



Bulkley LRMP Implementation Monitoring Report

(Revised)

February 8, 2001

For

Prince Rupert Inter-agency Management Committee

Prepared by Tom Chamberlin
Chamberlin Consulting Group

| Contents | Page |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Introduction | 3 |
| The Implementation Assessment Process | 3 |
| Effectiveness Assessment | 4 |
| Project Areas | 5 |
| Task Status Summaries | 5-28 |
| Discussion | 28 |
| Recommendations | 29 |
| Map 1: LRMP Planning Units/Landscape Units | 30 |
| Map 2: Watersheds considered for Watershed Assessment | 31 |
| Attachment 1: Task information summary table | 32-34 |
| Attachment 2: Summary table of tasks not yet initiated | 35 |
| Attachment 3: Glossary of abbreviations and terms | 36 |
| Attachment 4: Watershed assessment letter to licensees | 37-41 |

Introduction

The Bulkley LRMP (March 1998) provides the provincial government and other users with four levels of land and resource management direction: General Management Direction; Resource Management Zones; Ecosystem Network and Enhanced Timber Development Areas; and Planning Unit Management Direction.

General Management Direction is provided in 11 resource categories (biodiversity, access, timber, water quality, fish and wildlife habitat, visual quality, range, outdoor recreation and tourism, subsurface resources, cultural heritage resources and future planning processes). These directions apply over the entire 760,000 hectares of the Plan Area.

Six Resource Management Zones are delineated in the Plan Area (Protected, Special Management 1 and 2, Integrated Resource Management, Settlement, and Agriculture/Wildlife). Each zone has distinct biophysical characteristics, resource issues or resource management directions.

Directions for more detailed planning are provided through the Ecosystem Network of core ecosystems and landscape corridors and through Enhanced Timber Development areas.

The LRMP also subdivides the resource management zones into 12 Planning Units, and provides specific management direction for each of 50 units or sub-units.

To ensure that the management directions in the LRMP are carried through in the delivery of projects and related agency programs, it is essential to develop clear procedures for implementation, and to monitor implementation progress on a regular basis.

The Implementation Assessment Process

The process for Implementation Assessment is outlined in the Bulkley LRMP Implementation Strategy (October, 1999), and follows the provincial policy paper "Provincial Monitoring Framework for Strategic Land Use Plans". An implementation assessment will be carried out each year by provincial agencies and will result in a Monitoring Report for the Inter-agency Management Committee.

The strategies and tasks required to implement the Bulkley LRMP were identified in the Implementation Strategy. The Implementation Strategy Data Base describes the 146 tasks required to implement the plan and the various resource agencies with lead responsibility for them.

Strategies and tasks may be implemented as base activities (under agency program mandates), or as incremental activities. Incremental activities are not currently supported by agency programs and are implemented as specific LRMP projects. The Implementation Strategy for the Bulkley LRMP identifies 77 incremental tasks. Some

have been combined for this report, resulting in 72 reported tasks. The implementation assessment in this report will focus on these incremental activities, and does not assess progress on base activities which are monitored through internal program reviews and through other processes such as the Forest Practices Review Board and the Environmental Appeal Board.

The complete list of incremental tasks was drawn from the Bulkley LRMP Implementation Data Base which is available upon request.

Effectiveness Assessment

Effectiveness assessment is also described in the Provincial Monitoring Framework. Unlike implementation assessment, which deals with the extent to which tasks have been completed, effectiveness assessment monitors the extent to which the resource objectives identified in the LRMP have in fact been achieved.

Effectiveness assessment starts with "expected outcomes" for each set of resources, and defines the measurable criteria or indicators which characterize the outcome. The procedure for applying the indicator must also be carefully specified so that the "rolled-up" evaluation has meaning over the Forest District or other land area of the LRMP. For example, one water quality measurement would have little value if the variability in water quality over a year or between streams is large in the LRMP area.

Effectiveness indicators must also be practical to measure, and repeatable at appropriate intervals so that trends can be monitored. They are generally drawn from existing data sources or inventories. In any case, a baseline value must be available for subsequent comparisons. A period of from 3 to 5 years after the initial baseline will usually be needed before an effectiveness assessment can be completed. For example, animal populations are inventoried (funding permitting) at about this interval.

In the Prince Rupert Region, an inter-agency working group from several districts has begun work to define the expected outcomes and indicators appropriate to each district. A preliminary catalog of indicators may be available for discussion in the Spring of 2001. It is anticipated that the next Monitoring Report will contain a draft effectiveness monitoring strategy.

Project Areas

Incremental strategies and tasks in the Bulkley LRMP have been grouped into 12 Project Areas for the purpose of implementation reporting. Table 1 lists these Project Areas, the number of tasks in each, and provides an overall summary of the degree of completion in each. The degree of completion was derived from a weighted average of the degree of completion of each task included in the Project Area.

A complete summary of information about each task, including cross-references to the Implementation data base and the LRMP is included as Attachment 1.

Table 1: Project Implementation Summary

| <u>Project Area</u> | <u>Number of Incremental Tasks</u> | <u>Degree of Completion</u> |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Access | 11 | Substantially complete |
| Biodiversity | 7 | Substantially complete |
| Fish Habitat Mgt. | 2 | Underway |
| Planning | 7 | Substantially complete |
| Protected Areas | 4 | Underway |
| Range | 3 | Not started |
| Recreation | 10 | Underway |
| Subsurface | 2 | Ongoing |
| Timber | 2 | Substantially complete |
| Visual | 12 | Substantially complete |
| Watershed Mgt. | 4 | Substantially complete |
| Wildlife Habitat Mgt. | 8 | Underway |

Task Status Summaries

The following tables provide a status statement for each incremental task included in the 12 Project Areas. Each Project Area is associated with a principal lead agency, and therefore the tasks listed also represent a work plan for that agency.

The status summaries were provided by lead agency representatives, and will be updated periodically.

Project A: Access (MOF)

Project Status: Substantially complete

Objective: Provide roads to access timber, mineral, range and recreational resources within the plan area, while minimizing the impact of human disturbance on fish, wildlife, and other environmental resources.

Status of Tasks

1. *Ensure opportunity for public input on any future circular routes:*

Section 2.1.2.1 of the Bulkley LRMP reads that circular routes that connect to adjacent Districts should be discouraged wherever possible. Potential circular routes include the following:

Babine River

One of 3 timber harvest access options under consideration is a circular route linking Bulkley and Kispiox District road networks (the Nichyeskwa Connector option).

Public input on route selection was sought from April 1 to May 31, 2000:

- District MOF and BCE prepared and mailed copies of an information pamphlet describing access options, to 1st Nations, stakeholders and interested public, to solicit written comment and advise of open houses.
- Open houses were advertised (by radio and local paper) and conducted in Smithers, Hazelton, and Fort Babine.
- Two public meetings were held: one for mill workers at Skeena Cellulose, Smithers; one at a Town of Smithers council meeting. A further meeting was conducted with the Community Resources Board.

40 written responses were received. The majority of comments regarding the Nichyeskwa Connector option were unfavorable.

A joint MOF/BCE Regional Director decision on access option is expected early in 2001. The decision and rationale will be made publicly available. Access management objectives and strategies will be developed for inclusion in Kispiox and Bulkley Landscape Unit Plans (LUP's) - by ~October 2001 for Bulkley LUP's.

Blunt

There is potential for development of a circular route connecting Bulkley/Kispiox Districts in the Touhy Lake area. The licensee has agreed not to propose any access option that would result in a circular route.

Copper

There was concern that the licensee would propose a connector linking McDonnell FSR with Kispiox TSA via the Kitsuns Main road, thus establishing a Bulkley/Kispiox District circular route. In their 2000-2006 FDP, Skeena Cellulose Inc. has proposed two access options; neither will result in a circular route.

Deep Creek

The Deep Creek Planning Committee formed in 1992 to review timber harvest access options into the Deep Creek area. Several options were proposed, but the committee as a whole didn't strongly favor one.

An access option by way of Canyon Creek was proposed as a result of public input from several open houses. The District Manager approved this option in July 1994. A Deep Creek Access Management Plan was developed as a component of the 1998-2001 SBFEP Forest Development Plan (FDP) (as required by LRMP Specific Management Direction for Access, for the Deep Creek Planning Unit). The FDP was approved by the DM, upon conclusion and consideration of public input provided during FDP review.

The Canyon Creek FSR is now mostly constructed. It currently links Babine Lake Road to Deception Lake road resulting in a within-District circular route (Hwy 16 to Deception Lake FSR to Canyon Creek FSR to Babine Lake Road to Hwy 16). A connector does link Canyon Creek FSR into a road system in Morice TSA, but this connector is not maintained and is impassible except to four-wheel drive vehicles.

An extension of Canyon Creek FSR to Kerr Road is under construction that could potentially have resulted in another within-District circular route (Hwy 16 to Quick Road to Kerr Road to Canyon Creek FSR to Babine Lake Road to Hwy 16). Because Quick residents had social concern with haul past Quick school, it was agreed that haul would be north via Canyon Creek FSR. This agreement is reflected in the 2000-2006 SBFEP FDP's Deep Creek Access Management Plan.

In both cases a circular route connecting to other Districts won't occur.

Harold Price

In their latest FDP submission, Skeena Cellulose Inc. initially proposed an access option through Suskwa Pass that would have resulted in a circular route between Bulkley/Kispiox Districts. Upon discussion with MOF District staff, this option was dropped.

Kitsequecla

No circular route has been proposed.

Telkwa

A former circular route linking Bulkley to Morice Forest District (Houston to Pine Creek via the Telkwa River main road; Pine Creek to McDonnell Forest Service Road; McDonnell FSR to Hwy 16; Hwy 16 to Houston) has been discontinued. The connector at Pine Creek was permanently deactivated in 1995. No other connectors to Morice District have been proposed.

2. *Identify hard surface roads and trails.*

The context of this requirement is that ATV's are to be permitted only on hard surface roads and trails in sensitive terrain.

Hard surface roads

- Hard surface roads are shown on forest cover maps. Maps are updated on a 2-year cycle, using licensee GPS'd road locations and satellite imagery to ensure continued accuracy.

Trails

- Many but not all appear on forest cover maps. Dependent on visibility from aerial photography/satellite imagery.
- District recreation maps show general location of major recreation trails. These are currently being GPS'd by MOF District, in order based on their Trail Attractiveness Rating as assigned by the Bulkley Strategic Recreation Study (in progress). Most should be GPS'd within the next 3 years – GPS'd locations are being assembled onto a digital trail map.
- 1st Nations trails are also being GPS'd by MOF District, in order based on their cultural significance. The length of time to completion of this project is uncertain. Some but not all trail locations will be added to the digital map - certain information is confidential.

3. Road deactivation may be necessary to minimize off-road vehicle damage to fragile ecosystems.

Road deactivation has relatively poor success in minimizing off-road damage to fragile ecosystems.

Forest licensees commonly deactivate haul roads after operations have ceased in an area. The level of deactivation can be permanent, semi-permanent or temporary in nature, depending on the future need for the road (i.e. the road may need to be quickly reactivated for additional hauling).

Only permanent road deactivation is likely to deter off-road vehicles. Permanent road deactivation is commonly conducted to two standards: one that results in access suitable for four-wheel drive (4WD) trucks; and one suitable only for ATV's. The choice of standard is highly influenced by the need to meet the requirements of other resource users (e.g. mineral and range tenure holders). However, by definition access to some form of off-road vehicle will still be possible post-deactivation.

Minimization of off-road damage to fragile ecosystems can be accomplished with better success using strategically-placed access control structures (i.e. a physical barrier, such as a gate or a rockpile). Examples of numerous existing access control structures whose main purpose is to protect fragile ecosystems include the gate on Howson Creek Road (controlling access into Mooseskin Johnny Lake and associated wetlands), and several gates controlling access to alpine in the Babine Mountains Park. The need for an access control structure is currently reviewed on a situational basis.

4. Complete Coordinated Access Management Plan, including access options from the south side of Reiseter Creek and protection of hiking trail access to Babine Mountains:

The Reiseter Access planning process was completed August 2000. Several access options were assessed through the Reiseter Access planning process, and an access

control strategy has been developed for the selected route. Strategies for protection of trails into Babine Park in case of harvest are provided in Landscape Unit Plans (DM Policy as of September 1999).

5. *Permanent access structures to stay 1 km from Kitseguecla R and branch roads within 1 km will be deactivated:*

An objective in the Trout Creek/Kitseguecla Landscape Unit Plan (LUP) reads “maintain the classified angling opportunity along the Kitseguecla River”. The strategy for this objective (DM Policy as of September 1999) is to restrict access using a deactivation strategy, access control point, or temporary roads. The licensee’s FDP’s are currently consistent with LUP direction.

6. *Maintain walk-in only status for Jack Mould Lake.*

Jack Mould Lake is protected from future road development by its incorporation into a core ecosystem. LUP strategies (DM Policy as of November 1998) prohibits road building within core ecosystems unless alternative access is impossible, which is not the situation here. To date, walk-in only status has been maintained.

7. *Consult with existing guide and Morice District regarding a Telkwa River and Scallion Ck. access control point.*

BCE/MOF District and PIR consulted with the guide outfitter (McIntyre), the Wet’suwet’en Treaty Office, and Morice District in 1997. Although having the access control at Scallion Creek addressed BCE objectives for caribou management, Wet’su’weten concerns were best addressed by placing the control on the north side of the Telkwa River. The parties agreed.

The proposed control location was advertised in the Telkwa LUP. LUP’s underwent critical public review in 1998, and in the absence of adverse comment the location was approved and the control point established. A map showing the control location is in the Telkwa LUP, copies of which are publicly available. To date, the control point has met its objectives.

8. *Address concerns about impact of main road on Telkwa river corridor (recreational, fish, water quality and ecological values), and assess options of altering main road access.*

At the time of LRMP development, the Telkwa River main road had structural problems resulting in the need for large annual expenditures for maintenance and slope stabilization, to deter sediment transfer into the Telkwa River. The LRMP table was aware of an ongoing study to assess the feasibility of relocating the main road up onto Hydro hill to bypass some of the problem areas, and (it is MOF District’s understanding) wanted to give effect to any results from that process.

Ultimately the new option was impractical from both an ecological and an economic perspective, because it resulted in a need to develop new access structures on both sides

of the Telkwa River including a new bridge over Howson Creek. It was decided to maintain the current location. Slope stabilization work has since been completed, and the issue is no longer a concern.

9. Prevent access from crossing Serb Creek from any direction.

Access restriction for Serb creek are identified and enforced through the Copper LUP.

10. Provide access and linking trail systems to Upper Corya Creek.

Activity should be corrected to “Maintain and enhance linking trail system; provide (recreational) access to (alpine areas at the headwaters of Corya Creek, Boulder Creek)”. Boulder Creek Road and Corya Creek Trail (into Corya Basin) provide access – they are not currently linked.

The Bulkley RAMP (approved as DM Policy in 1997) designated Corya Basin summer non-motorized and Boulder Creek Road as summer motorized, and reinforced the LRMP requirement to maintain and enhance linking trail systems.

The Corya LUP recognizes the Boulder Creek Road (Corya Creek Trail will be recognized in the next amendment), and provides strategies to ensure the trailbed is maintained in case of harvest.

The Bulkley Strategic Recreation Study (in progress) doesn’t currently identify activities to link trail systems in Upper Corya Creek – the limited recreation budget will be used for trails with a High Attractiveness rating (Boulder Creek Road has Moderate Attractiveness; Corya Creek Trail has Low Attractiveness). Development of this link is a very low priority.

11. Maintain accessibility of Cronin Road and maintain hiking trail access to Babine Mountains.

The Chapman and Reiser LUPs provide strategies (approved as DM Policy in 1998) to ensure that trailbeds for major trails are maintained in case of harvest.

The Bulkley Strategic Recreation Study (in progress) assigns a Very High Attractiveness rating to Cronin Road and several well-known Babine Mountains hiking trails (e.g. Little Joe Lakes, Onion Mountain, etc.) – the proposed strategy for trails with this rating is a high maintenance priority when recreation funding is available.

This task is also identified in the Recreation and Subsurface Projects.

Project B: Biodiversity (MOF with BCE)

Project Status: Underway

Objective: Maintain landscape biodiversity at district, planning unit and stand levels through management objectives defined as part of Landscape Unit Plans. Objectives and strategies will consider ecosystem representation, old growth retention, seral stage distribution, landscape connectivity, stand structure, species composition, temporal and spatial distribution of cutblocks, endangered plant and animal life, sensitive area designation, special management or protection status of specific areas, and varied stocking densities and patterns.

Status of Tasks

1. *Prepare Biodiversity objectives for all landscape units.*

Biodiversity objectives were established (in November 1998) as District Manager Higher Level Plan objectives through Landscape Unit Plans, for all Landscape Units except the Bulkley. It is anticipated that biodiversity objectives for the Bulkley LU will be established within the next two years. These include objectives for management of Core Ecosystems, Landscape Corridors, Seral Stage, Patch Size Distribution, Coniferous and Deciduous Diversity, and Stand Structure.

2. *Consider Touhy Lake meadows for inclusion in ecosystem network.*

Touhy Lake is incorporated into the core ecosystem, and Touhy Meadows into the landscape corridor, of the ecosystem network in the Harold Price Landscape Unit.

3. *Designate cottonwood and aspen as acceptable species. Encourage use of domestic livestock for brushing and weeding.*

A recent revision to the FPC "Establishment to Free-Growing" Guidebook designates cottonwood and aspen as acceptable species for certain (but not all) site series. In addition, silvicultural strategies for maintaining a deciduous component in harvested stands are presented within Landscape Unit Plans.

Because of overlap of existing range tenures with new forest plantations in the Agriculture /Wildlife Zone, domestic livestock by default perform a brushing and weeding role. Silviculture prescriptions are structured to address livestock use of plantations – commonly they prescribe obstacle planting (to protect seedlings while enabling brush control through browse), and prompt revegetation of roadsides and landings with grass/legume mixes.

4. *Maintain values associated with shallow lakes, wetlands and aquatic ecosystems in the Mooseskin Johnny Special Management Zone of the Telkwa Planning Unit.*

Mooseskin Johnny Lake and associated wetlands are protected by their inclusion in the ecosystem network of the Telkwa Landscape Unit. In addition, objectives and strategies (DM Policy as of September 1999) for maintaining caribou habitat values within the Mooseskin Johnny SMZ2 are provided in the Telkwa Landscape Unit Plan.

5. *Incorporate known rare ecosystems from Glacier Gulch special management zone into ecosystem network.*

Incomplete. The known rare ecosystems were not mapped during the 1998 Skeena Sensitive Ecosystem Inventory. Forested ecosystems similar to that found in Glacier Gulch are protected by the Boulder Creek protected area. Further discussion on objectives are needed with the Monitoring Committee.

6. *Track percentage and distribution of crown land plant communities in the Bulkley Valley Agriculture/Wildlife Zone to guide referral comments on development proposals.*

Incomplete. Although a system for tracking all plant communities in the Bulkley Valley does exist, MOF Range has a mechanism for following range land which is a base activity, and the BCE Sensitive Ecosystem study (1998) provides useful base inventory. The issue should be clarified in the Bulkley LUP process.

7. *Undertake inventories of red and blue-listed plant species and ecosystems in the Bulkley Valley Zone.*

The BCE 1998 inventory identified ecosystems and communities in 879 map polygons. It is difficult to develop species lists from this data.

Project C: Fish Habitat Management (BCE)

Project Status: Underway

Objective: Conserve the wide abundance of fish habitat and populations in the Plan Area.

Status of Tasks

1. *Assess watersheds in Bulkley TSA to determine need for watershed assessments to protect fishery values.*

Watershed Assessment panel consisting of fisheries, hydrology and forestry experts from DFO, MELP, and MOF reviewed all watersheds in the Bulkley TSA and identified those that would require assessments now and in the future. These assessments will be a legal requirement for forest development plans submitted in 2002 and beyond. The enabling letter is attached as Appendix 6.

2. *Undertake assessments to protect the following regionally significant spawning areas: Rainbow Alley; Telkwa River Corridor and tributaries to the Telkwa River where spawning is concentrated; Creeks between McDonnell and Dennis Lakes and Passby Creek proper; Area downstream from McDonnell Lake and the Confluence of Serb Creek; Kitseguecla watershed below the lake, and Toboggan and Kathlyn Creek watersheds.*

Telkwa River, Toboggan Creek and Kathlyn Creek assessments captured under task 1 assessment. Watershed assessment completed for the Kitseguecla Watershed by the Kispiox Forest District. Overview fishery assessments completed for the Upper Copper River Watershed and an overview assessment was completed for Tsezakwa Creek (Rainbow Alley). Map 2 illustrates watersheds currently being considered for assessment in the Bulkley planning area.

Project D: Planning (MOF and BCE)

Project Status: Substantially complete

Objective: Future land and resource-oriented planning processes will provide input from local community groups and individuals, be consistent with this LRMP, and will ensure that each Planning Unit is managed on a sustainable basis.

Status of Tasks

1. *Review zoning and associated terminology in all detailed plans.*

Terminology consistent with the LRMP has been used in 12 comprehensive Landscape Unit Plans.

Other detailed plans initiating since LRMP establishment, that are either directed by or have been reviewed for consistency with the LRMP, include:

- Bulkley Resource Management Zone Higher Level Plan (RMZ HLP)
- Recreational Access Management Plan (RAMP)
- Bulkley Strategic Recreation Study (in progress)
- Reisetser Access Plan
- Babine River Access Option Study
- Telkwa Caribou Herd Strategy
- Wet'suwet'en Landscape Unit Planning
- Bulkley Silviculture Strategy
- Bulkley Forest Health Strategy

2. *Complete Management Strategy for Reisetser Creek area, including harvesting practices; ensure CRB and public review prior to implementation.*

The Community Resources Board (CRB), in consultation with agency and licensee staff, developed "Consensus Guidelines for Development of the Reisetser Creek Special Management Zone." These Guidelines provide forest management strategies for issues including Access, Water Quality, Visual Quality, Rate of Cut and Monitoring. They were presented by the CRB to the public in April, 2000, and were considered by the District Manager in approving Pacific Inland Resources' 2000-2009 Forest Development Plan submission (which includes the Reisetser SM2) in August, 2000.

3. *Involve adjacent residents in development plan reviews of Ganokwa Creek area at an early stage.*

During and since LRMP establishment, the MOF Woodlot Forester consulted door-to-door with locals to discuss and address their issues prior to woodlot establishment and license issuance. Individual Woodlot Management Plans are advertised to solicit public review and comment, as are Small Business Forest Enterprise Program (SBFEP) Forest Development Plans for the area (i.e. Canyon Creek).

The issues most commonly submitted by local residents during development/management plan reviews regard visual aesthetics of cutblocks, and the potential for harvest-related sediment transfer into streams with domestic water licenses.

Visual aesthetic concerns relating to block location are addressed case by case by the licensee. Sediment transfer potential is addressed by modified harvesting practices - because Ganokwa Creek is within the Canyon Creek Community Watershed, proposed development is subject to Community Watershed Guidelines. Permitted levels of disturbance have been set through an Interior Watershed Assessment Procedure.

4. *Agencies will consult with resource users and local governments to ensure coordinated planning for the ecosystem network in the Bulkley Valley IRM Planning Unit.*

Coordinated planning for implementing the ecosystem network in the Bulkley Valley Landscape Unit should occur over the next two years.

This planning process is more complex than most. Harvesting options are by definition restricted in the ecosystem network (EN), and in the Bulkley Valley LU the EN doesn't just include unencumbered provincial forest where the MOF is the obvious lead agency. The EN includes private land, Agriculture Land Reserve, and areas targeted for future community expansion through Regional District and Municipal planning processes. It is uncertain who should be lead agency, but the task is identified as an MOF priority.

5. *Consult with Kitsequecla Valley residents and tenure holders when developing future timber plans.*

The major licensee (Pacific Inland Resources) advertises and conducts open houses annually to solicit public input for Forest Development Plans. Referral letters describing the timing and location of open houses are additionally sent to local organizations (e.g. Bulkley Valley Cattleman's Association), and individuals who have expressed concerns in past reviews (including several Kitsequecla Valley residents).

Until 1997, PIR held special open houses in the community of Evelyn to solicit comments from local residents. Most comments received to date have been in regards to water quality and visual aesthetics, and PIR has addressed these case by case.

PIR sends referral letters to range tenure holders up to 3 times annually, in the event that there are planned road deactivation/reactivation activities that might affect access to their tenures. They also conduct field trips with individual residents to discuss and find means to address their concerns.

6. *Coordinate management of Hankin Plateau with Morice District in boundary areas.*

BCE manages viable caribou population. Morice District and the community of Houston were consulted throughout the various stages of the caribou recovery plan.

7. *Consider Seven Sisters Planning Group recommendations for headwaters of Mulwain and Red Canyon creeks in future LRMP reviews.*

The Planning Group identified access control and visual quality concerns in the headwaters of Mulwain and Red Canyon creeks. These are or will be addressed in the

Copper Landscape Unit Plan (LUP). It is agreed they should also be recognized in future LRMP reviews.

Changes have already been incorporated to the Copper LUP to accommodate access control concerns. Additional visually sensitive areas (as seen from viewpoints in the Seven Sisters) are being contemplated for the visual quality map within the Copper LUP. Once finalized, visual quality objectives for new areas will be established through an upcoming LUP amendment [target date is October 2001].

The Seven Sisters Planning Group recommended that the upper portion of Mulwain Creek be considered for protection, but this recommendation was not dealt with by the Bulkley LRMP table because it had already finished its deliberations. This recommendation will need to be considered by the Bulkley Monitoring Committee at the first opportunity, and not later than the first formal review of the LRMP.

Project E: Protected Areas (Parks)

Project Status: Underway

Objective: Develop and implement management plans for new protected areas designated by the Bulkley LRMP.

Status of Tasks

- 1. Complete Babine River Corridor park management plan.*
- 2. Complete management plan for the Babine Mountains Recreation Area and the Driftwood Extension.*
- 3. Complete management plans for the Goal 2 Protected Areas of Burnt Cabin Bog, Boulder Creek, Netazul Meadow and Waterfall, Nilkitkwa Lake, Rainbow Alley and Call Lake.*
- 4. Manage Goal 1 and 2 Protected Areas in accordance with their designation.*

A modification of the initial zoning (from Wilderness to Natural Environment) was made to permit continued access to Harry Orm's cabin.

As an initial step toward management plans, Management Direction Statements have been completed for the Babine River Park, Driftwood Extension to Babine Mountains Park, and the Goal 2 areas of Burnt Cabin Bog Ecological Reserve, Netazul Meadows Park, Nilkitkwa Lake Park, Rainbow Alley Park, Call Lake Park, Driftwood Canyon Park and Tyee Lake Park.

Priorities for the development of full management plans are Babine River Park, Babine Mountains Park, Tyee Lake Park, and Call Lake Park, in that order. The other protected areas are not considered to be high priorities at this time.

Given other district priorities and funding limitations, initiation of the Babine river management plan is about 5 years away. Total costs for these four plans would be about \$80-\$100,000. Priorities for park planning in the District are reviewed annually, and advice from the Monitoring Committee on need and priority would be welcomed.

Project F: Range (MOF)

Project Status: Not Started

Objective: Promote agriculture while ensuring that wildlife habitat is also provided.

Status of Tasks

1. *Develop target Animal Unit Month levels for the Bulkley Planning Unit area.*

MOF District range staff has insufficient manpower and budget for this activity. Their time is concentrated on completing base activities – part of which includes the development of AUM levels for existing tenures. To date, tenure administration has not required the completion of this activity for the entire Planning Unit, and it will not be a priority until local demand develops.

2. *Evaluate Goathorn Creek (Telkwa) Planning Unit for range potential and potential range use expansion.*

There are no existing range tenures within the Goathorn Creek sub-unit. However, in 1998 MOF District range staff mapped the area as having high range potential. Potential range use expansion is currently reviewed (as a “base” activity) when a tenure proposal is received. None have been received so far for this area.

3. *Evaluate area close to Bulkley Valley for range potential.*

There are no existing range tenures within the Sinclair Creek sub-unit. However (as above), in 1998 MOF District range staff mapped the area as having high range potential. No tenure proposals have been received so far for this area.

Project G: Recreation (MOF)

Project Status: Underway

Objective: Maintain or enhance opportunities for a diverse range of recreational values and uses across the biophysical settings of the area through a Recreation Access Management Plan and a Recreation Plan.

Status of Tasks

1. *Identify snowmobile trails through forest plantations in areas of conflict.*

The Bulkley RAMP (DM Policy as of July 1997) identified and mapped the general locations of several well-known winter motorized trails; the Bulkley Strategic Recreation Study (in progress) will identify and map others. These trails are either currently listed in Landscape Unit Plans, or will be through future LUP amendments. LUP's provide strategies (DM Policy as of September 1999) to ensure trails are maintained through new plantations.

2. *Request agencies, tenure holders and public to provide input and assist in management of existing and new recreational sites and trails.*

This activity can be split into three sub-activities:

2.1 Request agencies, tenure holders and public to provide input in management of existing recreational sites and trails.

This activity was fulfilled upon implementation of a public referral process for the Bulkley RAMP (approved as DM Policy in July 1997)

2.2 Request agencies, tenure holders and public to provide input in management of new recreational sites and trails

MOF District will fulfill this activity by implementing a public referral process following completion of the Bulkley Strategic Recreation Study.

2.3 Request agencies, tenure holders and public to assist in management of new recreational sites and trails

MOF District is currently fulfilling (and will continue to fulfill) this activity by:

- setting up agreements with recreation interest groups for management of trails and cabins;
- directing major licensees through LUP strategies to assist in managing existing trails (e.g. through trailbed maintenance/marketing strategies, and deactivation strategies that ensure access is maintained to trailheads), and those trails made known through future LUP amendments.

3. *Identify lakes for Landscape Unit plans that should remain in semi-primitive or primitive settings.*

The “Lakes Management” section of the Bulkley Strategic Recreation Study (in progress) contains an assessment of lakes with known recreational values. It proposes that about a third of assessed lakes will be maintained in “Backcountry” class (defined as ‘no trail and greater than 200 metres from a road) and “Wilderness” class (no trail and greater than 1 km from a road). Lakes in these classes correspond well to lakes in “primitive or semi-primitive settings”.

Following its completion, the Recreation Study will be discussed and taken through a public process to finalize strategies, including lake access strategies. These strategies will be added to Landscape Unit Plans and established as DM Policy in a future amendment [target date is ~October 2001].

4. *Plan and monitor development to be sensitive to Babine Lake water quality, recreational potential and the high archeological potential of the lakeshore.*

MOF District’s understanding is that Babine Lake’s recreation potential is best served by managing lake viewsapes sensitively. The Babine lakeshore foreground viewscape has been assigned a retention visual quality objective (VQO) in the Torkelson LUP (i.e. forest management activities may be discernible but not clearly visible to the average viewer). Background viewsapes as seen from Babine Lake have been assigned a partial retention VQO (forest management activities may be noticeable but must blend well with the natural appearance of the landscape). Strategies for managing to these VQO’s are DM Policy as of September 1999.

Regarding Babine Lake water quality – future forest development within Babine Lake viewsapes is subject to VQO management plus riparian management legislation from the *Forest Practices Code of BC Act*, so is sensitive to Babine Lake water quality. A potential gap in management is in water quality monitoring of major streams flowing into Babine Lake, that transport impurities from sources not associated with the Babine Lake viewsapes. [MOF District will investigate this gap in 2001].

Development planning in areas with archaeological potential on Babine Lake lakeshore is influenced by the Bulkley/Cassiar Cultural Heritage Aboriginal Resource Inventory (CHARI - approved as DM Policy in November 2000), and the Culturally Modified Tree Policy (CMT Policy - approved as DM Policy in May 1999).

The CHARI identifies a band of 300 metres around the Babine Lake lakeshore as having high archaeological potential, and a further band extending 200-1000 metres as having moderate potential. In areas with high archaeological potential, the CHARI requires the forest licensee to hire a specialist (e.g. an archaeologist) to prepare an Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) prescribing management measures for any cultural heritage or archaeological features present, in conjunction with affected 1st Nations. The AIA must be submitted to the DM prior to approval of development.

In areas with moderate archaeological potential - the CHARI requires licensees to have a trained individual assess cultural heritage resources and develop management measures in conjunction with affected 1st Nations, in the following situations:

- where a significant cultural heritage resource (e.g. trail, village site, campsite, etc.) is known to be present;
- where 1st Nations have raised concerns with respect to impacts on traditional use features within the area proposed for development.

Under the CMT Policy, if any previously unidentified archaeological resource feature is located during forest operations, it must be reported immediately to the district manager and work suspended until appropriate mitigative measures are developed.

5. Recognize and protect hiking trails into the Babine Mountains.

Recreation trails into the Babine Mountains are recognized in the Reiserer and Chapman LUP's. LUP strategies (DM Policy as of September 1999) provide management measures in case of disturbance by harvest. This task is also recognized in the Access and Subsurface projects.

6. Prepare plan to address existing and potential activities among recreational users in the Blunt Mountain area .

Recreational issues for this contentious area were discussed during the Bulkley RAMP process, but left unresolved. The Bulkley Strategic Recreation Study (in progress) includes MOF vision for potential resolution of user conflicts in the Blunt and other areas. This vision will be brought forward for public input through a future planning process.

7. Agencies will provide management to address recreational user conflicts in the Bulkley Valley Planning Unit, including those on the Bulkley River.

The Bulkley RAMP (approved as DM Policy in July 1997) addressed recreational user conflicts of the day (e.g. designation of Malkow Lookout access as non-motorized). Management of future conflicts will be coordinated or facilitated by MOF District, as the need arises.

Recreational user conflicts on the Bulkley River are addressed by the Bulkley River Angling Use Plan, which has been partially implemented. A comprehensive review of the Angling Guide Management System and Classified Waters is being undertaken by the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, with a preliminary discussion paper expected in early 2001.

8. Prevent development of facilities or motor vehicle operation on the prairie west of the existing Hudson Bay Mountain ski boundary.

No new facilities are being developed in this area.

MOF District is aware of occasional motor vehicle operation on the prairie west of the ski boundary, despite the winter/summer non-motorized designation established by the Bulkley RAMP and the presence of a sign on the Prairie T-bar outbuilding.

The DM's approval letter to the Bulkley RAMP dated July 25, 1997, commits MOF District staff to conducting periodic spot checks on designated and posted non-motorized areas. Under section 26 of the *Forest Practices Code of BC Act* Forest Recreation Regulation, a forest official can issue violation tickets of \$115 for various offences including unauthorized entry. Penalties increase for repeat offenders to a maximum of \$100,000 and/or 1 year in prison.

9. Maintain opportunities for high recreational use in the Sinclair Creek Planning Unit, especially with access from the Microwave Road.

Strategies to ensure recreational access and trails are maintained in case of harvest are established (DM Policy as September 1999) in the Telkwa LUP. The Microwave Road has a winter and summer motorized access designation in the Bulkley RAMP (DM Policy as of July 1997).

10. Review guide outfitting and angling potential in the Deep Creek Planning Unit and co-ordinate reviews of future backcountry recreation activities. (BCE)

There are no current plans to alter existing guiding territory boundaries or activities in this area.

Project H: Subsurface (Mines)

Project Status: Substantially complete and ongoing

Project Objective: Provide opportunity for safe, efficient and environmentally sound development and use of the energy and mineral resources for the economic benefit of the Bulkley Plan Area and the province.

Status of Tasks

- 1. *Maintain hiking trail access into the Babine Mountains.*** Mineral exploration and mine development plans will identify existing trails. Permit conditions will specify that public access to the trails be maintained.
- 2. *Prepare deactivation plans for any approved access and ensure that remote lakes remain without public road access.***

Mineral exploration and mine development plans will contain access deactivation plans. Permit conditions will be used to ensure that roads to remote lakes are completely deactivated.

3. *The status of mine development reviews is currently as follows:*

There are no mine development projects under active review by the Environmental Assessment Office in the Bulkley TSA. Luscar Ltd. has decided not to proceed with completion of the Telkwa Coal project report. The company has reclaimed approximately 90% of the access trails and drill sites which are located in the Goat Horn Creek (11-4) Management Zone

In 2000 there were three exploration projects and one reclamation project active in the Bulkley TSA. In the Deep Creek (6-1) Management Zone Telkwa Gold Corp. drilled four holes on the Del Santo property and Equity Engineering drilled two holes on the Ascot property. In the Hankin Lake (12-4) Management Zone, Silver Standard Resources Inc. continued their reclamation effort on the Duthie mill tailings and prospector Harold Hendrickson drilled three holes on the Win property.

In 1999, Freeport Copper Company drilled six holes on the Zymo property in the Mulwain Creek (12-5) Management Zone. Telkwa Gold Corp. completed 300 metres of trenching and one drill hole on the Del Santo project.

Project I: Timber (MOF)

Project Status: Underway

Objective: Maintain a sustainable supply of timber for the communities in the Bulkley Plan Area.

Status of Tasks

1. *Declare Forest Land Reserves.*

The process for establishing Forest Land Reserves (FLR) is no longer being spearheaded by the MOF in Bulkley TSA, and will not be for the foreseeable future.

The FLR program was a political initiative to set areas aside specifically for commercial forestry. There were fears provincially that too much operable forest was being lost through protected area designation and conversion to settlement-related uses. This is a serious problem in the southern part of the province; less so in the north at present.

The advantage of an FLR designation is that in the case of Provincial Forests, land withdrawals (“deletions”) require a ministerial order, routinely made in accordance with MOF procedures. Removal of Crown land from FLR, however, is much more difficult. It requires an Order-in-Council, and unless Cabinet considers the removal to be in the public interest the proposal must be referred to the Land Reserve Commission (LRC). The LRC is an agency authorized through the *Forest Land Reserve Act* to oversee Crown land allocation in much the same way that the Agriculture Land Commission does with the ALR.

There is an MOF policy to add Crown land currently in Provincial Forest (i.e. minus protected areas, heritage sites and ALR) to the FLR following completion of LRMP’s. However, MOF has recently decided not to do so until issues around dual designation (FLR and PF) have been resolved: establishing FLR on top of existing PF greatly adds to the burden of land administration.

The possibility for future FLR designation remains. In preparation, MOF (as a low priority activity) is identifying all areas not currently designated as protected, heritage sites, ALR or Provincial Forest, and is starting work towards having these areas designated as Provincial Forest. The *Forest Land Reserve Act* states that only lands designated as PF can be designated as FLR.

2. *Structure forest health practices to meet RMZ objectives.*

The Forest Health Plan for Bulkley TSA (approved as DM Policy in June 2000) was specifically structured to address objectives from LRMP Resource Management Zones.

Project J: Visual (MOF)

Project Status: Substantially complete

Objective: Objectives to manage the scenic resources will be identified in the landscape unit plans, with special attention given to major corridors, recreation focus points, and specific viewpoints.

Status of Tasks

1. Utilize partial cutting and creative block design to meet visual quality objectives.

Visual Quality objectives and strategies were established for 12 Landscape Units in Bulkley TSA, all except Bulkley Landscape Unit (DM Policy as of September 1999). Partial cutting and creative block designs are identified as strategies to achieve visual quality objectives.

2. Pay special attention to sensitive views as seen from: Babine Lake, Nilkitwa F.S. Rd. and recreational lakes and roads.

Visual Quality objectives and strategies for views as seen from these viewpoints are established in the Babine and Nilkitwa Landscape Unit Plans (LUP's).

3. Development plans to pay special attention to views from Suskwa community and Touhy Lake.

Visual quality objectives and strategies for views as seen from Suskwa community are established in the Harold Price LUP. They are not as yet established for views as seen from Touhy Lake, but will be through an upcoming amendment to the Harold Price LUP (~October 2001).

4. Apply visual quality constraints identified in review and approval processes for industrial development in Big Onion Mountain Special Management Zone.

Visual quality objectives for timber harvesting are established for the Chapman and Reiser LUPs. These objectives will be applied where applicable to mine development. Visual quality objectives that are designed for timber harvesting have only limited application to mine development. Areas to be harvested for pits, dumps and tailings ponds are determined by the location and size of the ore deposit and the topography of the site. Visual quality objectives may be applicable to access roads and mill sites.

5. Identify visual quality constraints for the Ganokwa Creek sub-unit of the Babine Mountains.

Visual quality objectives and strategies are established for the Reiser LUP.

6. *Development plans will pay special attention to the views from Hy. 16 and from the Babine Mountains Park.*

Visual quality objectives and strategies for viewscales as seen from these viewpoints are established for the Reisetser LUP.

7. *Development plans will include prescriptions that pay special attention to the views from Kitsequecla and Jack Mould Lakes.*

Visual quality objectives and strategies for viewscales as seen from these viewpoints are established for the Trout Creek/Kitsequecla LUP.

8. *Address high visual quality concerns in Development Plan reviews in the Glacier Gulch sub-unit of Hudson Bay Mountain.*

Bulkley Valley LUP not completed at this time. Visual Quality objectives will be included. Viewscales within the Glacier Gulch subunit are currently and informally being managed as 'Preservation' visual quality objective (i.e. only minimal alterations that enhance natural wildland are permitted).

9. *Manage timber with low impact methods (single tree/group selection) to maintain visual quality and forest health in the Ski Smithers SM2 zone.*

Bulkley Valley LUP is not completed at this time. Visual Quality strategies will be included.

10. *Develop Visual Quality Objectives for Copper River viewscales.*

Copper LUP identifies visual quality objectives for Copper River viewscales.

11. *Identify Visual Quality objectives for corridor of McDonnell F.S. Rd.*

Visual quality objectives for the McDonnell road corridor are identified in the Copper LUP.

12. *Develop visual quality objectives for viewscales as seen from Seven Sisters and the Copper River corridor.*

Visual Quality objectives for the Copper River are identified in the Copper LUP. As mentioned previously, Visual Quality objectives are still to be developed for viewscales as seen from the Seven Sisters.

Project K: Watershed Management (BCE)

Project Status: Substantially complete

Objective: Assure acceptable levels of water quality in the Bulkley Plan Area and identify priority areas for watershed assessments.

Status of Tasks

1. *Ensure that all relevant agencies review proposed watershed rehabilitation projects.*

Watershed restoration work was completed in 1995 in Kitsequecla, Harold Price/Blunt and Telkwa Landscape units. A process is established for further work.

2. *Recognize as priority areas for watershed assessments the following areas: Rainbow Alley; Toboggan and Kathlyn Creek watersheds; Kitsequecla watershed below the lake; creeks between McDonnell and Dennis Lakes, Passby Creek proper, and the Serb Confluence area below McDonnell Lake; and tributaries to the Telkwa River where spawning activity is concentrated.*

All areas have been identified as priorities for watershed assessment (see also Task 1, Fish Habitat Management and Map 2). The Watershed Assessment Letter to licensees is appended to the report (Attachment 6).

3. *Development plans in the Gramophone Creek sub-unit of the Babine Mountains will include precautions to maintain the water quality needs for domestic water consumption.*

The CRB's "Consensus Guidelines for Development of the Reisetser Creek Special Management Zone" included guidelines for maintaining water quality. PIR's 2000-2009 Development Plan considers these guidelines. Additionally, the CRB guidelines will be incorporated into the Reisetser LUP in a future amendment.

4. *Ensure existence of acceptable levels of water quality by mapping community watersheds.*

Completed in 1995.

Project L: Wildlife Habitat Management (BCE)

Project Status: Underway

Objective: Conserve the wide abundance of all wildlife habitats in the Plan Area.

Status of Tasks

- 1. *Develop a comprehensive plan to sustain and enhance a viable caribou population and restrict motorized access as required for the Howson and Telkwa Range Special Management One zones, the Telkwa River and Mooseskin Johnny Lake Special Management Two zones and the Goathorn and Sinclair IRM zones.***

BC Environment's Wildlife program completed a recovery plan in 1997 and relocated caribou from the Sustut/Chase herd to the Telkwa Mountains. In conjunction with the relocation program, public consultation occurred to promote voluntary access restrictions in the Telkwa mountains. Additionally, the forest industry participated in developing compatible harvest strategies for within the caribou recovery plan area.

The access management measures have initially been successful; the herd is currently increasing. Consultation with all interested recreational groups continues through a "Telkwa Mountains Advisory Committee" which has met in November, 2000, with more meetings planed. The group will explore ways to make voluntary access management more effective.

- 2. *Do 1:50,000 habitat inventory where not available and in areas where specific species have been identified as a priority for management.***

Priority species identified for management include grizzly bear, caribou, goat, moose and mule deer. To date, key forested caribou habitat has been identified as part of the Telkwa Caribou recovery program, 1:50,000 goat habitat mapping has been completed for the TSA and included in landscape unit plans and 1:50,000 ungulate mapping exists for moose and mule deer in the Bulkley Valley. Winter Ungulate habitat mapping is still required for the areas outside of the Bulkley Valley, primarily in the Chapman, Torkelson and Babine landscape units. 1:50,000 grizzly bear mapping is still required for the TSA outside of the Babine watersheds. At the present time, elk management planning has a low priority in the Bulkley Valley.

- 3. *Complete grizzly bear interpreted ecosystem mapping and incorporate into management prescriptions for the Nilkitkwa River sub-unit.***

1:20,000 terrestrial ecosystem mapping was completed in 1998. Interpretations for grizzly bear habitat were provided and used in developing a comprehensive access and development strategy of the Nilkitkwa Landscape Unit.

- 4. *Identify habitat subzones and complete the establishment of wildlife habitat map reserves under Section 12 of the Land Act.***

Not yet initiated.

5. *Continue collection of goat baseline data in the Howson Range.*

Inventories are conducted as funding is available. The last inventory was completed in 1999. Changes in access or increase in harvest will prompt further inventories. Goat populations are currently healthy.

6. *Identify grizzly bear habitat as part of the Serb Creek Landscape Unit Plan.*

Grizzly bear habitat, *per se*, has not been identified in the Serb Creek watershed, however, we feel that the significant habitat feature of the watershed is the complex wetland network. This wetland complex is included in the ecosystem network. Additionally, the landscape unit plans provide significant direction to minimize interactions between bears and people (access and development periods).

7. *Improve local public participation in wildlife enhancement and recreational plans in livestock grazing and agricultural areas.*

Not initiated, pending inter-agency agreements between BCE, MOF and Ministry of Agriculture.

8. *Evaluate and control snowmobile impacts on goat populations in Upper Corya and Silvern Lakes special management zones.*

Ongoing, although in an informal capacity through the collection of anecdotal information.

Discussion of the Implementation Assessment

As of this date, 33 incremental tasks have been substantially completed, 16 are underway, 8 are ongoing and 15 have not been initiated. The primary reason for the high degree of completion of incremental tasks has been the vigorous development of Landscape Unit Plans by MOF and BCE staff. Several of the tasks not yet initiated will come on line when the Bulkley Valley Landscape Plan and the Bulkley Recreation Strategy have been completed.

Landscape Unit Plans have been initiated over the entire plan area, following a refinement of the original Planning Unit geographic area boundaries. Biodiversity objectives have been formally established for all Landscape Units except the Bulkley Valley Unit. The original 12 Planning Units have evolved to 14 Landscape Unit Plan areas to better reflect the biophysical or resource use objectives identified in the LRMP. Map 1 illustrates the original Planning Units and the final Landscape Planning Unit boundaries.

Considerable progress has also been made in identifying watersheds requiring watershed assessments and in tracking watershed restoration activity and plans. Map 2 illustrates these watersheds. BCE and MOF staff have cooperated in developing a policy that will ensure needed watershed assessments as licensees undertake their forest development planning.

Recommendations

The planning framework provided by the Bulkley LRMP has provided clear direction to the Landscape Unit Plans being developed. The Bulkley Valley LUP needs to be completed, and will require significant inter-agency coordination. All landscape unit plans will require future evaluation to ensure their objectives are realized in forest development plans. Follow-up will also be required to ensure that watershed assessment recommendations are implemented.

Initial review by the Bulkley LRMP Monitoring Committee identified a desire for substantially more information about other agency activities (base tasks, operational plans) than the Monitoring Report addresses. Agencies may need to consult with the Committee or its constituents to provide this information.

Finally, the effectiveness of activities to date has not yet been assessed. Work is progressing to establish effectiveness criteria and indicators for the Prince Rupert Region, and future Monitoring Reports should include them.

Map 1: Comparing Planning Unit and Landscape Unit boundaries within the Bulkley
LRMP Planning Area

(Previously distributed)

Map 2: Bulkley TSA watersheds to be considered for watershed assessments

(Previously distributed)

Attachment 1: Task Information Summary Table

(Note: The Monitoring Report has grouped some similar tasks from the Implementation Plan. Some Monitoring Report Tasks may apply to more than one task from the LRMP)

Completion categories used: Not started; Underway; Substantially Complete; Ongoing.

| <u>Task</u> | <u>Completion</u> | <u>Imp. D.B. Code</u> | <u>LRMP Page</u> |
|-------------|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| A1 | U | GD/A/2.1 | 32 |
| A2 | U | GD/A/3.2.1 | 33 |
| A3 | O | GD/A/3.3.1 | 33 |
| A4 | SC | PU05-06/1.1.1 | 70 |
| A5 | SC | PU09-1/1.1.3 | 89 |
| A6 | SC | PU09-2/1.1.1 | 90 |
| A7 | SC | PU11-3/1.1.2 | 99 |
| A8 | N | PU11-5/1.1.3 | 100 |
| A9 | SC | PU12-3/1.1.5 | 106 |
| A10 | N | PU09-2/1.1.3 | 86 |
| A11 | U | PU05-10/1.1.2 | 66-69; 73 |
| B1 | SC | GD/B/1.1.1 | 31 |
| B2 | SC | PU04-1/1.1.2 | 64 |
| B3 | SC | PU07-3/1.1.4 | 82 |
| B4 | SC | PU11-3/1.1.3 | 99 |
| B5 | N | PU10-1/1.1.1 | 92 |
| B6 | N | PU07-3/1.1.2 | 82 |
| B7 | SC | PU07-1/1.1.1 | 80 |
| C1 | SC | GD/H/1.1.1 | 34 |
| C2 | U | Various tasks | Various |
| D1 | SC | GD/P/2.2.1 | 37 |
| D2 | SC | PU05-06/1.1.2 | 71 |
| D3 | U | PU05-07/1.1.1 | 71 |
| D4 | N | PU07-1/1.1.2 | 80 |
| D5 | SC | PU09-1/1.1.4 | 89 |
| D6 | O | PU11-2/1.1.3 | 98 |
| D7 | SC | PU12-5/1.1.2 | 107 |
| E1 | U | PU02-1/1.1.2 | 59 |
| E2 | U | RMZ/P1/1.1.2 | 40 |
| E3 | U | RMZ/P2/1.1.2 | 40 |
| E4 | U | RMZ/** | 40 |

(Attachment 1 continued)

| | | | |
|-----|----|---------------|---------|
| F1 | N | PU07-3/1.1.1 | 83 |
| F2 | N | PU11-4/1.1.2 | 100 |
| F3 | N | PU11-6/1.1.3 | 101 |
| G1 | SC | GD/O/1.4.1 | 36 |
| G2 | O | GD/O/1.4.2 | 35 |
| G3 | U | GD/A/4.1.1 | 33 |
| G4 | U | PU03-1/1.1.3 | 62 |
| G5 | SC | PU05-02/1.1.2 | 68 |
| G6 | SC | PU05-08/1.1.1 | 72 |
| G7 | U | PU07-1/1.1.4 | 81 |
| G8 | N | PU10-3/1.1.2 | 93 |
| G9 | SC | PU11-6/1.1.5 | 101 |
| G10 | N | PU06-1/1.1.2 | 76 |
| H1 | O | PU05-03/1.1.1 | 69 |
| H2 | O | PU01-1/1.1.1 | 53 |
| I1 | N | GD/T/1.2.1 | 33 |
| I2 | SC | GD/T/2.1 | 33 |
| J1 | SC | GD/V/1.1.1 | 34 |
| J2 | SC | PU03-1/1.1.1 | 61 |
| J3 | SC | PU04-1/1.1.1 | 64 |
| J4 | SC | PU05-2/1.1 | 62 |
| J5 | SC | PU05-7/1.1.2 | 72 |
| J6 | SC | PU05-09/1.1.2 | 73 |
| J7 | SC | PU09-2/1.1.2 | 90 |
| J8 | N | PU10-1/1.1.2 | 92 |
| J9 | N | PU10-3/1.1.2 | 93 |
| J10 | SC | PU12-2/1.1.5 | 106 |
| J11 | SC | PU12-4/1.1 | 107 |
| J12 | U | PU12-5/1.1.1 | 107 |
| K1 | O | GD/W/2.1 | 34 |
| K2 | SC | Various tasks | Various |
| K3 | U | PU05-09/1.1.1 | 73 |
| K4 | SC | GD/W/1.3.1 | 33 |

(Attachment 1 continued)

| | | | |
|----|----|--------------|-----|
| L1 | SC | PU11-1/1.1.1 | 97 |
| L2 | U | GD/H/1.1.2 | 34 |
| L3 | SC | PU01-2/1.1.2 | 54 |
| L4 | N | PU07-2/1.1.1 | 81 |
| L5 | O | PU11-1/1.1.2 | 97 |
| L6 | U | PU12-3/1.1.1 | 106 |
| L7 | N | PU07-3/1.1.5 | 83 |
| L8 | O | PU08-1/1.1.2 | 84 |

Attachment 2: Summary of Tasks Not Yet Initiated *

- A8 Telkwa Road Impact Study
- B5 Incorporate Glacier Gulch Rare Ecosystems
- B6 Track Bulkley Valley Plant Communities
- D4 Bulkley Valley Landscape Unit Planning
- F1 Bulkley Valley Landscape Unit Planning
- F2 Telkwa LU Range Evaluation
- F3 Bulkley Valley Range Evaluation
- G8 Protect Area West of Ski Area
- G10 Deep Creek P.U. Guiding and Recreation Review
- I1 Declare Forest Land Reserves
- J8 Glacier Gulch Visual Quality Concerns:
- J9 Ski Smithers Visual and Forest Health Concerns
- L4 Establish Wildlife Habitat Map Reserves
- L7 Improve Public Participation in Wildlife Projects in Grazing Areas

- Please refer to Task Status Summaries for comment

Attachment 3: Glossary of Abbreviations and Terms

| | |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| BCE | Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks (Environment) |
| CHARI | Cultural Heritage Aboriginal Resource Inventory |
| CRB | Community Resources Board – the public representatives on the Bulkley LRMP Monitoring Committee |
| DM | District Manager of the Ministry of Forests |
| FPC | Forest Practices Code |
| GPS | Geographic Positioning System – a system using satellite information to locate positions on the ground |
| LRMP | Land and Resource Management Plan – the strategic level plan which guides all land use planning and operational land and resource use decisions in the plan area |
| LUP | Landscape Unit Plan |
| MOF | Ministry of Forests |
| RAMP | Recreational Access Management Plan |

Attachment 4: Watershed Assessment Letter to Licensees

February 17, 2000

Your File:
Our File: 77900-01

Bulkley TSA Licensees

Re: Watershed Assessments in the Bulkley TSA

The District Manager for the Bulkley/Cassiar Forest District and the Regional Fish, Wildlife and Habitat Manager for the Skeena Region have reviewed the recommendations made by the Bulkley TSA watershed assessment panel for watershed assessments in the Bulkley TSA. We concur with the panel's assessment and, therefore, as per the Operational Planning Regulation (OPR), section 14, subsection 1, require that forest development plans be consistent with the results and recommendations of a watershed assessment (as per OPR(18)y) for the following watersheds:

Table 1. Community Watersheds

| Landscape Unit | Watershed |
|----------------|------------|
| Reiseter | Canyon |
| Corya | Corya |
| | John Brown |

Table 2. Watersheds with significant downstream fisheries values or licensed domestic water users and significant watershed sensitivity

| Landscape Unit | Watershed |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|
| Babine | Boucher |
| | Nilkitkwa Lake ¹ |
| Torkelson | West Babine (9-mile and 5-mile only) |
| Reiseter | Gramophone Creek |
| Trout Creek | Toboggan |
| Telkwa | Jonas |
| | Cumming |

Table 3. Watersheds for which the district manager determines an assessment is necessary

| Landscape Unit | Watershed |
|----------------|---------------------|
| Chapman | Fulton ¹ |

For the watersheds identified in tables 2 and 3, we require that the watershed assessments be completed in time so as to be considered in development plans submitted in 2002. We expect that the watershed assessment will be completed according to the recommendations of a forest hydrologist. In some cases this may mean an abbreviated assessment that provides guidance for forest development plans and in other cases the assessment will follow the watershed assessment guidebook.

The following watersheds do not currently require an assessment based on the harvest history to date. However, because of significant fishery values, the following watersheds will require assessments in the future.

¹ Consists of several watersheds; therefore, watershed assessments need to be done on each of the individual watersheds based on the boundaries and advice provided by a hydrologist or other qualified individual.

Table 4. Watersheds requiring future assessments

| Landscape Unit | Watershed | Assessment Trigger ² |
|----------------|------------|---------------------------------|
| Babine | Nichyeskwa | 15% |
| Blunt | Blunt | 15% |
| Deep Creek | Deep Creek | 10% |
| Copper | Coal Creek | 15% |
| | Hankin | 15% |
| Telkwa | Pine | 10% |
| | Winfield | 15% |
| | Sinclair | 15% |
| | Goathorn | 15% |
| | Arnett | 15% |

To monitor the watersheds in Table 4., we require that forest development plans submitted with harvesting proposed in these watersheds report the area logged by watershed to the end of the plan. District staff will assume responsibility in tracking these watersheds and the District Manager will notify the licensee(s) when these triggers are reached. As with those watersheds where an assessment is currently required, a forest hydrologist may recommend an abbreviated assessment once an assessment is directed by the District Manager.

Recognizing that new information and procedures will be available in the future, the watershed assessment recommendations completed by the watershed assessment panel will be reviewed within seven years from the effective date of this letter.

Attached is a summary of recommendations made by the watershed assessment panel and a map outlining the areas. If you have any questions or require guidance regarding watershed boundaries, please contact James Cuell, FES Bulkley/Cassiar Forest District at 847-6300.

Sincerely,

Reid White
Fish, Wildlife, Habitat Manager
Skeena Region

Barry Smith
District Manager
Bulkley/Cassiar Forest District

cc: Watershed Assessment Panel
Dave Wilford - MoF, Smithers
Eero Karanka - DFO, Smithers
Terry Turnbull, DFO, Smithers (retired)
Mark Beere - BCE, Smithers
Bob Mitchell - MoF, Bulkley
Brian Fuhr - BCE, Smithers

Attachment: Watershed Assessment Recommendations

² Percentage of total watershed area less than 25 years old.

Table 1. Watershed Assessment Recommendations

| Landscape Unit | Watershed Group | Total Area | % Operable | % <25 yrs Fish Value | Hydrologic Features | Natural Hazards | Comments | WAP Recommendation |
|----------------|--------------------|------------|------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| BABINE RIVER | Babine | 30475 | 68% | 11% H ³ | Flat | | | None |
| BABINE RIVER | Boucher | 14155 | 45% | 15% H | Wetland | HTSIH ⁴ | key producer of Babine River steelhead | WAP |
| BABINE RIVER | Lower Nilkitkwa | 37673 | 49% | 13% H | | HTSIH | | None |
| BABINE RIVER | Nichyeskwa | 22624 | 50% | 5% H | | | harvest numbers do not reflect Kispiox. WAP would provide good harvest direction. Kispiox and Bulkley work together | WAP @ <25 years >15% |
| BABINE RIVER | Nilkitkwa Lake | 16051 | 70% | 17% H | Flat | | Nilkitkwa Lake very productive | WAP (based on individual watersheds within the unit) |
| BLUNT | Blunt | 19776 | 54% | 8% H | | | concentration of planned logging | WAP @ <25 years >15% |
| BLUNT | Upper Harold Price | 15778 | 39% | 19% | Wetland | | | None |
| BULKLEY | Bulkley | 66795 | 29% | 10% H | | | Valley Bottom | Not reviewed |
| CHAPMAN | Fulton | 26090 | 60% | 25% | | | Fishery values in Chapman and Fulton Lakes | WAP based on individual tribs (select watersheds of concern) |
| CHAPMAN | McKendrick | 14809 | 43% | 20% | Flat | | | None |
| COPPER | Caribou | 3193 | 31% | 1% | Mtn | | | None |
| COPPER | Copper | 23859 | 53% | 7% H | | | Valley Bottom/wetlands | None |
| COPPER | Hankin | 12280 | 58% | 11% H | Lakes | | needs to broken down to individual watersheds | Coal Ck and Hankin - WAP @ <25 yrs >15% |
| COPPER | Lee | 6688 | 18% | 1% | Mtn | | | None |
| COPPER | Mulwain | 20780 | 30% | 1% | Mtn | HTSIH | | None |
| COPPER | Serb | 16318 | 20% | 1% H | Wetland | HTSIH | sign. steelhead producer | None |
| COPPER | Silvern | 9889 | 16% | 4% H | Mtn | | | None |
| CORYA | Boulder | 6134 | 20% | 2% | Mtn | | | None |
| CORYA | Corya | 8739 | 22% | 12% | Mtn | | Community Watershed | WAP |
| CORYA | John Brown | 7888 | 29% | 2% H | Mtn | | Community Watershed | WAP |
| DEEP CREEK | Deep Creek | 19477 | 28% | 3% H | | | heavily impacted by agriculture | WAP @25 years>10% on Deep Creek watershed only |
| DEEP CREEK | McQuarrie | 4533 | 37% | 0% | Lakes | | | None |
| HAROLD PRICE | Lower Harold Price | 31248 | 40% | 10% H | | | | None |
| HAROLD PRICE | Touhy | 5526 | 41% | 0% | | | | None |
| KITSEGUECLA | Kitseguecla | 9644 | 64% | 17% H | Flat | HTSIH | Bulkley and Kispiox work together in planning | Done by Kispiox |
| NILKITKWA | Barbeau | 8615 | 9% | 0% | Mtn | | SMZ 1 | None |
| NILKITKWA | Upper Nilkitkwa | 19065 | 33% | 0% H | Wetland | | SMZ 1/ small tribs critical for fish production | None |
| NILKITKWA | West Nilkitkwa | 16964 | 26% | 0% H | Wetland | | headwaters SMZ1 | None |

³ High⁴ High Terrestrial Sediment Input Hazard

Table 1. Watershed Assessment Recommendations (continued)

| Landscape Unit | Watershed Group | Total Area | % Operable | % <25 yrs | Fish Value | Hydrologic Features | Natural Hazards | Comments | WAP Recommendation |
|----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|---------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| REISETER | Canyon | 26980 | 38% | 6% H | | | HTSIH | Community Watershed collection of watersheds | Done |
| REISETER | Causqua | 18102 | 57% | 17% H | | | | | WAP on Gramophone watershed only (69% operable & 18% < 25 yrs) |
| REISETER | Reiseter | 27339 | 31% | 1% H | | | | park SMZ 2 | |
| TELKWA | Arnett | 5031 | 35% | 2% | | Mtn | | high fishery values at mouth | WAP @ <25 years >15% |
| TELKWA | Bridge | 2049 | 68% | 11% | | | | high fishery values at mouth | WAP @ <25 years >15% |
| TELKWA | Cumming | 3065 | 52% | 29% | | | HTSIH | high fishery values at mouth | WAP |
| TELKWA | Elliot | 6859 | 9% | 0% H | | Mtn | HTSIH | highest value watershed in the Telkwas heavy emphasis on site level prescriptions (maintenance of valley bottom hydrology/ wetlands) | None |
| TELKWA | Goathorn | 18857 | 41% | 13% H | | | HTSIH | Bull trout | WAP @ <25 years >15% |
| TELKWA | Howson | 22827 | 27% | 1% H | | Mtn | HTSIH | | None |
| TELKWA | Jonas | 1353 | 66% | 33% | | | | high fish values at mouth | WAP |
| TELKWA | Milk | 4765 | 20% | 0% H | | Mtn | HTSIH | | None |
| TELKWA | Pine | 13873 | 55% | 5% | | | HTSIH | high fish values at mouth stability concerns | WAP @ <25 years >10% |
| TELKWA | Sinclair | 6164 | 32% | 6% | | | HTSIH | | WAP @ <25 years >15% |
| TELKWA | Telkwa | 16562 | 51% | 15% H | | | | Valley Bottom | Focus on tributaries |
| TELKWA | Tsai | 3991 | 16% | 0% H | | Mtn | HTSIH | | None |
| TELKWA | Upper Telkwa | 11439 | 6% | 0% H | | Mtn | | | None |
| TELKWA | Winfield | 4406 | 32% | 10% | | | HTSIH | high fish values at mouth | WAP @ <25 years >15% |
| TORKEELSON | Torkelson | 14855 | 69% | 24% | | Flat | | | None |
| TORKEELSON | Tsezakwa | 9736 | 16% | 7% | | | | | None |
| TORKEELSON | West Babine | 22488 | 58% | 9% H | | Flat | | composite of watersheds | WAP only on required watersheds (9-mile, and 5-mile) |
| TROUT CK | Toboggan | 10852 | 26% | 5% H | | Mtn | | high fishery investment with hatchery past problems with agric., railway and forestry | WAP |
| TROUT CK | Trout | 13861 | 53% | 14% | | | HTSIH | | None |

