3.9.3.1 Objective 3 of KBHLPO was cancelled by ministerial order – January 8, 2009.

3.9.3.2 Grizzly bear portion of KBHLPO objective 5 is not in effect as no Grizzly bear habitat map is available.

The connectivity corridor portion of this objective is satisfied by the preferential location of old and mature forest into connectivity corridors as per the ILMB map

referred to in the Old Growth Management Area section. The holder of this FSP shall plan operations in the Ecosystem Restoration Program Rocky Mountain Trench FDU to maintain the integrity of old and mature forests as laid out by the Integrated Land Management Bureau (ILMB) in the map produced in 2006.

3.9.3.3 No result or strategy is required to meet 9(1), 9(2), 10(1), and/or 12(1) 7 of the Government Action Regulation, as the amount of area required by the Notice – Indicators of the Amount, Distribution and Attributes of Wildlife Habitat Required for the Survival of Species at Risk in the Rocky Mountain Forest District has been satisfied for all 5 species listed in the notice, via the establishment of WHA's. The holder of this FSP will follow the general wildlife measures contained in the WHA orders and Ungulate winter Range Orders or request an exemption.

3.9.3.4 Wildlife Habitat Areas (FRPA Section 181)
No grandparented WHA's are within the FDU that is associated with this plan, therefore no result or strategy is required under this section of the act.

3.9.3.5 Ungulate Winter Range (FRPA Section 7 and 181, Forest Practices Code Operational and Site Planning Regulation Section 69(1)
No grandparented UWR is within the FDU that is associated with this plan, therefore no result or strategy is required under this section of the act.

3.10 SOILS:

3.10.1 Soil Objectives set by Higher Level Plan:

There are currently no objectives set for soils under the Kootenay Boundary Land Use Plan

3.10.2 Soil Objectives set by government

The Objectives set by Government for soils are as follows (*Section 5 of Forest Planning and Practices Regulation*)

3.□.□ The objective set by government for soils is, without unduly reducing the supply of timber from British Columbia's forests, to conserve the productivity and the hydrologic function of soils.

3.10.3 Results and Strategies that relate to Soils Objectives:

3.11.3.1 The holder of this FSP undertakes to comply with Section 35 and 36 of the FPPR.

3.11 VISUAL QUALITY

3.11.1 Visual Quality Objectives set by Higher Level Plan:

Objective 9 of the Kootenay Boundary Higher Kevel Plan Order establishes scenic areas and boundaries of as outlined by Map 9.1

3.11.2 Visual Quality **Objectives set by government**

The Objectives set by Government for visual quality are as follows (Section 9.2 *of Forest Planning and Practices Regulation*); however this section of the FPPR does not apply, as district scenic areas were established via KBHLPO on October 26, 2002.

9.2 (1) In this section:

"scenic area" means an area of land established as a scenic area under the *Forest Practices Code of British Columbia Act* on or before October 24, 2002 and continued as a scenic area under section 180 (c) of the Act;

"visual sensitivity class" means a visual sensitivity class established on or before October 24, 2002, particulars of which are publicly available in the Land and Resource Data Warehouse maintained by the minister responsible for the *Land Act*.

(2) The objective set by government in relation to visual quality for a scenic area, that

(a) was established on or before October 24, 2002, and

(b) for which there is no visual quality objective is to ensure that the altered forest landscape for the scenic area

(c) in visual sensitivity class 1 is in either the preservation or retention category,

(d) in visual sensitivity class 2 is in either the retention or partial retention category,

(e) in visual sensitivity class 3 is in either the partial retention or modification category,

(f) in visual sensitivity class 4 is in either the partial retention or modification category, and

(g) in visual sensitivity class 5 is in either the modification or maximum modification category.

VQO's and associated provisions were established for the RMFD by way of the district manager letter under the FPC and have been grandparented into FRPA via Forest and Range Practices Act section 180 and 181, Forest Practices Code Operational and Site Planning Regulation Section 36.1 and 37.

3.11.3 Results and Strategies that relate to Visual Quality Objectives:

3.11.3.1 The scenic areas applicable to the FDU applicable to this FSP do not meet the criteria specified in FPPR 9.2(2) (a). Under this section of legislation no result or strategy is required.

3.11.3.2 The holder of this FSP, when conducting operation in the Ecosystem Restoration Program Rocky Mountain Trench FDU, adopts as a result or strategy, the visual quality objectives (VQO's) and provisions defined by the District Manager on March 14, 2003 for the Rocky Mountain Forest District. This follows the grandparented scenic areas described under FRPA section 180 and 181.

3.12 CULTURAL AND HERITAGE RESOURCES:

3.12.1 Cultural and Heritage Objectives set by Higher Level Plan:

There are currently no objectives set for Cultural and Heritage Resources under the Kootenay Boundary Higher Level Plan Order.

3.12.2 Cultural and Heritage Objectives set by government

The Objectives set by Government for Cultural and Heritage Resources are as follows (Section 10 *of Forest Planning and Practices Regulation*)

10 The objective set by government for cultural heritage resources is to conserve, or, if necessary, protect cultural heritage resources that are
(a) the focus of a traditional use by an aboriginal people that is of continuing importance to that people, and
(b) not regulated under the *Heritage Conservation Act*.

3.12.3 Results and Strategies that relate to Cultural and Heritage Resources Objectives:

3.12.3.1 Prior to carrying out forest operations, the Ecosystem Restoration Program will make reasonable efforts through consultation and notification to First Nations to ascertain if ecosystem restoration operations will impact the cultural and heritage resources of First Nations. First Nations shall be notified of the presence of cultural keystone species including blue camas, bitter root, Soopallalie, and Saskatoon berry on areas proposed for operations. Such communication shall happen at least once every calendar year. If an impact is likely, the Ecosystem Restoration Program shall work with the First Nation to mitigate the impact.

3.13 FIRE MAINTAINED ECOSYSTEMS

3.13.1 Fire Maintained Ecosystems Objectives set by Higher Level Plan:
Objective 8 of the Kootenay Boundary Land Use Plan sets objectives for ecosystem restoration activities to rehabilitate fire maintained ecosystems.

3.13.2 **Fire Maintained Ecosystems Objectives set by government**
There are no other Objectives set by Government for fire maintained ecosystems.

3.13.3 Results and Strategies that relate to Fire Maintained Ecosystems Objectives:
3.13.3.1 This objective is not in effect as no map is available, therefore no result or strategy is required.

4. Results or Strategies for FRPA Section 5(1) (b) Objectives.

4.1 RECREATION:

4.1.1 Interpretive Forest Sites, Recreation Sites or Recreation Trails Objectives set by government

The Objectives set by Government for Interpretive Forest Sites, Recreation Sites or Recreation Trails were historically established under the Forest Practices Code and are grandparented as per FRPA section 181 with newer sites and trails locations and objectives being established as per FRPA Section 56.

4.1.1.1 Results and Strategies that relate to Recreation Objectives:

The holder of this FSP, when conducting operations in the Ecosystem Restoration Program Rocky Mountain Trench FDU, shall manage in a manner that is consistent with any forest and vegetation management objectives for the interpretive forest sites, recreation sites or recreation trails as outlined in Table 4.1. Where the removal of understory trees is required within the boundaries of the recreation sites and trails, the relevant Recreation Officer of the Recreation Sites and Trails Branch of the Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations shall be consulted and a resolution acceptable to both sides arrived at and implemented.

Table 4.1 List of Interpretive Forest Sites, Recreation Sites and Recreational Trails and Associated Objectives applicable to the Ecosystem Restoration Program FDU

Project No.	Project Name	Type	Established (yr/m/d)	Range Unit	Size (ha)	Length (km.)	Objectives
6259	Kootenay White Junction	Site	99/05/21	Watson	7		2001/02/22 The objective is to manage Kootenay/White Junction recreation site for a roaded recreation experience. The campsite will be maintained and any random sites on the floodplain will be removed. Opportunities for camping, picnicking, whitewater pursuits and viewing will be available at the site.
2177	Johnson Lake	Site	80/12/11	Sheep Creek North	49		2001/02/22 The objective is to manage the Johnson Lake recreation site for a lakeside, roaded recreation experience. The campsite will be maintained; the lake shoreline and natural vegetation will be conserved. Opportunities for camping, picnicking, nature study and swimming will be available at the site.
5228	Engstrom's Pond	Site	99/05/21	Findlay Basin	8		2001/05/01 The objective is to manage Engstrom's Pond recreation site for a roaded recreation experience. The campsite will be maintained; the lake shoreline and natural vegetation will be conserved. Opportunities for camping, picnicking and angling will be available at the site. The site access road will be unmaintained and suitable for high clearance and 4x4 vehicles.
6327	Findlay Falls	Site	99/05/21	Findlay Basin	14.8		2001/05/01 The objective is to manage Findlay Falls recreation site for a day use, non-roaded recreation experience. The natural vegetation along the canyon and trail will be conserved. Day use facilities will be limited to a vehicle parking site and foot trail available for non-mechanized use only. No overnight camping.
5124	Castle Rock Trail	Trail	94/03/17	Westside		5.2	2001/05/01 The objective is to manage the Castle Rock recreation trail for a forested and subalpine semi primitive non motorized recreation experience. The trail will be maintained and adjacent vegetation conserved. Opportunities for hiking and equestrian uses are available, no mechanized uses permitted.
5227	Findlay Creek	Site	99/05/21	Findlay Basin	15		2001/05/01 The objective is to manage the Findlay Creek recreation site for a creekside, roaded recreation experience. The campsite will be maintained; the creek shoreline and natural vegetation will be conserved. Opportunities for camping, picnicking, swimming and viewing will be available at the site.
5516	Lake Enid Forest Swamp Trail	Trail	94/03/13	Toby Horsethief	-	3.8	2001/05/01 The objective is to manage the Lake Enid Forest Swamp recreation trail for a forested and subalpine semi primitive non motorized recreation experience. The trail will be maintained and adjacent vegetation conserved. Opportunities for hiking and interpretation on local ecosystems are available through a self guided interpretative trail. No mechanized uses permitted.
2008	Lake Enid	Site	80/12/11	Toby Horsethief	10		2001/05/01 The objective is to manage the Lake Enid recreation site for a lakeside, roaded recreation experience. The campsite will be maintained; the lake shoreline and natural vegetation will be conserved. Opportunities for hiking, picnicking, car top boat launching swimming and nature study will be available at the site.
2175	Larchwood Lake	Site	94/03/17	Torrent	99		2001/05/01 The objective is to manage the Larchwood Lake recreation site for a lakeside, roaded recreation experience. The campsite will be maintained; the lake shoreline and natural vegetation will be conserved. Opportunities for camping, picnicking, car top boat launching and swimming will be available at the site.
2001	Lillian Lake	Site	94/03/17	Toby Horsethief	2		2001/05/01 The objective is to manage the Lillian Lake recreation site for a lakeside, day use, and roaded recreation experience. Day use facilities will be maintained; the lake shoreline and natural vegetation will be conserved. Opportunities for picnicking, beach activities and swimming will be available at the site. No overnight camping. Electric motors only.

5517	Living Forest Rec. Tr.	Trail	94/03/17	Toby Horsethief	-	2.2	2001/05/01 The objective is to manage the Living Forest recreation trail for a forested and subalpine, semi primitive non motorized recreation experience. The trail will be maintained and adjacent vegetation conserved. Opportunities for hiking and nature interpretation are available. No motorized uses permitted.
6160	Mt. Stevens Trail	Trail	95/02/09	Lewis-Wolf	-	9	2001/05/01 The objective is to manage the Mount Stevens recreation trail for a forested and subalpine semi primitive non motorized recreation experience. The trail will be maintained and adjacent vegetation conserved. Opportunities for hiking and equestrian uses are available, no mechanized uses permitted.
2002	Swansea Mountain	Site	95/02/09	Windermere Fairmont	0.2	0.5	2001/05/01 The objective is to manage the Swansea Mountain recreation site and trail for a subalpine, semi primitive non mechanized recreation experience. The look out and trail will be maintained; the alpine vegetation will be conserved. Opportunities for viewing and picnicking will be available at the site. Access is by non mechanized trail.
2169	Tamarack Lake	Site	94/03/17	Torrent	59		2001/05/01 The objective is to manage the Tamarack Lake recreation site for a lakeside, roaded recreation experience. The campsite will be maintained; the lake shoreline and natural vegetation will be conserved. Opportunities for camping, picnicking, car top boat launching and swimming will be available at the site.
2182	Whitetail Lake	Site	84/07/12	Findlay Basin	73		2001/05/01 The objective is to manage Whitetail Lake recreation site for a roaded recreation experience in a high use setting. The campsite will be maintained and rehabilitated in future. The shoreline and natural vegetation will be served. Opportunities for camping, picnicking, boating and swimming will be available. Waterskiing will not be permitted.
2003	Windermere Wells	Site	99/05/21	Windermere-Fairmont	24		2001/05/01 The objective is to manage Windermere Wells's recreation site as a walk in, day use site with minimal facilities. Trail head parking is available as opportunities for picnicking and diving. The adjacent vegetation at the trail and site will be conserved. Motorized use or access, and overnight camping, are not permitted.
5162	Lost Creek (Englishman)	Map	98/07/31	Gold Plumbob	42		2001/11/02 The objective is to manage the Englishman Creek recreation site for a lakeshore, roaded recreation experience. Maintain a campsite; conserve lake shoreline and natural vegetation. Provide opportunities for camping, picnicking, boat launching and beach activities.
2206	7 Mile Lake	Site	97/05/01	Gold Plumbob			98/02/20 The objective is to manage the 7 Mile Lake recreation site for a lakeshore, roaded recreation experience. Maintain a campsite; conserve the lake shoreline and natural vegetation. Provide opportunities for camping, day use, picnicking, boat launching and beach activities.
5188	Big Spring	Site	97/05/01	Grasmere	10		98/02/20 The objective is to manage the Big Springs recreation site for a lakeshore, roaded recreation experience. Maintain a campsite; conserve lake shoreline and natural vegetation. Provide opportunities for camping, picnicking, boat launching and beach activities.
6476	Cranbrook Community For Inter	Site	00/09/29	alkali lakes	2187		98/02/20 The objective is to manage the Cranbrook Community Forest interpretive forest for interpretive opportunities within a range of recreation experiences from semi-primitive non-motorized, roaded to rural varying with the proximity to the city. Maintain roads, trails and day use facilities; conserve forested, grassland, riparian and meadow areas. Provide opportunities for nature study, viewing, hiking, mountain biking, picnicking, horse riding and snowshoeing. Provide forest education and interpretation opportunities on local ecosystems and forest practices through brochures, self-guided interpretive trails and signs. Provide motor vehicle access on designated roads with low risk of environmental damage. Accommodate public use during day time without campfires. Prepare a management plan to guide operations and activities within the forest.
5110	Dewdney Trail	Trail	97/05/01	Wildhorse Lewis	40	2	98/02/20 The objective is to manage the Dewdney recreation trail for a forested, semi-primitive non-motorized recreation experience consistent with the Dewdney Trail Plan. Maintain as a heritage trail; conserve the adjacent vegetation. Provide opportunities for hiking, viewing, mountain biking and equestrian use.

5192	Dorr Road	Site	01/06/06	Grasmere	256		98/02/20 The objective is to manage the Dorr Road recreation site for a lakeshore, roaded recreation experience. Maintain a campsite; conserve lake shoreline and natural vegetation. Provide opportunities for camping, picnicking, boat launching and beach activities.
2204	Edwards Lake	Site	80/12/11	Grasmere	26		98/02/20 The objective is to manage the Edwards Lake recreation site for a lakeshore, rural recreation experience. Maintain a campsite; conserve the lake shoreline and natural vegetation. Provide opportunities for camping, day use, picnicking, boat launching and beach activities.
5191	Gold Creek Bay	Site	97/05/01	Newgate	28		98/02/20 The objective is to manage the Gold Bay recreation site for a lakeshore, roaded recreation experience. Maintain a campsite; conserve lake shoreline and natural vegetation. Provide opportunities for camping, picnicking, boat launching and beach activities.
5079	Hahas Lake	Site	97/05/01	Cherry Tata	245		98/02/20 The objective is to manage the Hahas Lake recreation site for a lakeshore, roaded recreation experience. Conserve the lake shoreline and natural vegetation. Provide opportunities for camping, picnicking, boat launching and beach activities.
5630	Hart Lake	Site	97/05/01	Waldo	36	-	98/02/20 The objective is to manage the Hart Lake recreation trail for a forested, rural recreation experience. Maintain the trail; conserve the adjacent vegetation. Provide opportunities for hiking, viewing and mountain biking.
2092	Horseshoe Lake	Site	86-03-13	Peckham's Lake	110		98/02/20 The objective is to manage the Horseshoe Lake recreation site for a lakeshore, rural recreation experience. Maintain a campsite; conserve the lake shoreline and natural vegetation. Provide opportunities for camping, day use, picnicking, boat launching and beach activities. Provide access within the site on designated roads.
2215	Kikkomun Creek	Site	97/05/01	Waldo	1		98/02/20 The objective is to manage the Kikkomun Creek recreation site for a creek side, roaded recreation experience. Maintain a campsite; conserve the creek shoreline and natural vegetation. Provide opportunities for camping, day use and picnicking.
2366	Lakit Lookout & Trail	Trail	97/05/01	Wildhorse Lewis		3	98/02/20 The objective is to manage the Lakit Lookout recreation trail and site for a subalpine, semi- primitive non-motorized recreation experience. Maintain the shelter and trail; conserve the adjacent vegetation. Provide opportunities for hiking, viewing and picnicking.
5157	Lazy Lake	Site	97/05/01	Lewis-Wolf	27		98/02/20 The objective is to manage the Lazy Lake recreation site for a lakeshore/benchland, rural recreation experience. Maintain separate campsite and day use areas; conserve the lake shoreline and natural vegetation. Provide opportunities for camping, picnicking, boat launching and beach activities at the campsite. Accommodate public use of the day use area during day time without campfires. Provide access within the site on designated roads.
2205	Loon Lake	Site	86/03/13	Grasmere	38		98/02/20 The objective is to manage the Loon Lake recreation site for a lakeside, rural recreation experience. Maintain a campsite; conserve the lake shoreline and natural vegetation. Provide opportunities for camping, day use, picnicking, boat launching and beach activities. Provide access within the site on designated roads.
2360	Mause Cr./Tanglefoot Trail	Trail	97/05/01	Peckham's Lake	7	7	98/02/20 The objective is to manage the Mause Cr. /Tanglefoot recreation trail for a forested/subalpine, semi-primitive non-motorized recreation experience. Maintain the trail; conserve the adjacent vegetation. Provide opportunities for hiking, equestrian use, day use and primitive camping.
5905	Mause/Sunken Cr. Trail	Trail	97/05/01	Peckham's Lake	9	4.5	98/02/20 The objective is to manage the Mause/Sunken Cr. recreation trail for a forested/subalpine, semi-primitive non-motorized recreation experience. Maintain the trail; conserve the adjacent vegetation. Provide opportunities for hiking, viewing, equestrian use and primitive camping.
2218	Caven Cr. / Mazur Meadows	Site	97/05/01	Gold Plumbob	55		98/02/20 The objective is to manage the Mazur Meadows recreation site for a creekside, roaded recreation experience. Maintain a campsite; conserve the creek shoreline and natural vegetation. Provide opportunities for camping, day use and picnicking.

2355	Mt Fisher Trail	Trail	97/05/01	Peckham's Lake		3	98/02/20..The objective is to manage the Mt. Fisher recreation trail for a subalpine/alpine, semi- primitive non-motorized recreation experience. Maintain the trail; conserve the adjacent vegetation and features. Provide opportunities for hiking and day use.
5283	Mt Stephens Trail	Trail	97/05/01	Lewis-Wolf	4.5	4.5	98/02/20..The objective is to manage the Mt. Stephens recreation trail for a forested/subalpine, semi-primitive non-motorized recreation experience. Maintain the trail; conserve the adjacent vegetation. Provide opportunities for hiking and viewing.
5904	Nichol Pass Trail	Trail	97/05/01	Lewis-Wolf	8	4	98/02/20..The objective is to manage the Nicol Pass recreation trail for a forested, semi-primitive non-motorized recreation experience. Maintain the trail; conserve the adjacent vegetation. Provide opportunities for hiking, viewing and mountain biking.
2209	North Star Lake	Site	86/03/13	Waldo	26		98/02/20..The objective is to manage the North Star Lake recreation site for a lakeside, rural recreation experience. Maintain a campsite; conserve the lake shoreline and natural vegetation. Provide opportunities for camping, day use, picnicking, boat launching and beach activities. Provide vehicle access within the site on designated roads.
2221	Rock Creek	Site	97/05/01	Waldo	1		98/02/20..The objective is to manage the Rock Creek recreation site for a creekside, roaded recreation experience. Maintain a campsite; conserve the creek shoreline and natural vegetation. Provide opportunities for camping, day use and picnicking.
2213	Sand Lake	Site	97/05/01	Pickering Hills	2		98/02/20..The objective is to manage the Sand Lake recreation site for a forested, roaded recreation experience. Maintain a campsite; conserve the lake shoreline and natural vegetation. Provide opportunities for camping, picnicking and day use.
2357	South Star Trail	Trail	97/05/01	Peavine	1436	27	98/02/20..The objective is to manage the South Star recreation trails for a forested, semi-primitive non-motorized recreation experience. Maintain the trails; conserve the adjacent vegetation. Provide opportunities for cross country skiing, hiking, mountain biking and equestrian uses. Provide non-motorized recreation access on designated trails except for trail maintenance, grooming or track setting activities.
2207	Suzanne Lake	Site	97/05/01	Waldo	3		98/02/20..The objective is to manage the Suzanne Lake recreation site for a lakeshore, rural recreation experience. Maintain a campsite; conserve the lake shoreline and natural vegetation. Provide opportunities for camping, day use, picnicking, boat launching and beach activities. Provide access within the site on designated roads.
5173	Tie Lake	Site	97/05/01	Pickering Hills	8		98/02/20..The objective is to manage the Tie Lake recreation site for a lakeshore, rural recreation experience. Maintain separate campsite and day use areas; conserve the lake shoreline and natural vegetation. Provide opportunities for camping, picnicking and beach activities. Provide access within the site on designated roads. Accommodate public use of the day use area during day time.
2210	Wapiti Lake	Site	86/03/13	Colvalli North	62		98/02/20..The objective is to manage the Wapiti Lake recreation site for a forested/lakeside, roaded recreation experience. Maintain a campsite; conserve the lake shoreline and natural vegetation. Provide opportunities for camping, day use, picnicking, boat launching and beach activities. Provide access within the site on designated roads.

4.2 Lakeshore Management Zone (FRPA Section 180 and 181, Forest Practices Code Operational and Site Planning Regulation Section 64(1)
No grandparented lakeshore management zones are within the FDU that is associated with this plan, therefore no result or strategy is required under this section of the act.

4.3 Emergency Bark Beetle Management Areas (FRPA Section 181, Forest Practices Code Bark Beetle Regulation Section 2)
No objectives are established for Emergency Bark Beetle Management Areas within the FDU that is associated with this plan, therefore no result or strategy is required.

4.4 Areas with Significant Watershed Sensitivity (FRPA Section 181)
No areas with significant watershed sensitivity are established within the FDU that is associated with this plan, therefore no result or strategy is required under this section of the act.

4.5 Forest Ecosystem Networks (FRPA Section 181)
No forest ecosystem networks are established within the FDU that is associated with this plan, therefore no result or strategy is required.

5. MEASURES REQUIRED UNDER FPPR

5.1 MEASURES TO PREVNT SPREAD OF INVASIVE PLANTS

5.1.1 Invasive Plant Measures required by legislation

The measures required for Invasive Plants are as follows (Section 17 of Forest Planning and Practices Regulation):

17 For the purpose of section 47 *[invasive plants]* of the Act, a person who prepares a forest stewardship plan must specify measures in the plan to prevent the introduction or spread of species of plants that are invasive plants under the Invasive Plants Regulation, if the introduction or spread is likely to be the result of the person's forest practices.

5.1.2 Measures that relate to Invasive Plants:

5.1.2.1 Prior to conducting field operations The Ecosystem Restoration Program shall review the Invasive Alien Plant Program Application and note invasive plants that are known to be in proposed treatment areas. In addition, Ecosystem Restoration prescription field work will identify and map invasive plants that are present on proposed treatment areas. The Ecosystem Restoration Program shall prescribe and implement treatment(s) to mitigate impacts of invasive plant infestations in the Ecosystem Restoration Prescription which may include one or all of the following:

- Grass seeding of exposed mineral soil
- Spraying of weed infestations
- Hand pulling of weeds

5.1.2.2 Bare soil exposed for fireguards, skid trails, and road construction, or by pile burning shall be reseeded as soon as practicable following disturbance and within two growing seasons at the latest. The seed mix appropriate for the site will meet or exceed Canada Common #1 Forage Mixture Specifications as defined by the Canada Seeds Act.

5.1.2.3 Prescribed burn areas will be assessed after the fire to see if grass seeding is required and appropriate treatment(s) will be taken to mitigate the risk of Invasive plant spread. This may include one or all of the following:

- Grass seeding of exposed mineral soil
- Spraying of weed infestations
- Hand pulling of weeds

5.2 MEASURES TO MITIGATE THE LOSS OF NATURAL RANGE BARRIERS

5.2 Natural Range Barriers Objectives set by government

The measures required to mitigate the loss of natural range barriers are as follows (Section 18 *of Forest Planning and Practices Regulation*)

18 For the purpose of section 48 *[natural range barriers]* of the Act, a person who prepares a forest stewardship plan must specify measures to mitigate the effect of removing or rendering ineffective natural range barriers.

5.2.1 Measures that relate to removing natural Range Barriers Objectives:

The Ecosystem Restoration program shall meet with, or refer projects to, range licensees prior to commencement of activities. The range licensees shall be asked to designate areas required to be kept as natural barriers. As a first option the Ecosystem Restoration program, shall designate thirty metre wide strips of fully stocked forest timber or ravines over 5 metres deep to be left untreated so as to maintain natural barriers between pastures. If retention is not an option, the Ecosystem Restoration program shall develop a mitigation plan with the range licensee and implement it so as to meet the range licensee's objective of stock dispersal.

6 STOCKING STANDARDS

6.1 Stocking Standards set by government

The requirements for stocking standards are as follows (Section 16 *of Forest Planning and Practices Regulation*)

16 (1) A person required to prepare a forest stewardship plan must ensure that the plan specifies the situations or circumstances that determine when section 44 (1) *[free growing stands generally]* or section 45 *[free growing stands collectively across cutblocks]* will apply to an area.

(2) In specifying a stocking standard under this section, a person who prepares a forest stewardship plan may consider the factors set out in section 6 *[factors relating to stocking standards]* of Schedule 1.

(3) A person required to prepare a forest stewardship plan must ensure that the plan specifies, for each of the situations or circumstances specified under subsection (1) where

(a) section 44 (1) (a) will apply, the regeneration date and stocking standards,

(b) section 44 (1) (b) will apply, the free growing height and stocking standards,

(c) section 45 (1) will apply, the regeneration date and the stocking standards, and

(d) section 45 (2) will apply, the free growing date and the stocking standards, as approved by the chief forester.

(4) A person required to prepare a forest stewardship plan must ensure that the plan specifies stocking standards for areas referred to in section 44 (4), and the situations or circumstances that determine when the stocking standards will be applied.

(5) A holder of a major licence that is a forestry licence to cut entered into under section 24.8 of the *Forest Act* or converted into a forestry licence to cut under section 24.9 of the *Forest Act* is exempt from this section.

6.2 Stocking Standards:

FPPR Section 44(1), free growing assessment on a block basis, applies in all situations or circumstances under this FSP.

When surveying to determine the stocking status of blocks the following guidelines will be followed:

- The current Silviculture Surveys Procedures Manual (April 1st 2011) (Weaver D 2011)
- Damage criteria from Appendix 5 of the Establishment to Free Growing Guidebook; Nelson Region (May 200) as amended by Rocky Mountain Forest District Standard Operating Procedure # 7 Free growing Acceptability Guidelines; November 30, 2005 and
- Rocky Mountain Forest District Standard Operating Procedure # 8 NDT4 Restoration Post Treatment Assessment; April 18th, 2008

Managed Forest units in Ecosystem Restoration blocks shall follow Rocky Mountain Forest District FSP Stocking Standards (August 3, 2010) for even aged management.

If the Ecosystem Restoration Program proposes any treatments within MSdk or ESSF Biogeoclimatic zones within the Ecosystem Restoration FDU a site plan specific variance with stocking standards will be applied for though the District Manager.

Table 3.17.1 Summary of Stocking Standards for Ecosystem Restoration Blocks

Stocking Regime ID	Stocking Type	Biogeoclimatic zone	Target Well spaced/ha	Minimum well spaced/ha	Maximum well spaced/ ha	Preferred species	Acceptable species
1001823	Open Forest	IDFdm2 01		76	400	Fdi, Lw, Py	Pli
1001824	Open Range	IDFdm2 02		0	75	Fdi, Lw, Py	
1001825	Open Range	IDFdm2 03		0	75	Fdi, Lw, Py	Pli
1001836	Open Range	PPdh2 01		0	75	Fdi, Py	Pli, Lw
1001837	Open Range	PPdh2 02a		0	75	Fdi, Py	
1001838	Open Range	PPdh2 02b		0	75	Fdi, Py	
1001839	Open Forest	PPdh2 03		76	400	Fdi, Sx, Py	PLI, Lw

Following conditions apply to all species and all stocking regimes:

- Minimum Inter Tree distance is 2 metres.
- No regen delay or early free growing period specified.
- Late free growing period 20 years from initiation of operations.
- Minimum Height is 0.5 metres all species.
- Relative height to competition is 125% all species
- Maximum countable coniferous stems per hectare on all stocking standards is 10,000 stems per hectare

Specific notes:
As per footnote U8, for the Open Forest Stocking Type, 20 to 50 stems per hectare of the largest third of the diameter range are to be retained and contribute to the well spaced stem counts.

As per footnote U9, for the Open Range Stocking Type, 5 to 20 stems per hectare of the largest third of the diameter range are to be retained and contribute to the well spaced stem counts.

Specific Footnotes that apply to Standard 1001823: #74; #U8; #U10; #U19; #U20; #U14; Fdi, Lw #32:-limited by growing-season frosts; Pli #10:-restricted to northerly aspects; Pli #13:-restricted to upper elevations of Biogeoclimatic unit; Rocky Mountain Forest District SOP #8 applies to the Open Range and Open Forest standards. **Additional information or requirements are contained in the text of the Rocky Mountain Forest District FSP Stocking Standards approved in the individual Licensee FSP and the FSP itself. The approved document in the Licensee FSP is the correct standard.

Specific Footnotes that apply to Standard 1001824: #74; #U9; #U10; #U14; #U20; Fdi #27:-partial canopy cover required for successful establishment; Lw #10:-restricted to northerly aspects; Lw #13:-restricted to upper elevations of Biogeoclimatic unit. Rocky Mountain Forest District SOP #8 applies to the Open Range and Open Forest standards. **Additional information or requirements are contained in the text of the Rocky Mountain Forest District FSP Stocking Standards approved in the individual Licensee FSP and the FSP itself. The approved document in the Licensee FSP is the correct standard.

Specific Footnotes that apply to Standard 1001825: #74; #U9; #U10; #U14; #U20; Fdi #27:-partial canopy cover required for successful establishment; Lw, Pli #10:-restricted to northerly aspects; Lw, Pli #13:-restricted to upper elevations of Biogeoclimatic unit; Rocky Mountain Forest District SOP #8 applies to the Open Range and Open Forest standards. **Additional information or requirements are contained in the text of the Rocky Mountain Forest District FSP Stocking Standards approved in the individual Licensee FSP and the FSP itself. The approved document in the Licensee FSP is the correct standard.

Specific Footnotes that apply to Standard 1001836: #74; #U9; #U10; #U14; #U20; Fdi #27:-partial canopy cover required for successful establishment; Fdi, Lw #32:-limited by growing-season frosts; Lw #10:-restricted to northerly aspects; Lw, Pli #23:-restricted to trial use. Rocky Mountain Forest District SOP #8 applies to the Open Range and Open Forest standards. **Additional information or requirements are contained in the text of the Rocky Mountain Forest District FSP Stocking Standards approved in the individual Licensee FSP and the FSP itself. The approved document in the Licensee FSP is the correct standard.

BEC Site series is PPdh2/02a; Specific Footnotes that apply to Standard 1001837: #74; #U9; #U10; #U14; #U20; Fdi #27:-partial canopy cover required for successful establishment; Fdi #32:-limited by growing-season frosts. Rocky Mountain Forest District SOP #8 applies to the Open Range and Open Forest standards. **Additional information or requirements are contained in the text of the Rocky Mountain Forest District FSP Stocking Standards approved in the individual Licensee FSP and the FSP itself. The approved document in the Licensee FSP is the correct standard

Site series is PPdh2/02b; Specific Footnotes that apply to Standard 1001838: #74; #U9; #U10; #U14; #U20; Fdi #27:-partial canopy cover required for successful establishment; Fdi #32:-limited by growing-season frosts. Rocky Mountain Forest District SOP #8 applies to the Open Range and Open Forest standards. **Additional information or requirements are contained in the text of the Rocky Mountain Forest District FSP Stocking Standards approved in the individual Licensee FSP and the FSP itself. The approved document in the Licensee FSP is the correct standard.

Specific Footnotes that apply to Standard 1001839: #74; #U8; #U10; #U14; #U20; Fdi #32:-limited by growing-season frosts; Py #1:-elevated microsites are preferred; Sx #28:-limited by moisture deficit; Pli #23:-restricted to max 20% of well spaced P&A; Rocky Mountain Forest District SOP #8 applies to the Open Range and Open Forest standards. **Additional information or requirements are contained in the text of the Rocky Mountain Forest District FSP Stocking Standards approved in the individual Licensee FSP and the FSP itself. The approved document in the Licensee FSP is the correct standard.

Appendix I Forest Development Unit Map

Appendix II Summary of Referral Comments Received
Actual copies of comments are on file 22000-20/ERP Forest Stewardship Plan 2012

Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of 2012-2017 Forest Stewardship Plan
Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan
October 2012

Document Number	Person	Organisation	Date	Pasture (Range Unit)	Comment	Result
PLANNING DOCUMENTS- Pre-Referral discussion of Five Year Plan File Back A						
A-1	Kori Venier, RPF, Silviculture Forester	Tembec Industries Elko	January 24th 2011	St Mary's, Cherry Tata, , Gold Plumbob, Sheep Creek North, Wildhorse, Waldo	Further Update on harvests on CP 292 (Fusee, cemetery), 542 Fusee-Duck, 808 (Dilts pasture), 430 Jeffrey Lakes-Rock; A81788 Canal pasture, A84742 China North; A84741 Indian Springs north South. Maps attached	Schedules and maps updated in FSP
A-2	Kori Venier, RPF, Silviculture Forester	Tembec Industries Elko	September 29th 2011	St Mary's, Cherry Tata, , Gold Plumbob, Perry Creek, Wildhorse, Waldo	Further Update on harvests on CP 542 (Fusee, Duck, Sheep Mtn), 554 Fusee-Duck, 808 (Dilts pasture), 474, Perry; A84742 China North; A84741 Indian Springs north South. Maps attached	Schedules and maps updated in FSP
A-3	Hillary Page, RP Bio	Nature Conservancy of Canada	September 27th 2011	Dutch Findlay, Watson	Cannot ,make ER Map meeting September 27th, will only burn piles on Kootenay River Ranch and Thunderhill Ranch in 2011-2012	Comments discussed at map meeting September 27th with partners.
A-4	Randy Byford, RPF	Galloway Timber Company Ltd	September 26th 2011	Waldo/ Rock	Cannot make ER Map meeting September 27th, proposing large block CP 143 near Rock Pasture Caithness area	Presented at Map meeting September 27th
A-5	Sue Crowley, Habitat Biologist	Ministry FLNRO-Habitat	September 9th 2011	All	Reminder of ER Operations meeting September 14th; agenda for ER Map meeting on September 27th set at this meeting.	Map Meeting held September 27th
A-6	Randy Harris, RPF, Team Leader ER	Ministry FLNRO-Rocky Mtn District	September 28th 2011	All	Minutes of map meeting held September 27th, most partners present, all projects proposed were discussed.	Plan adjusted to reflect updated plan. Annual Plan developed, both minutes and Annual Plan circulated to ER Operations Team
A-6A	Randy Harris, RPF, Team Leader ER	Ministry FLNRO-Rocky Mtn District	September 28th 2011	All	Copies of tables and draft Annual Plan handed out at ER map meeting held September 27th	Annual plan data reviewed and updated with input from partners.
A-7	Gerry Grady, RPF, Practices Forester	BCTS- Cranbrook	October 4th, 2012	Premier Ridge/ All	BCTS wants a full review of any harvest of NRFLs in this area prior to award.	Field trips held in July 212, NRFL did not proceed
A-8	Randy Harris, RPF, Team Leader ER	Ministry FLNRO-Rocky Mtn District	October 6th 2011	All	Copy of Annual Plan sent out for review after adjustment at Map meeting September 27th	Plan was agreed to as it stood
A-9	Sue Crowley, Habitat Biologist	Ministry FLNRO-Habitat	October 6th 2011	All	Copy of review email sent out; only response was to query if Mike Gall had represented Habitat issues in this plan	No changes requested, none made
A-10	Sue Crowley, Habitat Biologist	Ministry FLNRO-Habitat	October 27th 2011	All	A flurry of emails from October 10-17th referring to application by Habitat and BC Parks staff to Habitat Conservation Trust Fund for ER projects. New projects at East side Columbia Lake and Kindersley creek were not vetted or put into the plan. Five High wildlife value blocks were dropped.	New blocks at Kindersley and Eastside Columbia Lake put on hold until 2013 new annual plan. One of the high value projects picked up by Fish Wildlife Compensation Program. HCTF package approved.
A-20	Mike Black, RPF Stewardship Forester	Ministry FLNRO-Rocky Mtn District	May 3rd, 2011	All	Questions on progress on developing a rationale to explain the patch sized distribution of the NDT4 area in the ER FSP.	A rationale was developed
A-21	Randy Harris, RPF, Team Leader ER	Ministry FLNRO-Rocky Mtn District	October 16th 2011	All	Rough notes for developing a patch sized rationale	Rationale Developed

Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of 2012-2017 Forest Stewardship Plan
Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan
October 2012

Document Number	Person	Organisation	Date	Pasture (Range Unit)	Comment	Result
A-22	Dr. Lori Daniels	Tree ring Lab University of British Columbia	February 12, 2012	All	More papers from the Alberta foothills to consider in this rationale	Considered in drafting final rationale
A-23	Randy Harris, RPF, Team Leader ER	Ministry FLNRO-Rocky Mtn District	October 24th 2011	All	Draft of a rationale to explain why patch sized distribution for NDT4 must be upgraded to reflect recent research findings. Holes in the canopy are small under one hectare, fire frequency is much more rapid 10 to 20 years, historic stocking is more in line with Ungulate Winter Range and Er standards, skips are also small.	Rationale sent out for review by Dr. Lori Daniels, Bob Gray and Dr Kari Stuart Smith
A-24	Dr. Lori Daniels	Tree ring Lab University of British Columbia	October 27th 2011, November 4th	All	After two efforts Dr Daniels could not review the report, she referred it to her graduate student Greg Greene and forwarded his thesis.	Greg responded for Lori, thesis was considered in revamping rationale
A-25	Greg Greene	Tree ring Lab University of British Columbia	October 28th 2011	All	Greg Greene explained his methodology or estimating burn areas. Burn sixe was highly variable (pers. Comm.) from 2 to 1000 hectares but most burns were 100 to 200 hectares in size. Later verbal comments also incorporated into product.	The rationale was revamped with this information.
A-26	Bob Gray	Fire Ecologist RW Gray Consulting Ltd.	October 27th, 2011	All	Mr Gray concurs with the logic	No need for action.
A-27	Dr Kari Stuart Smith	Biologist Tembec Industries ltd	November 2nd, 2011	All	Editorial changes made to rationale, agrees patch size is smaller.	Editorial changes incorporated into final product.
A-30	Randy Harris, RPF, Team Leader ER	Ministry FLNRO-Rocky Mtn District	October 24th 2011	All	Draft of the Ecosystem Restoration Program Forest Stewardship Plan, posted on website and referred to Mike Black for peer review and Comment	Mike conducted three per reviews, no comments from general public or stakeholders on text of plan.
A-31	Mike Black, RPF Stewardship Forester	Ministry FLNRO-Rocky Mtn District	October 28th 2011	All	Several suggestions made to improve plan	Comments from third review incorporated into final product.
A-32	Mike Black, RPF Stewardship Forester	Ministry FLNRO-Rocky Mtn District	November 1st 2011	All	Several more suggestions made to improve plan	Comments from third review incorporated into final product.
A-32	Mike Black, RPF Stewardship Forester	Ministry FLNRO-Rocky Mtn District	November 8th 2011	All	As an experiment Mike Black rewrote the plan with minimal text so as to address the legal requirements	These comments became the base for redrafting the final FSP submission; much discussion reduced, several minor legalities included.
A-40	Randy Harris, RPF, Team Leader ER	Ministry FLNRO-Rocky Mtn District	June 30th 2011	All	Legal content map requirements cut from the current edition of the Forest and Range Practices Act. Copy forwarded to Laura Luxton for use in developing A Forest Development Unit map.	Laura used the text to develop new FDU maps
A-41	Laura Luxton, Geomatics Technician	Ministry FLNRO Geomatics section Cranbrook	July 10th 2011	All	Copy of fmer v3.3 (Fire maintained ecosystem restoration version 3) to be used in developing a new FDU map	Boundary used for FDU map, extra area added to east to cover off sheep projects between Premier Ridge and Powerplant Range Units.
A-42	Randy Harris, RPF, Team Leader ER	Ministry FLNRO-Rocky Mtn District	June 30th 2011	All	Notes from a meeting held July 6th 2011 to discuss storing data from fmer, Veepro storage, create RVI layer, turn project tracking sheet into estate model.	FMER is in BCGW, but needs upgrade to version 3.4, Veepro discussion became part of routine monitoring discussion with Science committee, new project tracking model is ongoing
A-43	Laura Luxton, Geomatics Technician	Ministry FLNRO Geomatics section Cranbrook	October 28, 2011	All	Laura used details from previous discussion to develop a legal FDU map and to create information maps showing where projects in annual plan were located	Randy requested small tweaks to projects
A-44	Laura Luxton,	Ministry FLNRO	October 28,	All	Laura made final adjustments to maps	Maps were posted along with all other ER plan documents to

Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of 2012-2017 Forest Stewardship Plan
Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan
October 2012

Document Number	Person	Organisation	Date	Pasture (Range Unit)	Comment	Result
	Geomatics Technician	Geomatics section Cranbrook	2011			website on November 2nd 2011
A-50	Randy Harris, RPF, Team Leader ER	Ministry FLNRO-Rocky Mtn District	July 8th 2011	All	Discussion with Ray Morello and Jamie Kroschel on format and content of Forest Stewardship Plan	No need for 20 year plan, referral and consultation process follow existing format but needs legal advertising period, links to Ungulate Winter Range, Range strategy and prioritising biofuel areas need not be made during FSP. Split Plan into FSP, Companion document and annual plan
A-51	Gary Dolynchuk, RPF, Timber Officer	Ministry FLNRO-Rocky Mtn District	August 1st, 2012	All	Declined opportunity to review FSP	No Action
A-52	Dean Draper RFT, Operations Supervisor	Ministry FLNRO-Rocky Mtn District	August 1st, 2012	All	Found typo in FSP	Typo corrected
A-53	Randy Harris, RPF, Team Leader ER	Ministry FLNRO-Rocky Mtn District	July 25th, 2012	All	Request for exemption to writing result or strategy for Objectives 4, 7 10 of Kootenay Boundary Land Use Plan.	Resubmitted August 3rd 2012.
A-53	Randy Harris, RPF, Team Leader ER	Ministry FLNRO-Rocky Mtn District	August 8th, 2012	All	Resubmitted request for exemption to writing result or strategy for Objectives 4, 7 10 of Kootenay Boundary Land Use Plan	Granted September 12th 2012.
A-54	Ray Morello, RPF, District Manger	Ministry FLNRO-Rocky Mtn District	September 12th	All	Request for exemption to writing result or strategy for Objectives 4, 7 10 and 2 e of Kootenay Boundary Land Use Plan.	Granted September 12th 2012 no further action needed.
File Back B Solicitation of Input						
B-1, B-2, B-3, B-4	All trappers in ER Area	Trapper Licensees	November 1st, 2011	All	Referral letter sent to all trappers in Ecosystem Restoration area. See list attached to B-1	No responses received; 2 letters Don Ratcliffe and Rory Snider returned as trapper moved with no forwarding address (B-2, B-3) No address at all for Doug and Kathy Snider (B-4)
B-5	Randy Harris	Ministry FLNRO-Rocky Mtn District	November 1st, 2011	All	Copy of all projects for 2012-2013 inserted into every letter and email sent out.	No comments
B-6	All guide Outfitters in ER Area	Guide Outfitters of Southern BC	November 1st, 2011	All	Referral letter sent to all Guide Outfitters in Ecosystem Restoration Area	No comments received
B-7, B-8, B-9, B-10	All Active CTP holders	Christmas Tree Permitees	November 1st, 2011	All	Referral letter sent to all Christmas Tree Permitees in Rocky Mountain district; some may look for cash sales	Three letters returned no forwarding address in any stakeholder file. Michael Coy, Marjorie Widmer, Bob Anderson (B8, B-9, B-10)
B-11, B-12, B-13	All Active Woodlot Licensees	Woodlot Licensees	November 1st, 2011	All	Referral letters sent to all Woodlot Licensees in Rocky Mountain Forest District, not all overlap ER area	No comments received. Two letters returned, no forwarding address on any stakeholder list. Joe Moreau (B-12) Lyn Campbell (B-13)
B-14, B-15, B-	Range Licensees	Range Licensees	November 1st,	All	Referral letter sent to all Range Licensees in Ecosystem Restoration Area. See list on file	No comments. Letter to Michael Rouse (B-15) not sent as he

Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of 2012-2017 Forest Stewardship Plan
Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan
October 2012

Document Number	Person	Organisation	Date	Pasture (Range Unit)	Comment	Result
16	in ER area		2011			had just retired, list not updated. Dr Kortlarz letter (B-16) returned no forwarding address on any stakeholder list.
B-17	Mayors of communities in ER Area	Canal Flats, Cranbrook, Invermere, Kimberley, Radium	November 1st, 2011	All	Referral letter sent to all mayors of all communities in ER Area	No comments received
B-18	Forest Licensees in ER Area	All Forest Licensees in district	November 3rd, 2011	All	Copy of referral email to all Forest Licensees in Rocky Mountain District, BCTS, Canfor, Tembec, Galloway Timber products, BCYTS, Nupqu Development Corporation, Kinbasket Development corporation and Tobacco Plains Indian Band	Much follow up discussion with BCTS and Canfor. Discussion or interface projects with Nuqu, Kinbasket, Tobacco Plains Band
B-19	All East Kootenay Regional District directors, fire chiefs and Health Authorities in District	Cranbrook, Radium, RDEK directors, all fire chiefs, Interior Health officers in Cranbrook ad Invermere	November 3rd, 2011	All	Copy of referral email sent to all RDEK directors, all fire chiefs, Interior Health officers in Cranbrook and Invermere. All citizens involved in fuel and smoke management. See list on file. Note several resends of email to ensure contact made. (Jim Miller, Al Collinson, Wendy Booth, Rob Gay, Stuart Moore, all recontacted)	No comments received
B-20	Utilities adjacent to ER operations and Conservation properties	Telus, TransCanada Pipeline, BC Hydro	November 3rd, 2011	All	Copy of referral email sent to Telus, TransCanada Pipeline, BC Hydro. Avoid damage to pipelines and power lines. ,	No comments received.
B-21	Agencies and Non Government Organisations	All agencies and Non Government Organisations active in ER Area	November 3rd, 2011	All	Copy of referral email sent to Recreation and Trails department MFLNRO, Parks Canada, The Nature Trust, The Land Conservancy, the Nature Conservancy of Canada, the Cranbrook Community Forest Society BC Parks	Parks Canada , Nature Conservancy of Canada and Cranbrook Community Forest Society had follow up conversations
B-22	Columbia Valley Residents	Columbia Valley Residents	November 3rd, 2011	Juniper Heights, CTP 101, Dry Gulch, Toby Benches	Copy of referral email sent to residents. See list of residents on file.	No comments received .
B-23	Sommerfeldt Road area Residents	Sommerfeldt Road Residents	November 3rd, 2011	St Mary's Prairie/ Indian Springs north South, Rowse	Copy of referral email sent to residents. See list on file note that almost half emails returned. Follow up letters not sent,	Several field trips during course of 2011-2012
B-24	Randy Harris, RPF Team Leader ER	Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Program	February 1st, 2012	All	Copy of advertising Insertion order sent to Invermere Valley Echo, Kootenay Advertiser, Fernie Free Press, Columbia Valley Pioneer	Valley Echo, Kootenay Advertiser, Columbia Valley Pioneer, Daily Bulletin ran the ad on February 8th, 6th and 10th respectively. One ad only per paper.
B-25	Kootenay News Advertiser	Kootenay News Advertiser	February 6th, 2012	All	Proof of advertisement run February 6th in the paper	No comments

Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of 2012-2017 Forest Stewardship Plan
Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan
October 2012

Document Number	Person	Organisation	Date	Pasture (Range Unit)	Comment	Result
B-26	Vizeum Canada Inc.	Black News paper Group	March 13th 2012	All	Invoice and proof that advertisement for plan placed in three papers as requested	No comments
B-30	Ken Walburger	MFLNRO, Range department Cranbrook	February 20th 2012	All	New project tables uploaded to website, cover all 5 years of plan not just 2	No comments received
B-31	Ken Walburger P.Ag Range Officer	MFLNRO, Range department Cranbrook	October 31st, 2011	All	Request (later confirmed) that on November 1st 2011 all plans and maps were on District website for stakeholder review	No action needed
B-32	Ken Walburger P.Ag Range Officer	Ministry FLNRO-Rocky Mtn District	August 1st, 2012	All	Updated FSP placed on District website	Data now available for First Nations review.
B-40	Randy Harris, RPF Team Leader ER	Ministry FLNRO-Rocky Mtn District	August 4th 2012	All	Request for Rick Fraser Aboriginal Liaison to initiate consultation with First Nations on ER FSP. Add District of Invermere blocks and Akisqnuk blocks, not really ER. Intake form and description of program included as well as noted on Canal Fats CWPP blocks reviewed July 2011 by K'tunaxa Land and Resources staff	Request initiated on August 11th 2012
RESPONSES TO 5 YEAR PLAN File Back C						
C-1	Ken Streloff	Tembec Industries Elko	April 11, 2011	Waldo/ Burnt Bottom	No commercial value in Burnt Bottom pasture; put it up for sale. Cemetery pasture possible only is an MPS competitive sale	Burnt Bottom was put up for sale
C-2	Grant Neville	Tembec Industries Cranbrook	July 22 2011	All	Invitation to discuss new Forest Stewardship Plan	No action taken, no details to comment on.
C-3	Grant Neville	Tembec Industries Cranbrook	May 7, 2012	All	Invitation to discuss new Forest Stewardship Plan proposals	Meeting held June 12, 2012
C-4	Dr. Kari Stuart Smith, RP Bio Forest scientist	Canfor Cranbrook	May 3rd 2012	Wildhorse Lewis/ Upper Brewery	Discussion on CP 458 Upper Brewery Creek, site appears to be Open Forest	Block to be logged 2015; good ER candidate
C-5	Grant Neville, RPF, Planning Supervisor	Canfor Cranbrook	June 12, 2012	Cherry Tata/ Cherry, TataSkook/ Echo	Meeting to discuss Canfor FSP. Exchange of information on various possible blocks and future NRFL Invermere is TatSkook-Echo and Reed pastures, Cranbrook is Cherry Tata-Cherry and South China	No action yet, blocks being checked out for feasibility
C-6	Randy Harris, RPF ER Team Leader	FLNRO, Rocky Mtn District	June 12, 2012	TataSkook/ Echo	Exchange of data, [potential NRFL block in Invermere TSA	No action yet, blocks being checked out for feasibility
C-7	Randy Harris, RPF ER Team Leader	FLNRO, Rocky Mtn District	March 22 2012	Perry/ Peavine	Forwarding request from Emergency Services RDEK. RDEK has completed a Community Wildfire Protection Plan and would like logging completed south of Cranbrook in Westview and Silver springs areas	Still in review Canfor staff taking file over from Tembec
C-8	Ian Johnson, RPF Planning Forester	Canfor Elko	July 4th 2012	Perry/ Peavine	Canfor is interested in interface wood but appears blocks are tied up in treaty	Canfor will pursue with Treaty table; proposed field trip in August 2012
C-9	Ian Johnson,	Canfor Elko	July 8th 2012	Waldo/ Elko	General enquiry if Canfor is planning to log this site proposed to burn in 2013	No harvest, prescribed burn to proceed

Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of 2012-2017 Forest Stewardship Plan
Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan
October 2012

Document Number	Person	Organisation	Date	Pasture (Range Unit)	Comment	Result
	RPF Planning Forester			Airport		
C-10	Ian Johnson, RPF Planning Forester	Canfor Elko	July 13th 2012	Waldo/ Sheep Mtn	Request that CP 542 be expanded for a better burn boundary	Must field review get back to ER Program
C-11	Dr. Kari Stuart Smith, RP Bio Forest scientist	Tembec Cranbrook	August 3rd, 2011	TataSkook/ Plot	Request for review of exemption to work in Long billed curlew WHA	Exemption approved
C-12	Dr. Kari Stuart Smith, RP Bio Forest scientist	Tembec Cranbrook	August 15th, 2011	TataSkook/ Plot, 42 pasture, Foster Pulpmill	Notes from a August 12th field tour of NRFL, overlap on long billed curlew WHA, layout of WTs, night hawk nests, painted turtle in lake, noxious weeds. Good rare species value here; very little chance of improved forage	Tembec amended prescriptions and harvest proceed summer 2012
C-13	Dr. Kari Stuart Smith, RP Bio Forest scientist	Tembec Cranbrook	August 23rd, 2011	TataSkook/ Plot	Request for exemption to build road in Long billed curlew WHA	Exemption approved
C-14	Dr. Kari Stuart Smith, RP Bio Forest scientist	Tembec Cranbrook	August 23rd, 2011	TataSkook/ Foster	Confirmation that earlier treatments of curlew habitat increased their numbers	No action needed
C-15	Dr. Kari Stuart Smith, RP Bio Forest scientist	Canfor Cranbrook	July 25th, 2012	TataSkook/ Foster, 42 pasture	Results of field tour with range licensee and local. Citizens want access to restricted sites may endanger night hawks. Access to be reduced as much as possible	Local people impressed with clean logging
C-16	Ian Johnson, RPF Planning Forester	Canfor Elko	August 1st 2012	Waldo/ Sheep Mtn	Request that CP 542 be expanded for a better burn boundary	Canfor hopes to log in spring 2013
C-17	Leanne Colombo, Range Technician	FLNRO, Rocky Mtn District	August 1st 2012	Waldo/ Sheep Mtn	Request to Canfor to realign new fenceline on sheep Mtn with new block configuration	Canfor will direct contractor to new location. Leanne to over see.
C-20	Paul Rasilainen, RFT, Operations Technician	BCTS, Cranbrook Team	November 4th 2011	All	Request for a review of all projects in BCTS operating area	Review held January 25th 2012
C-21	Randy Harris, RPF ER Team Leader	FLNRO, Rocky Mtn District	January 25th 2012	All	Mostly information exchange as per October map meeting. BCTS is looking for low need to build roads, >80m3/ha, more Py, close to US border. Some interest in harvest in Rampart Mayook and premier Ridge. Lots more fuel mgt in Community Forest-Cranbrook Fort Steele Eager Hills area.	Field trips to Premier and Cranbrook Fort Steele set up for summer
C-22	Randy Harris, RPF ER Team Leader	FLNRO, Rocky Mtn District	February 27th 2012	Premier Ridge/ Quartz, Alkali North	Forwarded prescriptions for possible blocks in this area	BCTS did follow up recce and field trip with ER program,
C-23	Gerry Grady, RPF, Practices Forester	BCTS, Cranbrook Team	February 22nd, 2012	Grasmere/ Loon lake	Response to complaint from Mr Letcher of Loon Lake, why are blocks proposed beside his cabin. Not BCTS blocks but blocks proposed by Tobacco Plains Indian Band under FNESS interface projects.	Follow up with Nupqu; BCTS wants to log blocks 1, 2 and 3. Nupqu interested in thinning blocks 2 and 4 under FNESS
C-24	Randy Harris, RPF ER Team Leader	FLNRO, Rocky Mtn District	March 14th 2012	Premier Ridge/ Quartz, Alkali North, south,	A joint review of all blocks in Premier Ridge area. BCTS sees logging potential on slopes east of Premier park, small block in quartz (possible cost sharing to develop marginal block). Area beside rod gun club beach in park not feasible. Blocks in Wolf and Alkali	BCTS continued to recce Alkali for potential blocks.

Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of 2012-2017 Forest Stewardship Plan
Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan
October 2012

Document Number	Person	Organisation	Date	Pasture (Range Unit)	Comment	Result
					North South pastures may be feasible in 20-40 years, grass okay now.	
C-25	R RPF, Practices Forester oger Powell	BCTS, Cranbrook Team	June 12th 2012	Premier Ridge/ Quartz, Alkali North, south,	After many recces BCTS could not find blocks in Alkali; small volumes irregular shapes lots of OGMAS. After some thought BCTS is willing to let ER program put up Quartz as a Forestry License to cut; marginal value as TSL. BCTS will pursue blocks adjacent to park	ER program is currently laying out Forestry License to cut in Quartz pasture.
C-29	Randy Byford, RPF	Galloway Lumber Company Ltd	March 21st, 2012	Waldo/ Rock Creek, Pickering Hills/ tie Lake	Forwarded a request from Regional District East Kootenay Community Wildfire Protection plan; Could Galloway do harvesting near Tie Lake and Galloway	Galloway is interested but wants shape files from RDEK. So far no resolution.
C-30	Sue Crowley, Habitat Biologist	MNRO, Habitat Section Invermere	February 17-20, 2012	Windermere-Sinclair/ Dry Gulch	Concern raised that cutting was occurring in Columbia Wetlands Wildlife Management Area with Habitat Section approval. Clearance did not show WMA, apology. Habitat wants more review of blocks in WMA	Referred to Range Strategy meeting. If blocks are in WMA, prescriptions have always been referred to Habitat, early in process.
C-31	Scott Witbeck RPF	Nupqu Development Corporation for Tobacco Plains Band	April 6th, 2012	Grasmere/ Loon Lake, Adolph's	Paper advertisement requesting public input on Fuel management blocks near Edwards and Loon Lake	No action required.
C-32	Scott Witbeck RPF	Nupqu Development Corporation for Tobacco Plains Band	April 6th, 2012	Grasmere/ Loon Lake, Adolph's	Notification and request for feedback on 5 prescriptions near Edwards and Loon Lake	Review split between Gary Dolynchuk and ER Program. Area has been in the ER plan for four years.
C-33	Jamie Kroschel RPF Operations Manager	MFLNRO Cranbrook	July 6th, 2012	Grasmere/ Loon Lake, Adolph's; Cranbrook Fort Steele/ Eager Hills; Toby Benches, Juniper Heights	Response to warning that a large workload of Fuel management plots are coming	Request that FLNRO staff do a minimum amount of checking but some checking of operations is required
C-34	Gary Dolynchuk RPF Tenures Officer	MFLNRO Cranbrook	July 6th, 2012	Grasmere/ Loon Lake, Adolph's;	Request to consult with Tenures group before approval of Section 52 authority letter	ER Program will consult before making final decision.
C-35	Scott Witbeck RPF	Nupqu Development Corporation for Tobacco Plains Band	July 16th, 2012	Grasmere/ Loon Lake, Adolph's	Response to R Harris prescription review on blocks 2 and 4; 1, 2 and 5 to be logged by BCTS. Some minor clean up needed but need written confirmation that Christmas tree permitees approve of massive loss of CTS on CTP 10 and 34	Nupqu has no directions from Tobacco Plains Band on how to proceed; issues not clarified and Section 52 cannot be approved
C-39	Greg DuBois, Consulting RPF	Summit Valley Contracting for District of Invermere	March 8, 2011	Toby Horsethief/ All	Copy of email and maps sent to all bands in K'tunaxa Nation and Shuswap Band. Proponent initiated contact for feedbackFirst application from contractor on working on Toby Benches, major decision is that we can proceed with notification on 3 small blocks, two large blocks are in CTPs already alienated land. Meeting field trip set up for March 17th	To be considered during review for approval of Section 52 authourity Meeting held March 17th, issues ruled out, clearance completed
C-40	Greg DuBois, Consulting RPF	Summit Valley Contracting for	March 18, 2011	Toby Horsethief/ All	Comments on March 17th field trip and meeting with Randy Harris, Gary Dolynchuk, Sue Crowley *MNRO) and Greg DuBois (Rory Hromadnik sick). District of Invermere wants	Work in CTPs is fine; in active managed areas do not cut down improved trees but remove slash. In rest of block

Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of 2012-2017 Forest Stewardship Plan
Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan
October 2012

Document Number	Person	Organisation	Date	Pasture (Range Unit)	Comment	Result
		District of Invermere			to carry out thinning on Toby Benches for interface purposes part of CWPP, two blocks are in CTPs (10 and 14), rest (3) in small crown land units. Funding is pending	follow Open Forest Open Range guidelines. Habitat section prefers clumpy distribution, work in WMA is permissable. Gary Dolynchuk to work with Greg DuBois and CTP holder.
C-41	Greg DuBois, Consulting RPF	Summit Valley Contracting for District of Invermere	March 18, 2011	Toby Horsethief/ All	Results of Clearance on 5 projects on Toby Benches, Block 15 is in Columbia Wetlands Wildlife Management Areas. Block 14, 13, 15 on private land. Block 15 has First Nation reserves.	Blocks are free to proceed. Block 15 to be referred to Habitat section Sue Crowley for comment on WMA proposal
C-42	Greg DuBois, Consulting RPF	Summit Valley Contracting for District of Invermere	September 16, 2011	Toby Horsethief/ All	Response to June 6th field trip where East side Columbia Lake was discussed. Fuel management program will not fund creation of Christmas tree. Wording suggestion made to deal with overlap of areas and thinning techniques by contractor	CTP issues must resolved
C- 43	Rory Hromadnik, RPF Planner	District of Invermere	September 22, 2011	Toby Horsethief/ All	Concern that CTP holders will not budge over thinning of stands. A suggestion that blocks 12, 13, 15 be split off from application and approval be given to them instead	So far no approval down or finalisation of First Nation consultation.
C-44	Greg DuBois, Consulting RPF	Summit Valley Contracting for District of Invermere	January 25th 2012	Toby Horsethief/ All	Response to request from R Harris to treat blocks 12, 13 and 15 with Wildfire Management crews. Prescriptions forwarded to Wildfire Management Branch.	Wildfire Management Branch declined the blocks; Shuswap Band wanted right to treat these three blocks. Block 8 inside down substituted for WMB crews
C-45	Rory Hromadnik, RPF Planner	District of Invermere	May 24th 2012	Toby Horsethief/ All	Request to cut trees in block 8 inside Invermere city limits after consultation with Wildfire Management Branch	Request granted and authority to cut issued under small scale salvage permission granted for First Nation consultation under SEA
C-50	Kathleen Opal, President	Cranbrook Community Forest Society	June 15th 2011	Alkali/ All	Setting up a work bee to cut down layer 3 and 4 trees within 20 metres of the access road near Sylvan Lake. Brush saws borrowed from WMB, chipper from Cranbrook City.	Two kilometres finished on June 16th. Chipping finished Tuesday June 18th. 40 volunteers
C-51	Rob Price, Planner	City of Cranbrook	August 17th, 2011	Alkali/ All	City gave some lot numbers but not names and addresses of persons adjacent to TU 4, a mastication project in CCF	Names located and owners contacted. City is in favour of treatment
C-52	Kathleen Opal, President	Cranbrook Community Forest Society	September 6th 2011	Alkali/ All	Setting up a work bee to cut down layer 3 and 4 trees within 20 metres of the access road near Sylvan Lake. Brush saws borrowed from WMB, chipper from Cranbrook City.	One kilometres finished on September 24th 2011. Chipping finished Tuesday June 18th . 2012 volunteers
C-53	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	October 23, 2011	Alkali/ All	Set up media event for all members of CCF society, local media o see mastication trial in TU 4.	Event held Wednesday October 26th. Favourable response.
C-54	Brian Watson, RPF, Director Lands and Natural Resources	St Mary's Indian Band	October 18th 2011	Cranbrook Fort Steele/ Lake, MM20	Request for letter of support from Er Program and Rocky Mountain District and Cranbrook Community Forest to apply for funding to carry out fuel treatments in north end of Community Forest.	All three organisations gave support letters for First Nations Emergency Services Society funding.
C-55	Kathleen Opal, President	Cranbrook Community Forest Society	February 1st, 2012	Alkali/ All	Email sent in by CCF members complaining of a lot of unauthorised cutting in the Community Forest. Some done by Initial attack crews as dangerous snag falling for ER projects, many authorised.	Issue was referred to Compliance and Enforcement team, more patrols carried out and poaching of firewood found through the CCF, especially north of highway 3. Includes poached elk; conservation officers involved

Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of 2012-2017 Forest Stewardship Plan
Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan
October 2012

Document Number	Person	Organisation	Date	Pasture (Range Unit)	Comment	Result
C-56	Chris Bullock, resident	Adjacent to Cranbrook Community Forest	March 8th 2012	Alkali/ All	Chris was curious as to why all the ribbon was up in the forest. I explained that area was to be thinned for ER and fuel management purposes.	Response emailed to CCF Society board
C-57	Chris Bullock, resident	Adjacent to Cranbrook Community Forest	March 8th 2012	Alkali/ All	Chris was curious as to why all the ribbon was up in the forest. I explained that area was to be thinned for ER and fuel management purposes.	Response showed support for projects
C-58	Kathleen Opal, President	Cranbrook Community Forest Society	March 28, 2012	Alkali/ All; Cranbrook Fort Steele/ Lake	ER program addressed annual General meeting of CCF Society. Mastication trial described, need to update management plan for CCF described. Outlined new spacing projects near College of the Rockies and Lake pasture	Members happy to hear work was progressing. Support for program
C-59	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	March 30th 2012	Alkali/ All; Cranbrook Fort Steele/ Lake	Notes from a scoping exercise run by Randy Harris, Denis Petryshen, Gerry Grady to update Management Plan for Community forest; make it reflect FRPA legislation and other legislated changes. Main issue is that classification of land into Managed Forest or Open Forest is outdated, prescriptions will not be in compliance. Update or delete most maps, add new players/ stakeholders, access management plan needs update.	District intended to take lead.
C-60	Jamie Kroschel, RPF Ops Manager	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	April 4th, 2012	Alkali/ All; Cranbrook Fort Steele/ Lake	Operations Manager questioned use of staff time for this project when district is short staffed. Plan to update management plan shelved. Subsequent meeting on July 18th with Lisa Cox, Mike Black, Jamie Kroschel R Harris it was decided to overcome the forest classification issue with an RPF rationale	R Harris developed a rationale to continue fuel management and ER work in CCF reviewed accepted by J Kroschel. Copy on opening files and on file 126500-20/ Alkali
C-61	Darrell Smith, PAg Director	East Kootenay Invasive Plants Council	April 11th 2012	Alkali/ All	Request to dovetail treatment of invasive plants with fuel treatments in CCF	EKCIP will treat large pocket of knapweed adjacent to TU 4 mastication trial.
C-62	Kathleen Opal, President	Cranbrook Community Forest Society	June 4th 2012	Alkali/ All	Setting up a work bee to cut down layer 3 and 4 trees within 20 metres of the access road near Sylvan Lake. Brush saws borrowed from WMB, chipper from Cranbrook City.	No new kilometres finished on June 9th. Work was Chipping trees left from September 2011. Heavy rain poor turnout. 20 volunteers
C-63	Kathleen Opal, President	Cranbrook Community Forest Society	June 4th 2012	Cranbrook Fort Steele/ Lake, MM20	Comments on notes from R Harris CCF society wants to be sure roads are deactivated on site. Support on this trip for BCTS to log block A around trailer park; reduce fire hazard but cut off access to rest of CCF. Support all for thinning and mastication on blocks L, J, B and D	BCTS to address issues on Block A. ER and St Mary's Band to work on improving prescriptions for treatment.
C-64	Brian Watson, RPF, Director Lands and Natural Resources	St Mary's Indian Band	October 18th 2011	Cranbrook Fort Steele/ Lake, MM20	Response to suggestions for changes to 12 Fuel management prescriptions in Lake and MM20 pastures. Need note from Band council to work block J; currently in treaty negotiations.	St Mary's Band to send addenda sheet to update prescriptions and a written confirmation that Band and council approve of this treatment. Then ER will arrange for Section 52 clearance.
C-65	Stephanie Marvel, Ops Assistant	Wildfire Management Branch, Cranbrook Zone	July 18th 2012	Alkali/ All	Request to review a fuel management sign prior to it being erected at TU 3 In CCF	ER to review by end of August 2012
C-66	Kathleen Opal, President	Cranbrook Community	July 24th 2012	Alkali/ All	Request for help cutting trees blown down on trails in CCF. Request in July 22	By July 24th Gary Casperson at Cranbrook Fire Zone had all fallen trees on trails bucked and cleared. Forest Health will

Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of 2012-2017 Forest Stewardship Plan
Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan
October 2012

Document Number	Person	Organisation	Date	Pasture (Range Unit)	Comment	Result
		Forest Society				hang funnel traps in area of fir blow down.
C-70	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	January 23, 2012	Alkali/ All, Cranbrook Fort Steele/Tule, Wildhorse-Lewis/ Campbel meyer; St Mary's Prairie/ McGinty,Luke	Notes on a discussion with Dennis Heigh Travis Opal Cranbrook Fire Zone and R Harris, Lyn Konowalyk Rocky Mtn District. WMB would like to action the Regional District East Kootenay Community Wildfire Protection plan. Emphasis is on Westview, Silver springs, Hidden valley all south of Cranbrook. Er Program willing to contribute projects in interface around district.	Field trips and projects subsequently set up.
C-71	Travis Opal, Fuel Tech	Wildfire Management Branch, Cranbrook Zone	February 10th, 2012	Alkali/ All, Cranbrook Fort Steele/Tule, Wildhorse-Lewis/ Campbelmeyer; St Mary's Prairie/ McGinty, Luke	Notes on field trip over all priority areas. Travis Opal, Peter Hisch Cranbrook Fire Zone, Lyn Konowalyk, Dennis Petryshen R Harris Rocky Mtn. Hidden Valley rejected, too may disease issues. West view and Silversprings trees too large; R Harris to approach Canfor to see if logging is possible. Community Forest and Luke-McGinty pasture are good crew projects. Falling practice possible on Fort Steele fire and Overpass burn areas.	Harris forwards prescriptions and maps for all projects to Travis work gets scheduled. Travis to contact College of the Rockies separately to work area held by college of the Rockies in CCF. Canfor willing to log Silver springs et al; Treaty issues.
C-72	Travis Opal, Fuel Tech	Wildfire Management Branch, Cranbrook Zone	February 27th, 2012	Wildhorse-Lewis/ Campbelmeyer;	Clarification requested on retention of WTPs and coarse woody debris.	ER Program ill masticate ant trees left behind from snag falling or fire wood cutting in Fort Steele Fire
C-73	Travis Opal, Fuel Tech	Wildfire Management Branch, Cranbrook Zone	February 10th, 2012	Cranbrook Fort Steele/Tule,	Clarification sought on retaining tres on overpass burn	Go to 159 stems/ha but limit by size of trees that crew can fell.
C-74	Travis Opal, Fuel Tech	Wildfire Management Branch, Cranbrook Zone	February 10th, 2012	Alkali/ All,	Clarification sought on retaining coarse woody debris in blow down in Community Forest	Chip stems to milt of equipment, Forest Health to hang funnel traps on site.
C-75	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	July 11th 2012	All	Review of prescribed burns for 2013; Artesian, Old Kimberley Airport, Elko Airport, Cutts Road, Twin Lakes North Waldo all look like good burns. Final boundaries fixed for Lakit and Brewery Ridge. Beacon west pasture is very poor, either relog or build lots of guard. First Nations may want their area burnt with Indian Springs block.	Note forwarded to Sue Crowley and Larry Ingham to start their planning for subsequent projects. Canfor contacted they will even out boundary on Sheep mtn. St Mary's Band will look at a joint burn on west boundary. New cat guard on Artesian to be built. New layout on Brewery Ridge.
C-80	Sue Crowley, Habitat Biologist	MNRO, Habitat Section Invermere	July 22nd, 2011	Columbia Lake East; Kindersley	Request for information on prescribed burning, activity in East Columbia and wants to give data to update Kindersley	N prescribed burns 2012, no activity in East Columbia, need more data on Kindersley, did not get it. Until after FSP developed
C-81	Sue Crowley, Habitat Biologist	MNRO, Habitat Section Invermere	October 23rd, 2011	Kindersley	Rough outline of map for Kindersley Luxor project. Thin out trail to habitat feature.	Boundary of FDU for FS extended to cover off this area in lieu of real map but project not included in 2012 FSP, data arrived late.
C-82	Sue Crowley, Habitat Biologist	MNRO, Habitat Section Invermere	February 21st, 2012	Kindersley	Request for prescription contract outline to speed hiring of RPF to complete prescription for Kindersley	Entire Layout contract forwarded.
C-83	Mark Hall, RPF	Consultant for	June 19th, 2012	Kindersley	Response to review of prescription by R Harris.	Prescription amendments address all issues raised in June

Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of 2012-2017 Forest Stewardship Plan
Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan
October 2012

Document Number	Person	Organisation	Date	Pasture (Range Unit)	Comment	Result
		MNRO, Habitat Section Invermere				19th review. Ready for review First Nations, 9.7 hectare block no removal large trees.
C-84	Donna Thornton	MNRO, Habitat Section Nelson	March 12th, 2012	Grasmere/ Galton Range	Caution sent to Donna to respect Range strategy process before proceeding with projects in Galton; sensitive area.	Assurances received that she would.
C-85	Hillary Page, R.P. Bio, Stewardship Co-ordinator	Nature Conservancy of Canada, Invermere	May 3rd, 2012	Dutch Findlay/ All	Script, map and list of attendees of one day field tour (May7th) held as part of Wings over the Rockies Festival. Joint tour NCC and ER program highlight Lewis' Woodpecker and co-operation NCC, TNT, Thunderhill Ranch ER program	No Action 20 attendees
C-86	Hillary Page, R.P. Bio, Stewardship Co-ordinator	Nature Conservancy of Canada, Invermere	July 25th, 2012	All	Notes, directions for Fuel management course held July 26th at college of the Rockies. NCC, Bob Gray Consulting, Fire Management branch and ER program presented.	No further action; education. Several landowners and fire chiefs understand responsibilities and options better.
C-90	Rejean Poulin, Resident	Elko	October 25th 2011	Waldo/ Rabbit Mtn	Investigation of a smoke complaint received by Chris Oman of Forest Practices Board. Investigation by Dean Drapoer. Weather was good, indicators are smoke vented properly but other fires in area not so clean. Resident informed.	No further inquiry or action taken.
C-91	Tim Cooper, RFT, Principle	Purcell Resources Inc., Cranbrook	December 13th, 2011	All	Request that pile burning not occur on squirrel caches.	ER will consider the request in future pile burns.
C-92	Rick Humble, resident	Torrent Road system	October 21st, 2011	Torrent/ North	Call from resident requesting a direct stand tending contract in area. Forest for Tomorrow would not fund. ER program not willing to put a project up not high enough priority.	Citizen went to Minister's office October 18th. Request for investigation came back through Lorraine Schmidt's office.
C-93	Rick Humble, resident	Torrent Road system	October 18th, 2011	Torrent/ North	Follow-up phone calls and voice mails. Still no opportunity for a small contract in area, field confirmed by chopper. Mr Humble now looking for First Nation's funding.	No request for ministerial response letter. Investigation left here.
C-94	Rick Humble, resident	Torrent Road system	January 26th 2012	Torrent/ North	Mr Humble requested old photos of area, wants to build rationale for funding of project.	R Harris printed out photos handed them to r Humble January 26th and reiterated previous points. No more action.
C-95	Dale Weshe, resident	Torrent Road system	February 3, 2012	Torrent/ North	Call fielded by Leanne Colombo Range staff. Me Weshe wanted ER project in Torrent area, independent of Mr Humble. Similar rationale given to Mr Weshe	No Action no further calls made.
C-96	Dave Sherk, resident	Radium/ Dry Gulch	February 9th, 2012	Windermere-Sinclair/ Dry Gulch	Complaint from Mr Sherk, doesn't agree with cutting large Juniper (told fie risk and visibility for sheep) Why not chip trees why use smoke? No ability to sell trees, we tried	No Action no further calls made.
C-97	Linda Hatt, resident	Juniper Heights	February 24th	Windermere-Sinclair/ Juniper Heights	Compliment on well the burns are going very good air quality.	No Action no further calls made.
C-98	Susan Bond, Communication	Rocky Mtn Trench Society	March 16th, 2012	Grasmere, Newgate/ All	The new Official Community Plan for Southland recommends support for Ecosystem Restoration, reduction of Off Road Vehicle Use and a zoned ORV play area.	Several directors of Trench Society attended meetings and supported the ideas. Expect request for zoning to come in new year, deal with it then
C-99	Mike Doggart, P Ag	Interior Seed and Fertiliser, Cranbrook	March 20th 2012	All	Invoice for purchase of seed blend #3, 39 bags; $4060 LBI funds	Two years supply of seed lots grass seeding needed.
C-100	Cheryl Bolph, resident	Castlerock estates	April 20th, 2012	Westside	Complaint of dying trees in yard, several possibilities. Compliance staff found the time to investigate, mechanical damage to trees during home construction.	No Action no further calls made
C-101	Tammy Brown,	Brown property	July 5th 2012	Waldo/ Cutts	Needed access to her property behind ER project; go to MOE for permit in Access Mgt	Contact Brown family prior to prescribed burn operations.

Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of 2012-2017 Forest Stewardship Plan
Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan
October 2012

Document Number	Person	Organisation	Date	Pasture (Range Unit)	Comment	Result
	landowner	Elk River		Road	Area. Trees are just being moved, roads to be regarded and grass seeded her access improved. She confirms that ER program can use her road as haul road and fire guard	
C-102	Darlene Larson, Rancher	Jaffray-Frenchman's pasture		Waldo/ Colvalli pasture	Trees blew over and damaged a page wire fence around her private property. Harvest had occurred in North Waldo to her downwind; rancher blames ER and wants help in clean up.	Response is that ER program cannot be held responsible for blow down, fence repair by law is rancher' responsibility.
C-110	John Todd, resident	Kragmont BC	March 27th 2011	Waldo/ Burnt Bottom	Request for an update on ER projects carried out on Burnt Bottom winter 2010-2011	Updated on 20 hectares of thinning. More contacts followed.
C-111	John Todd, resident	Kragmont BC	June 16th 2011	Waldo/ Burnt Bottom	Email train back to August 2010 and an introduction and expression of interest in harvest in Burnt Bottom. Angry response to a request for shape files of his trails.	Shape files eventually produced
C-112	John Todd, resident	Kragmont BC	June 22, 2011	Waldo/ Burnt Bottom	Resident requested a field trip, one set up for June 21st to review debris left on the trail after winter 2010-2011 harvests. John went fishing.	Shape files and maps produced, maps forwarded to loggers.
C-113	John Todd, resident	Kragmont BC	July 8th 2011	Waldo/ Burnt Bottom	Record of discussion, government does not have crews to clean trails. As good neighbour policy Er program will ribbon trails and tell logger to keep trails clear during operations. Government expects him to do some clean uo.	Shape files and maps produced, maps forwarded to loggers.
C-114	John Todd, resident	Kragmont BC	July 15th 2011	Waldo/ Burnt Bottom	Query about GPS gear of loggers. Note he has found more debris on trails.	Shape files and maps produced, maps forwarded to loggers.
C-115	John Todd, resident	Kragmont BC	August 11th 2011	Waldo/ Burnt Bottom	Shape File Delivered, request it be forwarded to Tembec. Map attached	Shape files and maps produced, maps forwarded to loggers and Tembec.
C-116	Brian Conroy and John Todd, resident	Kragmont BC	October 6th, 2011	Waldo/ Burnt Bottom	Notes on setting up a meeting with all Kragmont residents on October 13th, Joghn cannot make the 13th.	Meeting Held
C-117	Heath Slee, RDEK Director	Area C	October 13th	Waldo/ Burnt Bottom	Map and notes forwarded for October 13th meeting. Heath cannot make the 13th	Meeting held, citizens updated.
C-118	John Todd, resident	Kragmont BC	October 13th 2011	Waldo/ Burnt Bottom	Map forwarded for October 13th meeting. John did not attend.	Meeting held, citizens updated.
C-119	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	October 14th 2011	Waldo/ Burnt Bottom	Notes from meeting held October 13th, John Todd, Heath Slee, Brian Conroy could not attend. Only Dave Boreen Fire chief R Harris and one Resident Dan Hushion attended. Discussion of proposed harvest, extra maps handed out. Brian wants old homestead protected and an end to dumping on road.	Old Homestead will be protected during operations, but we cannot stop dumping with current level enforcement.
C-120	John Todd, resident	Kragmont BC	October 18th 2011	Waldo/ Burnt Bottom	Map and notes forwarded for October 13th meeting John did not attend.	Meeting held, citizens updated.
C-121	John Todd, resident	Kragmont BC	October 19th 2011	Waldo/ Burnt Bottom	Discussion of notes on authorised trails, request that trails be cleaned up.	No commitment made to clean up trails
C-122	John Todd, resident	Kragmont BC	March 27th 2012	Waldo/ Burnt Bottom	Email and request for a field tour feels that there is more debris on site than warranted.	Date for field tour set up, April 30th.
C-123	John Todd, resident	Kragmont BC	April 19th, 2012	Waldo/ Burnt Bottom	April 30th field tour cancelled, reset for May 3rd. Phone call ensued. John insisted that government clean all trails, did not feel it was his responsibility to clean up this amount of debris	Meeting cancelled, R Harris one student walked trails May 3rd threw 27 branches off trail, 2 hours work. Did not appear excessive.
C-124	John Todd, resident	Kragmont BC	May 6th, 2012	Waldo/ Burnt Bottom	Thank you for cleaning off trail	Bo further contact or action.
C-125	Randy Harris	MFLNRO, Rocky	May 15th 2012	Waldo/ Burnt	Summary note of all contacts on this trail issue to date.	Maps given to loggers instructions to clear trail upon

Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of 2012-2017 Forest Stewardship Plan
Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan
October 2012

Document Number	Person	Organisation	Date	Pasture (Range Unit)	Comment	Result
	RPF Team Leader ER	Mtn Resource District		Bottom		completion of harvest in last treatment unit given at prework.
C-126	Dave Boreen, Fire Chief	Jaffray, Baynes Lake, Elko	June 27th 2012	Waldo/ All	Response to email note updating Dave Boreen, John Todd, Heath Slee on large amount of harvest completed and proposed plans in Waldo Range Unit. Dave expressed appreciation for reduction in fire hazard	No Action necessary
C-130	Roger Mitchell, Dentist resident	Clearview Road, Wycliffe	December 13th 2011	St Mary's Prairie/ Rouse, Indian Springs N,S	Message through Barry Comin at Front Counter c he had concerns on harvest near airport.	Returned call January 20th 2012, Mr Mitchell out of country
C-131	Roger Mitchell, Dentist resident	Clearview Road, Wycliffe	February 7th 2012	St Mary's Prairie/ Rouse, Indian Springs N,S	No faith in Ecosystem Restoration, it spreads invasive plants destroys grasslands. Had attended spring meeting 2011 but not fall. No faith in process will proceed to MLAs office	No further contact tom MLA office. No action
C-132	Roger Mitchell, Dentist resident	Clearview Road, Wycliffe	February 22nd 2012	St Mary's Prairie/ Rouse, Indian Springs N,S	Notes from conversation with Mr Mitchell forwarded to Ken Streloff at Tembec.	No action taken
C-133	Roger Mitchell, Dentist resident	Clearview Road, Wycliffe	June 15th 2012	St Mary's Prairie/ Rouse, Indian Springs N,S	Mr Mitchell contacted Ken Streloff, still thinks Er will not work. Would prefer more jill pokes and trees be slashed post harvest	ER program Will consider the request to cut trees during post harvest assessment. Likely most will be kept.
C-140	Bob Couperus, RFT, Forest Technician	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	May 5th 2009	St Mary's Prairie/ Rouse, Indian Springs N,S	Invitation to meet Bob to help with layout of blocks May 12 and 13th	10 people met with Bob, trails were noted, GPs'd shape file and map forwarded to Tembec prior to block layout.
C-141	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	September 15th 2009	St Mary's Prairie/ Rouse, Indian Springs N,S	Notes and list of residents from June 12th 2008 meeting, set up October meeting. Concerns of large trees, calypso orchid areas, hauling by homes, noise from airport, to many trees taken	ER will address concerns in prescriptions, notes sent to Tembec to deal with.
C-142	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	October 15th 2009	St Mary's Prairie/ Rouse, Indian Springs N,S	Notes from meeting with residents October 13. JOP crew with space close o homes powerline; no issue. Citizens concerned with harvest retain large trees, haul away from residents, protect trails, schedule operations mentioned, sign up sheet Tembec will contact citizens directly for input.	These notes not forwarded to citizens. Tembec did solicit more information. No meetings held in 2010; bad oversight.
C-143	Ken Streloff, Planning Superintendant	Tembec, Elko	June 10, 2011	St Mary's Prairie/ Rouse, Indian Springs N,S	R Harris had a complaint from local resident Jim Campbell, wanted to meet and discuss. Logging looks harsh, access concerns trail protection.	Tembec responded July 21, too many holidays field tour set up for fall.
C-144	Ken Streloff, Planning Superintendant	Tembec, Elko	October 11th, 2011	St Mary's Prairie/ Rouse, Indian Springs N,S	R Harris had a complaint from local resident Jim Campbell, wanted to meet and discuss. Logging looks harsh, access concerns trail protection.	Field tour set for October 14th, ER program took no notes.
C-145	Susan Bond Communication consultant	Trench Society	May 16, 2012	St Mary's Prairie/ Rouse, Indian Springs N,S	Notes from October 14th meeting, citizens split; criticism on aesthetics, loss of recreation site, soil compaction, weeds spread, increased access, impact on trails	Tembec set up second field tour in November 3rd to discuss last harvest in Rouse pasture
C-146	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	October 5th, 2011	St Mary's Prairie/ Rouse, Indian Springs N,S	Resend of shapefiles from 2010 of trail locations in pastures	No record of forwarding maps and shape files but his was done in 2009 after second meeting with residents.
C-147	Susan Bond Communication consultant	Trench Society	November 10, 2011	St Mary's Prairie/ Rouse, Indian Springs N,S	Electronic newsletter from ER program highlighting the discussions around Rouse pasture. Rare plant areas ribboned in field and impacts to trails discussed	Tembec responded July 21, too many holidays field tour set up for fall.

Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of 2012-2017 Forest Stewardship Plan
Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan
October 2012

Document Number	Person	Organisation	Date	Pasture (Range Unit)	Comment	Result
C-148	Jim Campbell, resident	Sommerfeldt Road, Wycliffe	Marc 14, 2012	St Mary's Prairie/ Rouse, Indian Springs N,S	Email string on a series on conversations between R Harris and Ken Streloff with Jim Campbell. Concerned roads would not be put to bed, invasives not treated, mature trees would be harvested; please stop harvest go some where else. Had attended two previous meetings but was in New Zealand for November meeting	Resident told harvest extension not feasible, and mature trees would be logged. No request for meeting made assumption was that answers had been acceptable.
C-149	Susan Bond Communication consultant	Trench Society	April 18, 2012	St Mary's Prairie/ Rouse, Indian Springs N,S	Email string from Wildsight member who requested an action be planned on this harvest and on China North harvest	Wildsight spoke to member about value of Ecosystem Restoration. No action resulted.
C-150	Jim Campbell, resident	Sommerfeldt Road, Wycliffe	April 24, 2011	St Mary's Prairie/ Rouse, Indian Springs N,S	R Harris had Third complaint from local resident Jim Campbell, fear about recreation and trail impacts, elk cover compromised, grass seeding and weed cover would not be done. Very insistent that one mature stand of yellow pine be left; previous commitment to residents.	Forwarded to Tembec, after discussion another field meeting was
C-151	Liz Monteith, resident	Sommerfeldt Road, Wycliffe	May 14, 2012	St Mary's Prairie/ Rouse, Indian Springs N,S	R Harris follows up on complaint from local resident Jim Campbell, Liz felt a lot of residents unhappy.	Tembec set meeting for May 16th 2012l.
C-152	Sally MacDonald, reporter	Cranbrook Daily Townsman	May 16th, 2012	St Mary's Prairie/ Rouse, Indian Springs N,S	Anni Coulter local resident called Townsman to report the resident's grievances and invite more residents to meeting that night. Tembec did not respond to questions. E version of paper. Notes from Susan Bond before meeting on the October field tour attached.	Meeting held on May 16th, grievances addressed.
C-153	Sally MacDonald, reporter	Cranbrook Daily Townsman	May 16th, 2012	St Mary's Prairie/ Rouse, Indian Springs N,S	Anni Coulter local resident called Townsman to report the resident's grievances and invite more residents to meeting that night. Tembec did not respond to questions. Paper version.	Meeting held on May 16th, grievances addressed.
C-154	Susan Bond Communication consultant	Trench Society	May 16th, 2012	St Mary's Prairie/ Rouse, Indian Springs N,S	Setting up a meeting with Daily Townsman staff to answer accusations in paper. Several suggestions from Susan on what to speak to.	Meeting with residents held May 16th, meeting editor on May 17th. Second article printed.
C-155	Dr. Kari Stuart Smith, RP Bio Forest scientist	Tembec Cranbrook	May 18th 2012	St Mary's Prairie/ Rouse, Indian Springs N,S	Field notes on how to meet the recommendations and discussions held on the 16th. Involves ribboning of largest trees, a few more WTPs	Canfor used recommendations and agreed to long skid the last landing to avoid building on top of trail.
C-156	Barry Coulter, editor	Cranbrook Daily Townsman	May 18th 2012	St Mary's Prairie/ Rouse, Indian Springs N,S	R Harris and Dan Murphy met with editor and explained values and logistics of harvest. Paper and web version.	No further comment in paper
C-157	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	May 17th 2012	St Mary's Prairie/ Rouse, Indian Springs N,S	R Harris and Dan Murphy met with Daily Townsman editor and explained values and logistics of harvest. Article not reviewed by ER Program, Tembec and Anni Coulter contacted for comment	No further response in Townsman.
C-158	Unknown resident	Sommerfeldt Road	May 17th 2012	St Mary's Prairie/ Rouse, Indian Springs N,S	Different spin placed n May 16th meeting and posted on Cranbrook guardian website. Similar topics as other articles	No response made in blogosphere, no follow up comments made by other residents on blog.
C-159	Ken Streloff, Planning Superintendant	Canfor, Elko	June 14th 2012	St Mary's Prairie/ Rouse, Indian Springs N,S	Minutes and handouts from May 16th meeting. Review of meetings from 2008-2009 as well as action taken at October 15 and November 3rd meeting. Trails and reserve trees addressed, one orchid site damaged. In this meeting Roads to minimal standards and will be put to bed and grass seeded. Citizens will be able to participate in layout and prework. Last landing will not be built.	Canfor to harvest in September 2012, prework with citizens to review retention.
C-160	Anni Coulter,	Sommerfeldt	June 15th 2012	St Mary's Prairie/	Thank you to Canfor for not extending road.	Canfor to handle further contacts

Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of 2012-2017 Forest Stewardship Plan
Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan
October 2012

Document Number	Person	Organisation	Date	Pasture (Range Unit)	Comment	Result
	resident	Road, Wycliffe		Rouse, Indian Springs N,S		
C-161	Jim Campbell, resident	Sommerfeldt Road, Wycliffe	June 27th 2012	St Mary's Prairie/ Rouse, Indian Springs N,S	Follow up note hope it works.	Canfor to handle further communication
File back D Priority matrix table.						
D-1	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	October 22nd 2010	All	Setting up Meeting to discuss New priority tables. Handouts include existing table and the rationales to describe how figures L and C worked as well as three new versions of table. Preliminary meeting decided several edits; Add all Range Units, redefine biodiversity, add columns for off Road vehicle use and CPR issues, split table between biological criteria and planning issues, replace forage crunch with range health and understory criteria.	Meeting held October 29th. Subcommittee struck under direction of Steering Committee in fall 2009.
D-2	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	October 29th 2010	All	Minutes of meting; Decisions, 1)do away with likelihood and consequence rating; 2) change non game to rare and endangered species based on occurrence in CDC; 3) Ungulate per cent area in class 1 4) Biodiversity now based on TEM GIS run, number of site series higher more diversity 5) Forage Crunch now determined by Range Health/ understory=Proper Functioning Condition 6)Planning difficulty, Regional Priority dropped as criteria 7) Economic is difficulty logging	R Harris to find GIS runs for 2, 3, 4
D-3	Will Burt, Geomatics Technician	MFLNRO, Nelson	January 21, 2011	All	Request for new areas on all Range Units and run GIS criteria for 2, 3, 4 above	Will accepted
D-4	Will Burt, Geomatics Technician	MFLNRO, Nelson	January 28, 2011	All	Query on PEM mapping	Run was reset, Cranbrook run using 2008 PEM mapping Invermere with 2004 PEM
D-5	Will Burt, Geomatics Technician	MFLNRO, Nelson	February 1, 2011	All	Area of each range Unit in class 1 and 2 suitability as winter range for elk and bighorn sheep calculated	Elk numbers good, bighorn were recalculated
D-6	Will Burt, Geomatics Technician	MFLNRO, Nelson	February 1, 2011	All	PEM mapping queried, Suggestion that we use Shannon Biodiversity index.	This run used to calculate Shannon Biodiversity index taken
D-7	Will Burt, Geomatics Technician	MFLNRO, Nelson	February 9, 2011	All	Map clean up of fmer	NO Action
D-9	Randy Harris RPF Team	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource	February 14th 2011	All	Agenda of meeting February 15th, handouts include new area calculation of fmer, updated priority table version #4 (changes from October), elk and bighorn sheep winter	Meeting held

Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of 2012-2017 Forest Stewardship Plan
Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan
October 2012

Document Number	Person	Organisation	Date	Pasture (Range Unit)	Comment	Result
	Leader ER	District			range areas, Number of BEC units per range Unit as per PEM, Proper Functioning Condition description, description of Shannon Index.	
D-10	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	February 15th 2011	All	1) Changes to table okay 2) Elk numbers for UWR okay, bighorn sheep not correct, no range area 3) The Numbers from PEM okay, Shawna Larade calculated Shannon Index from them 4) Proper Functioning condition, agreed to use this and area treated or in proper OR/OF as priority matrix to replace forage crunch 5) Need GIS run for rare endangered species 6) Planning criteria to be reviewed next meeting	Next meeting set and work starts on action points
D-11	Peter Homes RP Bio, Habitat Biologist	MFLNRO, Invermere	February 16th 2011	All	Peter directed Will Burt to new location of better bighorn sheep data; biophysical not UWR data. P drive in nelmart	This data gave better results but did not reflect true value of land base.
D-12	Will Burt, Geomatics Technician	MFLNRO, Nelson	February 1, 2011	All	Confirmation of which PEM layer to use.	Cranbrook run using 2008 PEM mapping Invermere with 2004 PEM
D-13	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	February 15th 2011	All	Regrouping of data and request to Will Burt for Bighorn sheep run and the rare endangered species GIS run	Runs took one year to complete, government reorganisation in 2011.
D-14	Ted Antifeau, RP Bio Rare Endangered Species Specialist	MFLNRO, Resource Mgt Nelson	April 21st 2011	All	Effort by R Harris to get information on masked species occurrences, should they count towards rare species count.	Effort not successful
D-15	Ted Antifeau, RP Bio Rare Endangered Species Specialist	MFLNRO, Resource Mgt Nelson	May 26th 2011	All	Effort by R Harris to get information on masked species occurrences, should they count towards rare species count.	Effort not successful, locations given masked occurrences withdrawn from analysis
D-16	Ted Antifeau, RP Bio Rare Endangered Species Specialist	MFLNRO, Resource Mgt Nelson	May 30th 2011	All	Effort by R Harris to get information on masked species occurrences, should they count towards rare species count.	Effort not successful, locations given masked occurrences withdrawn from analysis
D-17	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	May 30th 2011	All	Outline of a speech to given to Columbia Mountain Institute at Annual General Meeting May 30th.	Speech over ruled by mgt, never given, general update on Er given instead
D-18	Will Burt, Geomatics Technician	MFLNRO, Nelson	October 11, 2011	All	Second bighorn sheep run completed	Evaluated at meeting decided not good representation.
D-19	Will Burt, Geomatics Technician	MFLNRO, Nelson	October 11, 2011	All	Non sensitive run for Rare endangered species completed	Harris manipulated numbers accepted at meeting

Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of 2012-2017 Forest Stewardship Plan
Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan
October 2012

Document Number	Person	Organisation	Date	Pasture (Range Unit)	Comment	Result
D-20	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	October 15, 2011	All	Data tables sent out for bighorn sheep, rare endangered species, Shannon biodiversity, and updated priority table Version 5. Scores not added in yet, data not manipulated into scores.	Meeting set for February 2012
D-21	Will Burt, Geomatics Technician	MFLNRO, Nelson	August 11, 2011	All	Copy of 2011 estimate of FMER layer area by classification by pasture, this run used to calculate all other values over 2008 version.	NO Action
D-22	Sue Crowley, Habitat Biologist	MFLNRO, Resource Mgt, Invermere	October 18, 2011	All	Request for clarity on why all district was not evaluated, what was source of data, how Parks and Conservation Lands fit in, what about non Range Unit areas.	Agreement was only for fmer area, source data listed in previous meetings, Parks and conservation Lands fit into Range Units, 3 non Range unit areas set up as Restoration Units
D-23	Ken Walburger, PAg, Range Officer	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	February 14, 2012	All	Best estimate of Proper Functioning Condition by Range staff, in face of lack of hard data.	Data added to Priority Table 6.
D-24	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	February 21, 2012	All	Copy of all spreadsheets to date emailed out, this time data has been manipulated into possible scores. Version 6 of the Priority table built to speed discussion. 1) Rare endangered species for 3 non Range units done by hand, added local knowledge, old score and regional fudge factor 2) Elk done as % later 3 non Range Units calculated 3) Bighorn sheep calculated as class 1 and 2 as % of total area times 15 points 4) Shawna did Shannon score, simple score suggested 5) Estimate of PFC	Meeting held March 8, 2012
D-25	Will Burt, Geomatics Technician	MFLNRO, Nelson	March 8th, 2012	All	Calculations for Bighorn sheep and elk areas for East Columbia, Wigwam ad Windermere Sinclair added.	Used after meeting Mach 8th
D-26	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	March 15th 2012	All	Results: 1) Rare endangered, some non grass species (caribou) removed; drop species importance fudge factor. Add regional significance column, drop non grassland species. 2) Elk numbers accepted add wigwam, East Columbia, Windermere Sinclair numbers 3) Bighorn sheep numbers don't reflect importance of areas to sheep; class 1 and 2 using biophysical data still do not share small relative to R unit size. Get Larry and Irene Teske to add expert estimate. 4) Shannon biodiversity accepted score points from highest to lowest score. 5) PFC added but only as expert layer showing that area's relative importance to grazing by cattle and livestock and that area could benefit from ER, discounted for invasive plant occurrence. Revisit late with true data	Changes made to table
D-27	Larry Ingham, RP Bio Biologist	Fish Wildlife Compensation Program Columbia Basin	March 19th 2012	All	Estimate of relative importance of Restoration Units for importance to bighorn sheep	Used in Version 7 of Priority Table
D-28	Irene Teske, RP Bio, Wildlife	MFLNRO, Resource Mgt,	March 26th 2012	All	Estimate of relative importance of Restoration Units for importance to bighorn sheep	Used in Version 7 of Priority Table

Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of 2012-2017 Forest Stewardship Plan
Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan
October 2012

Document Number	Person	Organisation	Date	Pasture (Range Unit)	Comment	Result
	Biologist	Cranbrook				
D-29	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	March 31st 2012	All	Results presented in new table 7: 6) Rare endangered, some non grass species removed; dropped species importance fudge factor. Add regional significance column. 7) Expert rating of sheep habitat added; in case of difference of opinion, difference split	No further comments received, presented to ER Operations Committee April 4th 2012 and Steering Committee April 16th
D-30	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	April 4th 2012	All	Operations committee ratified Priority table version 7	Add to Companion document with full explanation of scores. Review Proper Functioning Condition with better data
D-31	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	April 16th 2012	All	Operations committee ratified Priority table version 7	Add to Companion document with full explanation of scores. Review Proper Functioning Condition with better data
File Back E First Nation Consultation						
C-170	Greg DuBois, Consulting RPF	Summit Valley Contracting for Village of Canal Flats	April 15th 2011	East side Columbia	Response from Consultant for map to show to First Nations	Maps sent to First Nations for consultation
C-171	Brent Lucas, RFT FN Liaison Officer	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	April 21st 2011	East side Columbia	Advice from Brent to consultant that area needs archaeological assessment	Assessments carried out
C-172	Brent Lucas, RFT FN Liaison Officer	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	April 21st 2011	East side Columbia	Advice from Brent to consultant that full consultation will be needed	Full consultation done
C-173	Greg DuBois, Consulting RPF	Summit Valley Contracting for Village of Canal Flats	April 25th 2011	East side Columbia	Commitment to carry out archaeological assessments	Assessments done in time for prescriptions
C-174	Greg DuBois, Consulting RPF	Summit Valley Contracting for Village of Canal Flats	April 25th 2011	East side Columbia	Request for advice from FN liaison after K'tunaxa Lands and Resources council requested more information	Information provided, consultation occurred.
C-175	Brent Lucas, RFT FN Liaison Officer	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	June 22nd 2011	East side Columbia	Discussion with Dora Gunn at K'tunaxa Lands and Resources council about level of consultation. Given past reviews and opportunities, Brent felt level 2 appropriate.	Resource Council let it sit at this point but the want full review in future.
C-176	Dora Gunn, MRM Manager Lands Stewardship	Land and Resources Agency, K'tunaxa Nation Council	July 5th 2011	East side Columbia	Response letter to Village of Canal Flats, approval but request that archaeologist visit site twice during operations	Request forwarded to proponent, they agreed to request.
C-177	Greg DuBois, Consulting RPF	Summit Valley Contracting for	July 11th, 2011	East side Columbia	Request for archaeologist visit forwarded to proponent, proponent agrees. 8 blocks covered but not block in provincial park	The crown land ER blocks free to proceed, Parks has separate process.

Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of 2012-2017 Forest Stewardship Plan
Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan
October 2012

Document Number	Person	Organisation	Date	Pasture (Range Unit)	Comment	Result
		Village of Canal Flats				
C-178	Greg DuBois, Consulting RPF	Summit Valley Contracting for Village of Canal Flats	September 16th, 2011	East side Columbia	Very confusing email string, but Fuel management funding cannot be used to produce Christmas trees (issue for block 3 and two blocks near Invermere). Greg proposes o thin area but not prune.	Issue still somewhat unresolved for Invermere, CTP near Canal Flats is now vacant, block 3 can proceed.
C-179	Greg DuBois, Consulting RPF	Summit Valley Contracting for Village of Canal Flats	October 16th, 2011	East side Columbia	Request to add block 4 to ER Five Year Plan	Cannot Blok 4 is in Thunderhill Provincial Park; BC Parks responsibility
C-180	Paul, Sam Chief	Shuswap Indian Band, Invermere	February 20, 2012	East side Columbia	Offer from Shuswap Band to carry out work in East Columbia.	No action, crews are hired by Canal Flats directly not ER program, courtesy letter to program
C-181	Sue Crowley, Habitat Biologist	MFLNRO, Resource Mgt	March 22nd, 2012	East side Columbia	Review by Habitat staff of five ER prescriptions for Village Canal Flats, inside Wildlife Management Area. Request for clarity on Wildlife Tree retention.	Retention clarified at prework; blocks approved for cutting under Section 52 FRPA
C-182	Dora Gunn, MRM Manager Lands Stewardship	Land and Resources Agency, K'tunaxa Nation Council	June 5th 2011	All	Request for fmer shape files to review plan.	Shape files made available To Lands agency.
E-1	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	August 3rd 2012	All	Request for Consultation to First Nation Relations Consultant	Rick Fraser sent engagement on August 8th 2012 letters with due date for comments of October 8th 2012
E-2	Dora Gunn, MRM Manager Lands Stewardship	Land and Resources Agency, K'tunaxa Nation Council	September 17th 2012	All	Request for more time and request for clarity as to why District of Invermere and Akisqnuk Fuel Management projects were included	Time extended to October 15th, Invermere and Akisqnuk are similar projects not part of ER Program. Rick Fraser sent explanatory note September 18.
E-3	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	September 19th 2012	All	Response to telephone conversation from Dora Gunn requesting summary of public information and notes from 2008 meeting with Ray Warden	Email sent. Response from Dora given on October 17th
E-4	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	September 19th 2012	All	Response to telephone conversation from Dora Gunn requesting digital version of FDU map	Email sent. Response from Dora given on October 17th
E-5	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	September 19th 2012	All	Notes of conversation with Dora Gunn on September 19th. Outlining concerns with District of Invermere and Akisqnuk blocks and request for more information, FDU map, public consultation summary and notes from 2008. Declined to send SPs for DOI and Akisqnuk	Email sent. Response from Dora given on October 17th
E-6	Rick Fraser, Advisor First Nations Relations	MFLNRO, Kootenay Boundary Region	October 15th 2012	All	Consultation Record and assessment of strength of claim, recommendation for approval	Signed off by District Manager October 17th, 2012
E-7	Dora Gunn, MRM Manager Lands	Land and Resources Agency, K'tunaxa	September 17th 2012	All	Response to referral, general concerns about AOA coverage, retaining Larch Py and following Ungulate Winter range orders, wildlife tree retention and riparian protection, rare elements reseeding bare soil, and clumpy retention.	R Harris did response October 22nd

Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of 2012-2017 Forest Stewardship Plan
Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan
October 2012

Document Number	Person	Organisation	Date	Pasture (Range Unit)	Comment	Result
	Stewardship	Nation Council				
E-8	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	October 22nd 2012	All	Response to referral letter can address all issues but the search for rare ecosystem elements but we follow due diligence	Email send October 22nd
E-9	Randy Harris RPF Team Leader ER	MFLNRO, Rocky Mtn Resource District	October 22nd 2012	All	Response to referral letter can address all issues but the search for rare ecosystem elements but we follow due diligence	Email send October 22nd

Appendix III Exemption approval letter from Rocky Mountain Resource District Manager for writing specific strategies contained in the Kootenay Boundary Land Use Plan

BRITISH COLUMBIA

File: 22000-20/ ER FSP 2012

September 12, 2012

BJ Randall Harris
Team Leader Ecosystem Restoration
Rocky Mountain Forest District
Area Forester
1902 Theatre Road
Cranbrook B.C. V1C 7G1

Dear BJ Randall Harris:

Reference is made to your request for exemption from specific results or strategies relating to the Kootenay-Boundary Higher Level Plan Order (KBHLPO). Pursuant to authority granted to me by the Minister of Forests Lands and Natural Resource Operations under the *Forest and Range Practices Act,* I have considered your request and determined that the Ecosystem Restoration Program is exempt from writing results or strategies for the following sections of the KBHLPO.

With respect to Objective 10 of the KBHLPO (Social and Economic Stability), this objective is beyond the scope of a FSP and there is no practicable way for the proponent to prepare a result or strategy for this objective. Therefore, in accordance with Section 12(7) of the *Forest Planning and Practises Regulation*, I hereby exempt the Ecosystem Restoration Program from the requirement of a result or strategy in respect of Objective 10 of the KBHLPO.

With respect to green-up requirements in Objective 4 of the KBHLPO, these requirements typically apply to even-aged management forestry rather than Ecosystem Restoration treatments. The KBHLPO anticipated this difference as Objective 8 of the KBHLPO provides relief from green-up requirements for open forest and open range areas within fire maintained ecosystems which corresponds to the Ecosystem Restoration Program's area of interest. However, as the fire maintained ecosystem map has not been added to the KBHLPO, Objective 8 is not legally in effect. I have no reason to believe that governments' original intent in this regard has changed, as the Ecosystem Restoration Program continues to be staffed and funded. Applying green-up requirements to open forest and open range areas would severely constrain the effectiveness of the Ecosystem Restoration Program and it would be impracticable for the program to specify a result or strategy for Objective 4 of the KBHLPO. Therefore, in accordance with Section 12(7) of the *Forest Planning and Practices*

Ministry of Forests Lands and Natural Resource Operations

Rocky Mountain District

Location:
1902 Theatre Road
Cranbrook, BC V1C 7G1

Mailing Address:
1902 Theatre Road
Cranbrook, BC V1C 7G1

Tel: (250) 426-1700
Fax: (250) 426-1777

Regulation, I hereby exempt the Ecosystem Restoration Program from the requirement for a result or strategy in respect of Objective 4 of the KBHLPO.

With respect to Objective 7 of the KBHLPO (Enhanced Resource Development Zone – Timber) this objective is not applicable to the Ecosystem Restoration Program. Objective 7 is intricately linked to Objective 4 and I have already determined that it is not practicable for the Ecosystem Restoration to write a result or strategy for green-up requirements in Objective 4 of the KBHLPO. Therefore, in accordance with Section 12(7) of the *Forest Planning and Practises Regulation*, I hereby exempt the ER program from the requirement for a result or strategy in respect of Objective 7 of the KBHLPO.

In addition, with respect to Objective 2, Footnote "e" of the KBHLPO, I note that this requirement specifies that as part of drawing down the old growth target by two thirds, in low biodiversity emphasis landscape units, a recruitment strategy is required that describes how to meet the full target. Given the long time frames involved, it is not practicable for the proponent to create a strategy that would be still valid in 2 to 3 rotations. Government plans to address this issue in the next amendment to the KBHLPO. Given these factors, I have determined that it is not practicable for the proponent to develop a strategy for Objective 2, Footnote "e" at this time. Therefore, in accordance with Section 12(7) of the *Forest Planning and Practises Regulation*, I hereby exempt the Ecosystem Restoration Program from the requirement for a result or strategy in respect of Objective 2, Footnote "e" of the KBHLPO.

If you have any questions on the above, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Yours truly,

Ray Morello, RPF
District Manager
Rocky Mountain District

Appendix IV Rationale for Patch size, stocking standards and cutting rights

Rationale for Section 26 (3) and (4) of FPPR; The stocking standards in Section 6 of this FSP should meet the conditions of FPPR s. 26 (3 and 4) in that these tree species are ecologically suited for these sites and that analysis and sensitivities conducted as part of Timber Supply 3 indicated that reducing stocking on these sites would have negligible impact on the Long Run sustainable yield. The Open Range and Open Forest sites are of very poor site index, tend to be overstocked easily and will tend to unhealthy overstocked stands if left untreated. These stocking standards also address interface wildfire concerns that wildfire management branch has raised with these stands. These standards have also been recommended by the district silviculture steering committee and have been approved by the District Manager. The Ecosystem Restoration Program will provide better information an alternate forest stand management regime, differing from the TSR 3 model, for Open Range and Open Forest stands when the analysis for TSR 4 is carried out.

Rationale for FRPA Section 5 (2): This FSP is "consistent with timber harvesting rights granted by the government" FRPA section 5(2) in that the blocks and potential projects proposed under this FSP are referred to Forest Licensees who hold Forest Licenses over portions of the ER FDU. The intent is that the Forest Licensee will harvest any commercial timber on site and the Ecosystem Restoration Program will clean up harvested areas or thin out the unmerchantable stands to Open Range and Open Forest conditions. Again for long term cutting rights the Ecosystem Restoration Program will provide better information an alternate forest stand management regime, differing from the TSR 3 model, for Open Range and Open Forest stands when the analysis for TSR 4 is carried out.

Rationale for FRPA Section 9: In order to meet Section 9 of the FPPR the Ecosystem Restoration program is following the direction of the KBLUP-IS fire maintained ecosystem guidelines and Ungulate Winter Range Orders 4-006 (Cranbrook) and 4-008 (Invermere). The stand conditions for open range and open forest are designed to mimic the naturally occurring forest. The rationale follows.

Table App IV.1 Recommended Patch size distribution for NDT4 forests from the Biodiversity Guidebook (FPC 1995a)

Patch size (ha)	% Forest area within landscape unit
<40	30–40
40–80	30–40
80–250	20–30

1) Recent publications indicate that the NDT4 distribution listed in the Biodiversity guidebook (FPC 1995a) as in table 3.7.1 above may be simplistic (Gray 2005) and that the Rocky Mountain Trench may be a complex of mixed and low intensity fire regimes (RW Gray et al 2008; Blackwell et al, 2003, Hessburg et al. 2005). Further, stand replacement patches may be much smaller than suggested by the biodiversity guidebook (Hessburg, et al 2007) and the replacement areas being on the order of 1 to 5 hectares in the Ponderosa Pine forests in the Black Hills of Dakota. Similarly canopy gaps showing very small areas of stand initiating events of well under 1 hectare in Ponderosa pine and mixed forest types in Oregon, California and Arizona studies (as reported in Gray et al 2003). Overall it is difficult to determine how large the actual fires were as there was very stand initiating burns to show up on forest cover mapping and linking separate fire ring data is speculative; fire scarred trees twenty metres apart may not both be marked by the same fire (Gray et al 2004). But recent studies do show that the natural occurring fires were large and in the order of hundreds of hectares in size (Daniels et al 2011, Greene, 2011) The Ecosystem Restoration Program will operate within logical burn units of 60 to 700 hectares; size will be determined by public safety and operational constraints. The small patch size of openings will be met by maintaining a forest canopy meeting open forest and open range stocking characteristics as defined by the Cranbrook and Invermere Ungulate Winter Range orders.

2) Low intensity fires have a fire return period under 30 years (Blackwell et al, 2003, Daniels et al 2011) where 90% of the canopy and about 70% of the basal area is retained after the fire (Gray and Blackwell 2005). The fires can often be large (Daniels et al 2011) but frequent copses and skips are a feature of natural fires and these skip features tend to be small (Gray et al, 2004, Gray and Daniels, 2007, Stuart-Smith and Hendry, 1988). Wildlife tree patches shall be retained to simulate skips as per section 3.8 of this plan. The Ecosystem Restoration program will plan its prescribed burns to be of low impact retaining most of the thinned canopy but thinning the regenerating trees under one metre tall. Removal of larger trees will require mechanical treatments.

3) The stand reconstruction surveys carried out in the district on NDT4 stands, as per table AppIV.2 generally show that the historic pre-ingrowth stands are close to those called for in the Cranbrook and Invermere Ungulate Winter Range Orders (Gray 2001, Gray et al 2004, Gray, Nesbitt, Daniels 2008). The studies in NDT3 forest (upper IDFdm2, MSdk and ICH) show understory/ ingrowth trees in these stands tend to be recruited in pulses after a fire event. The Ecosystem Restoration program will aim to create stands stocked to the Ungulate Winter Range Orders which will create the lower density open forests that the studies detailed. Maintenance of these stands is necessary as the action of prescribed burning may reinitiate the ingrowth and ingress problem that this program was established to reduce. To reduce in fill rate the Ecosystem Restoration program will emphasise light impact fires (determined as per National Park Service 2003) in its prescribed burns and favour the retention of fire resistant species (Hessburg et al 2005).

Table 3.7 Summary of recent publications showing actual stand structure changes in Interior Douglas and Ponderosa Pine Biogeoclimatic sub zones in the Rocky Mountain Trench

Publication	Biogeoclimatic subzone	Location of study	Fire Return period (years)	Stand Density change	Stand structure comments
Gray 2001	IDFdm2 1120 to 1260m elevation	Stoddart Creek	10-46 ave 32	Up to 1670% increases (22 to 1700st/ha	Light frequent fires historically; no char in forest floor. Evidence that trees infiltrated from upslope to down. Large increase in Juniper 19th century. Pulses of FDi ingrowth following fires from 1900 to 1950
Gray et al 2003	IDFdm2 to MSdk	Lone Peak	1-43 ave 13.9	More increase at lower elevation	Regen pulse of FDi from 1900s at lower elevation, species change from Lw, Py, Fdi to Fdi Py. Older trees at higher elevation more diverse species; down hill encroachment
Gray et al 2003	IDFxk and dm2 to MSdk	East side Columbia lake Warspite to Geary Creeks	2-44 ave 13.9	Increase from historic marked at low elevation	Fdi at all elevations but more Pli at Msdk; cohorts of ingrowth from 1800 to 1850. Most fires seem started by midslope lightning fires, appears little influence from First Nations
Gray, Riccius, Wong 2004	IDFdm2	Lewis Ridge Isadore Canyon	3-52 ave 18.9 1-29 ave 14.1	Density increase 540%	Pulses of trees, switch from Lw and Py to Fd, little regeneration since 1920's most regeneration 1800s, no fir for 104 to 115 years
Gray and Daniels 2007	Lower MSdk	Lower Gold and Joseph Creeks	3-93 ave 17.2 3-69 ave 20	Well spaced to multi layer	Change From well spaced Lw to multilayered stand with significant Pl component. Flatter areas had larger disturbance 100ha, steeper had smaller patches a few hectares. Moderate severity burns. 10 plots, targeted old forest/ growth.
Gray, Nesbitt, Daniels 2008	IDFdm2	McLeary Park Cranbrook	3-23 ave. 7.7	25 trees to 3500 thickets of 10,000	Historic forest almost all Lw some Py FDI, now 95% Fdi. Pulses of regeneration from 1800's. No fire since 1938. Light severity frequent fires

Cochrane, 2007	MSdk	Perry Creek to Radium most east side valley			20 plots
Da Silva 2010	IDFdm2 MSdk	Joseph Creek	4-91 ave 14-27 1-148 ave 7-57	Cohorts of recruitment	Mixed severity fires in MSdk; continuum with IDF, roughly 97 years since last fire.

Bibliography; References cited

Blackwell, B.A., Gray, R.W., Green, R.N., Feigl, F., Berry, T., B. Hawkes, and D. Ohlson. 2003. Development and implementation of a regional scale assessment of forest fuel conditions in southern British Columbia. Report to Forest Innovation Investment, Vancouver, B.C.

Covington, W .W., R .L. Everett, et al. 1994. Historical and anticipated changes in forest ecosystems of the inland west of the United States. *In* Assessing forest ecosystem health in the inland W est. N .R. Sampson and D.L. Adams (Eds). Haworth Press, New York: pp 13-62.

Da Silva. E. 2009. *Wildfire History and Its Relationship with Top-down and Bottom-up Controls in the Joseph and Gold Creek Watersheds, Kootenay Mountains, British Columbia*. M.Sc. Thesis, Department of Geography, University of Guelph, Guelph, ON, Canada.

Daniels, LD Cochrane, J, Gray, RW, 2007 Refining Mixed Severity Fire Regimes in the Rocky Mountain forest District; A report to Tembec Industries Limited, Canfor Radium and Forest Investment Account UBC Tree Ring Lab, Vancouver BC

Daniels, L.D., Gedalof, Z., Pisaric M., Courtney, C.J. Mustaphi, Da Silva, E., Marcoux H., Mather, V, Nesbitt, J., Paul-Limoges, E., Perrault, J, Steele, C. 2011 Historic Climate-Fire-Vegetation interactions of the West *versus E*ast Kootenays: Implications of climate change and fire suppression, 2011 Report to NSERC Canada

Forest Practices Code of BC, 1995a, Biodiversity Guidebook
http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/tasb/legsregs/fpc/FPCGUIDE/Guidetoc.htm

Forest Practices Code of BC, 1995d, Riparian management Area Guidebook
http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/tasb/legsregs/fpc/FPCGUIDE/Guidetoc.htm

Gray, R.W. 2001. The Effect of Stand Structure and Fire Regime Alterations on Bighorn Sheep Habitat, unpublished

Gray, R .W . 2004 Operational Effectiveness of Maintaining Large, Old Trees in Prescribed Burns, *in* 16th Int'l Conference, Society for Ecological Restoration, August 24-26, 2004, Victoria, Canada

Gray R.W., Blackwell B., 2005 Forest Health, Fuels and Wildfire; Implications for Long term Health; A Report Commissioned by the BC Forest Practices Board, 84 pp

Gray, R .W., Nesbit, J. and Daniels L. ,2009, An investigation of Fire History and Forest Dynamics and their effect on Wildfire Hazard in McCleary Park Cranbrook , Prepared for the City of Cranbrook unpublished

Gray, R .W., B . Andrew, B .A. Blackwell, A . Needoba and F . Steele. 2002. The effect of physiography and topography on fire regimes and forest communities. Report submitted to Habitat Conservation Trust Fund, Victoria, BC.

Gray, R .W., E. Riccius and C. Wong. 2004. Comparison of current and historic stand structure in two interior Douglas-fir sites in the Rocky Mountain Trench, British Columbia, Canada. *In* Proceedings of the 22nd Tall Timbers fire ecology conference: fire in temperate, boreal, and montane ecosystems. R .T. Engstrom and W.J. deGroot (Eds). Tall Timbers Research Station, Tallahasee, FL .

Gray, R.W. , Daniels, L.D. , 2007 An Investigation of Fire History in the Lower Gold/ Joseph creek Watershed. Unpublished

Greene, G. 2011. Historical Fire Regime of the Darkwoods: Quantifying the Past to Plan for the Future. M.Sc. Thesis, Department of Geography, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada.

Hessburg, P., Agree, J.K., Franklin, J.F. 2005 Dry Forest and Wildland fires of the inland Northwest USA: Contrasting the landscape ecology of the pre-settlement and modern eras *in* Forest Ecology and Management 211 (2005) 117-13 www.elsevier.com/locate/foreco

Hessburg, P, R Brion Salter, K.M. James, 2007, Re-examining fire severity relations in pre-management era mixed conifer forests: inferences from landscape level patterns of forest structure *in* Landscape Ecology10:1007-1022

Kootenay Boundary Land Use Plan Implementation Strategy Task Force-Land Information, March 6 1998. Rocky Mountain Trench Fire maintained Ecosystem Guideline Implementation through Landscape Design; Ministry of Forests and Range, Cranbrook BC, p 9

Mather, V. 2010. *Climate Relationships and Sub-ring Parameters of Four Conifer Species in the Kootenay Region of British Columbia Canada.* M.Sc. Thesis, Department of Geography, University of Guelph, Guelph, ON, Canada.

National Parks Service, 2003. Fire Monitoring Handbook., Fire Management Program Center, National Interagency Fire Center, Boise, Idaho

Nesbitt, J. 2010. *Quantifying Forest Fire Variability Using Tree Rings Nelson, British Columbia 1700–Present.* M.Sc. Thesis, Department of Geography, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada.

Paul-Limoges, E. 2010. *Regeneration Dynamics in Montane Forests of the East Kootenays, British Columbia*. B.Sc. Directed Study. Department of Geography, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada.

Perrault, J. 2011. *Spatial Accumulation Patterns of Macroscopic Charcoal in an Alpine Lake in British Columbia, Canada.* B.A. Honours Thesis. Department of Geography and Environmental Studies, Carleton University, Ottawa, ON, Canada.

Steele, C. 2010. *Fire and Climate Interactions During the Past 1000 Years from the West Kootenay District, British Columbia, Canada.* B.Sc. Honours Thesis. Department of Geography and Environmental Studies, Carleton University, Ottawa, ON, Canada.

Stuart-Smith K. and Hendry R. 1988. Residual Trees left by Fire: Final Report, Enhanced Forest Management Pilot Project, http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/drm/Pilot/Fireresidual/firesresidualIndex.htm

Wong C., Dorner B., and Sandmann, H., 2003, Estimating Historical Variability of Natural Disturbances in British Columbia, Land Management Handbook #53, Ministry of Forests, Forest Science Program and Ministry of Sustainable Resource Management Resource Planning Branch, Victoria BC, 148 pages