

Phone conversation with Scott McNay
Afternoon of Tuesday, August 5, 2008

Re: MK FSP Amendment #1 – wording of UWR sections – Caribou specifically

MK BCTS operations staff have been referring blocks to Scott as per the result/strategy in the originally approved FSP (particularly the blocks within low elevation winter range). Scott and some members of BCTS staff in MK had a meeting to discuss the need to continue this practice, and he suggested a change to our FSP wording. This was communicated to me and I phoned Scott to get clarification of his recommendations.

He said he was particularly looking for clarification in how the orders were worded and how that affected how we dealt with them. I explained first that we only dealt with UWRs that impacted our areas of operations – in this case, 001, 007, 009 (all caribou). If an order totally exempted us from the need to write a result/strategy (i.e. it was just GWMs), then we didn't refer to it in the text, only mapping was required. Also, "new" UWRs" were shown in one part of the FSP, and grandparented UWRs (FRPA section 180/181) were presented in a different part because they have different "weight" in the legislation.

This helped give him background as to how we presented the UWRs in the FSP. Then he told me that he was sure that the latest caribou UWR (007) was for low elevation winter range. If that was the case, then that part of our r/s could be considered to be covered off. There would no longer be a need to refer blocks in low elevation winter range (as per the RIG maps) to a qualified professional for evaluation as our r/s currently states.

I reviewed UWR 007 and it is indeed low elevation areas. Based on Scott's recommendation I have modified our r/s to remove reference to evaluating blocks in low elevation winter range (presumably enough of these areas have now been set aside).

Sharon Dow, RPF
Aug. 6, 2008