# ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROGRAM
# Rocky Mountain Trench

# NATURAL DISTURBANCE TYPE 4

# Five Year Plan
# 2010-2015

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**
**May 21st 2010**

**Approved by _____Date:_____**
**Tony Wideski,**
**District Manager Rocky Mountain Forest District**
**Under Section 52 1) b) Forest and Range Practices Act**

# Rocky Mountain Trench

Ecosystem Restoration Program
Five Year Plan 2010-2015

List of Figures

List of Tables

# Chapter 1 Introduction

This plan outlines the process, management objectives and proposed Ecosystem Restoration projects for the Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Program. It should be noted at the start that although co-ordinated by the Ministry of Forests and Range out of the Rocky Mountain Forest District, the Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Program is a coalition of forest and range licensees, naturalist, hunting, angling and environmental clubs, and government agencies.

## 1.1 Definition of Ecosystem Restoration

The common definition of Ecosystem Restoration can be found at the Society for Ecological Restoration International website http://www.ser.org/

*Process of assisting the recovery of an ecosystem that has been degraded, damaged, or destroyed. Practice of restoring ecosystems* (Society for Ecological Restoration International [SERI] 2004).

In the context of the Rocky Mountain Trench the ecosystem in need of restoration is the treed grassland/ savannah that occupied the valley bottom prior to European settlement and the suppression of the natural fire regime. Fire return studies in the Trench refer to low intensity fires burning through the Douglas fir and Ponderosa Pine forests ever 5 to 20 years (Gray et al 2004, Gray, Daniels 2005)

## 1.2 Legal Mandate for Ecosystem Restoration

This plan has to meet the legal requirement of the Forest and Range Practices Act (FRPA), FRPA regulations, orders issued under the Government Action Regulations and the Kootenay Boundary Higher Level Plan Order (KBHLPO). This interaction of legal direction is complicated by the fact that the Kootenay Boundary Higher Level Plan order was drafted under the legal terms and regulations of the Forest Practices Code of BC Act.

In setting objectives for this program administrative law requires that some provisions in legislation override provisions in regulations. In this sense the hierarchy of legal precedence is the Kootenay Boundary Land Use Plan (KBLUP), FRPA and other legislation, regulations issued under FRPA and other Acts, Planning documents (approved FSPs, objectives set under previous Acts) and the Ecosystem Restoration Plan created for any Range Unit. The choice of measurables as directed to a great degree by the *Effectiveness Monitoring Plan for NDT4 Ecosystem Restoration in the East Kootenay Trench*, March 2002, by Marlene Machmer, Hillary Paige, Chris Steeger, Pandion Ecological Research, a protocol agreed to by most Ecosystem Restoration partners involved in the program

### 1.2.1 Kootenay Boundary Land Use Plan,

The consensus arrived at in the 1990s can be found contained in the final draft of the Kootenay Boundary Land Use Plan (KBLUP). The document and the implantation strategy can be found at
http://ilmbwww.gov.bc.ca/ilmb/lup/lrmp/soutern/Kootenay

Despite this the legally enforceable portion of the plan is contained the Kootenay Boundary Higher Level Plan Order declared in January 2003. It establishes Resource Management zones (corresponding to the six former Forest Districts in the Kootenay Region since reduced to 4) and 10 Resource Objectives to be met in each of the Resource Management Zones. They are:

1. Biodiversity emphasis
2. Mature and Old Forest Retention targets (based on Biogeoclimatic Zones)
3. Caribou habitat requirements
4. A variation to greenup heights
5. Grizzly Bear Habitat and Connectivity Corridors
6. Management of Consumptive Use streams
7. an Enhanced Resource development zone for Timber
8. Fire Maintained ecosystems (which outlines management in the area for Ecosystem Restoration)
9. Visual quality
10. Social and Economic stability.

As with every other program carrying out primary forest activities the Ecosystem Restoration program must write measures to address these objectives; these will be found in Section 3. If, in the opinion of the 5 year plan proponent the objective should not apply to the Ecosystem Restoration program than a rationale will be submitted for review and rejection or approval by the Rocky Mountain Forest District manager. The actual plan, backup documents and implantation strategy for the Kootenay Boundary Land Use Plan are used as known information in fleshing out the measures and strategies.

### 1.2.2 Forest and Range Practices Act

The Ecosystem Restoration Program is unique in that it does not fit clearly into any of the provisions of forest management contained the *Forest and Range Practices Act* yet the program cuts trees and harvests trees, builds roads, landings and fireguards, carries out silviculture operations and prescribed burns under a variety of programs. The following is a series of interpretations of the Act that must be considered in developing or evaluating this plan.

Under section 52 of the Act no trees may be cut or destroyed on crown land unless authorised by a license granted under the *Forest, Land* or *Parks* Acts. Harvest under *Forest Act* Licenses requires a Forest Stewardship Plan. Activities funded by basic government votes or the Forest Investment Account are authorised under this section. Unfortunately the majority of funding sources do not fall into this category and other authourity is required.

Under Section 52.1 the Minister may authorise cutting trees for silviculture, stand tending, fuel abatement, forest health or other reasons. Ecosystem Restoration falls into this category and the Rocky Mountain District Manager has requested that the review and comment period of the five year plan as well as the final five year plan document approximate the same rigour and content that a full Forest Stewardship Plan would meet. This would be the interpretation of Sections 1.2 to 4.01 of the Forest Planning and Practices Regulation issued under FRPA.

*Forest and Range Practices Act* is results oriented and has set objectives for timber, water, riparian/ fish habitat, wildlife, cultural heritage, soils, biodiversity, forage/ communities, recreation, visual quality and resource features. This plan drafts measures to address all these issues. It considers the measures laid out in Forest Planning and Practices and means to meet or exceed these measures as per section 1.2 and 2 of the Regulation. By signing this 5 year plan the District Manager approves the subsequent prescriptions and actions of the program so long as they follow this plan. If the Ministry of Forests and Range do not actually supervise or carry out the operations then a letter signed by the District Manager is required to allow operations to proceed as per Section 52.1b) Of the *Forest and Range Practices Act*.

### 1.2.3 Ungulate Winter Range

Two Government Act regulations dated February 10, 2005 (U-006 Cranbrook and U-008 Invermere) cover the ungulate Winter Range in Invermere and Cranbrook Timber Supply Areas. These Ungulate Winter Ranges completely overlap the NDT4- Ecosystem Restoration Area. It is this regulation that establishes the stocking standards for Open Range and Open Forest stands and it defines these two desired stand conditions by Biogeoclimatic ecosystem types. It is unlikely that exemptions will be required to this order as Ecosystem Restoration operational goals are consistent with the Ungulate Winter Range General Wildlife Measures.

Note too that one restoration unit is in Wildlife Management Area # 10 (East Columbia) established under section 4 of the Wildlife Act. To use the resources of this area will require the consent of the Regional Manager of the Ministry of Environment. The consent will be sought by the Ecosystem Restoration program and it should hopefully be given as it is the Ministry of Environment that as taken the lead on proposing works in this restoration unit.

### 1.2.4 Blue Print for Action

The goals of the Ecosystem Restoration Program in the Rocky Mountain Trench (RMT) are taken from the executive of the "Blueprint for Action". The Blue print for Action is the summary document put forward by the RMT Natural Disturbance Type 4 Steering Committee; it is not legal direction but it is known information put forward by citizen groups to interprets the mandate of the Kootenay Boundary Land Use Plan (KBLUP). As it has been agreed to by all Ecosystem Restoration partners it is used in this plan as direction towards a common goal.

**Vision:**

A restored Trench Landscape functioning at its ecological potential and thereby supporting:

- The native and historical and condition matrix of trees plants and animals
- A sustainable forage resource for wild and domestic grazing ungulates and
- The social economic and cultural needs of stakeholders as they relate to the open range and open forests of the Trench

**The Mission:**

1. Progressively restore the designated 118,500 hectares of the Trench to an ecologically appropriate fire maintenance condition by 2030, in accordance with tree stocking standards for open range and open forest sites.

2. Maintain the restored 118,500 hectares in an open range or open forest condition in perpetuity.

This document breaks this direction into 20 objectives with measurable targets, design criteria for prescribers and monitoring procedures.

This Ecosystem Restoration program mandated a Steering Committee to oversee progress and find funding for the projects required to carry out the restoration of the grasslands and open forests. The members of this Committee are representatives from:

- The Ministry of Forests and Range
- Parks Canada
- Rocky Mountain Trench Natural Resources Society
- Range Advisory Committee
- Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program
- Kootenay Livestock Association
- BC Wildlife Federation
- Tembec Industries
- Ministry of Agriculture and Lands
- Ministry of Environment

To carry out the fine details of project development and implementation an Operations Committee was also struck. Members are;

- Ministry of Forests and Range
- Rocky Mountain Trench Natural Resources Society
- Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program (Columbia Basin)
- Galloway Lumber Company Ltd.
- BC Parks Branch
- BC Timber Sales
- Tembec Industries
- Ministry of Agriculture and Lands
- Ministry of Environment
- The Nature Trust of BC
- The Nature Conservancy of Canada

# Chapter 2 Process of Plan Development and referral

## 2.1 Goals of program

The goals of the program is contained the Blueprint for Action and involves progressively treating the 118,500 hectares contained in the NDT4 operating areas until all hectares are in a mosaic of open range and open forest types by the year 2030. The goal by forest type are summarised in table 2.1. The blue print for action also targets 4500 hectares of treatment per year. The target numbers were derived by a GIS algorithm being run on the entire NDT4 area (some 250,000 hectares) in the Rocky Mountain Trench. The details of the algorithm are found in section 3.1 Timber.

Table 2.1 Targets of forest types to be achieved by the Ecosystem Restoration Program by 2030 (source Blueprint for Action 2006)

| | Percentage of Trench NDT4 Area (%) 250,000 ha | | | Area in 2030 (ha) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Forest type | As of 1998 | As of 2004 | As of 2030 | |
| Shrub lands | 5 | 1 | 5 | 12,500 |
| Open Range | 10 | 12 | 17 | 43,500 |
| Open Forest | Combined as 85% | 26 | 30 | 75,000 |
| Managed Forest | | 61 | 48 | 119,000 |

## 2.2 Prioritisation process and table of results

In order to focus operations to achieve this goal the NDT4 Operations Committee drafted criteria to prioritise 14 Range Units in the Rocky Mountain Trench. These 14 units comprise about 80% of the entire NDT4 area. In a series of 6 meetings over the winter of 2005 to 2006 the multi sector committee came to a consensus over the relative score for each range unit. The end results are tabulated in table 2.2 and 2.3. The remaining twenty one range units should be scored by 2010 and the scores of these 14 range units revisited in 2009.

Note also that the prioritisation score is one of many factors in scheduling, funding or inclement weather may delay projects going forward. It is also desirable to spread out projects within the same restoration or range unit so that operations of range or forest licensees are not disturbed and that a steady supply of habitat features (snags, rejuvenated shrubs etc.) are provided across the landscape on a more or less steady stream.

Table 2.2 Prioritisation rating for Ecosystem Restoration Treatments for 14 Restoration Units in Rocky Mountain Trench

| Range Unit | Score | Fire Interface | | Non Game Sp | | Ungulates | | Biodiversity | | Forage Crunch | Planning | Economical | Regional Priority |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | L | C | L | C | L | C | L | C | | | | |
| Possible Scores | 170 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E. Columbia Lake | 116 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 20 |
| TaTa Skook | 119 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Powerplant | 119 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Newgate | 114 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 10 |
| Dutch-Findlay | 110 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Westside | 110 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| St. Mary's | 108 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Cherry Tata | 106 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Waldo-south half | 103 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Premier Ridge | 101 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Windermere/ Sinclair | 98 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Gold-Plumbob | 95 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 10 |
| Sheep Cr North | 93 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Peckham's | 92 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Rampart & Tokay | 86 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 10 |
| Colvalli | 78 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 10 |
| Windermere-Fairmont | 73 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 20 | 10 | 10 |
| Wild Horse-Lewis Cr | 68 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 10 |
| Lewis/Wolf | 62 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Findlay | 52 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 20 | 10 | 10 |
| Pickering Hills | 88 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 0 | 20 | 20 |

Table 2.3 Legend to interpret Table 2.2

| | **Description** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Fire Interface** | Based on Spotting Potential | 5,4,3,2,1 | | |
| | | | | |
| **Non Game Sp** | Based on R & E Species; Excludes Big Horn Sheep | | | |
| | | | | |
| **Game Sp.** | Based on % of Class 1 Winter Range for Elk and Big Horn Sheep | | | |
| | | | | |
| **Biodiversity** | Based on listed Plant Communities | | | |
| | | | | |
| **Forage crunch** | Based on forage shortages for cattle and wildlife | 10 =Serious forage shortage | 5=Minor forage shortage | 0= No Noted Forage shortage |
| | | | | |
| **Planning** | Based on planning constraints (includes integrating with HCTF, CBFWCP, Range Use Plans) | 20 = No planning constraints | 10 = Minor planning Constraints | 0 = Major Planning Constraints |
| | | | | |
| **Economical** | Based on economic constraints | 20 = No Economic constraints | 10 = Minor Economic Constraints | 0 = Major Economic Constraints |
| | Refers to best outcome for cost expended | | | |
| **Regional Priority** | Based on Stakeholder Priorities | 20 = High | 10 = Medium | 0 = Low |
| | | | | |
| | L= Likelihood of unfavourable outcome | **Note that Likelihood and Consequences are multiplied not added to reach a score** | | |
| | C= Consequences of unfavourable outcome | | | |

## 2.3 Description of default operations

- The past 20 years of range burning and ecosystem restoration operations have created a body of experience that points to several efficiencies and a standard sequence of treatments to show the best results. For planning and budgeting purposes it is important to note them here. Frequent surveys are required to check the effectiveness of the treatment and to feed into a monitoring feedback loop that will be reviewed annually by the operations and steering committees to ensure that the program is constantly improving.

- The efficiencies found are
  - It is easier to control stocking of trees by logging and slashing than by burns alone. Burns hot enough to kill trees can usually burn off the grass and seed bank found in the soil.
  - Logging can increase forage production by as much as three fold but there is another increase of forage by combining a followup burn with logging.
  - The unit cost of treatments, especially prescribed burning decrease with larger blocks. An optimum size for a moderately complex block in the trench is about 300 to 400 hectares. Sixty hectares is about the maximum size that can be lit up by a hand light crew in one day. Blocks over 400 hectares will require two helicopters to complete the burn one day. Aerial Ignition Devices (Rocky Mountain District has three) are preferred as they ignite the understory and not the tree canopy. An aerial drip torch can be used to ignite the canopy but it is a slower treatment and a refuel crew is needed.
  - The North Waldo Pilot Project has shown there is considerable treatment efficiencies in combining the slashing of the block with logging. At 40m3/ha of sawlog and about 10-15m3/h of pulpwood the pilot showed a minor profit of logging and slashing in good log markets and a break even in poor log markets.
  - The Central pasture project has shown that it is cheaper to use feller bunchers and grapple skidders to get wood to roadside than conventional hand felling and piling. The end product is cleaner with less slash to burn and it increases the possibility of selling the wood as pulp, sawlog or hog fuel.
  - From both projects it is preferred to take wood to a landing or roadside for a cleaner block, less smoke management issues, better marketing opportunity and cheaper rehabilitation f roadside areas versus burning widely scattered burn piles. Typically burns follow slashing by two years so typically the Ministry of Forests and Range would have two years to market the semi logged, decked wood.
  - To decrease operational costs and fire guard construction it is best to treat a “logical burn unit” a block that ends in easily defended fire boundaries that respects topography, fence lines, road systems and reserve areas while still allowing good burn operations and the ability to set up convection columns.

The Preferred default treatment regime is:

- Outline a logical burn unit. Year 1
- Carry out the field work for an Ecosystem Restoration prescription, includes a review of conditions and the site by a biologist. Year 1
- Refer the projects January- March Year 2

- In high probability archaeological polygons either avoid damaging the site or hire and archaeologist for a preliminary field reconnaissance April to September Year 2
- It is preferable to log and slash the block simultaneously in summer to late winter year 2.
- Note that slashing of Ponderosa pine stands should occur only after cattle are off site (Ingesting Ponderosa pine needles can cause cattle to abort their foetuses).
- Hand slashing should be late fall prior to snowfall; snow makes heavier work for a crew, and increases high stumps and live limbs.
- Mechanical thinning of stands should be carried out on snow pack especially in archaeologically or ecologically sensitive sites. Note that this phase should include quality plots that carry out tree counts to ensure the correct stand structure is being retained.
- Debris should be left to cure on site two years before the initial broadcast burn in year 4
- A Post treatment plot survey should be carried out to ascertain burn intensity and tree count. Year 4.
- Maintenance burn should be scheduled every ten years south of Skookumchuck and every 15 years north of it. To fine tune the actual timing of routine maintenance surveys should be done every five years.

## 2.4 Consultation with First Nations

All government and licensee operations using natural resources and the land base are required to consult with First Nations to discuss their concerns. The Ecosystem Restoration program will follow government guidelines and processes for these consultations and allow at least 60 days for the response to the request for consultation.

## 2.5 Referral to stakeholders

All other stakeholders will be sent letters requesting input to the plan. Details of who was contacted and their timing for response are summarised in table 2.4. To facilitate the review it was decided to hold open houses to present maps and tables to the stakeholders. With few high speed internet cables in the Trench very few stakeholders can download the large ma files associated with these plans. If the stakeholders cannot make the open houses but still respond to the invitation letter then other methods of input (emails, field trips etc.) will be considered and carried out.

The list of stakeholders, ranges licensees, Forest Licensees, guide outfitters, trappers, municipalities, community groups, utilities, Conservation Programs, recreation organisations are noted in list kept on file 22000-20/ERP 2010. Their responses and comments are summarised and presented in Appendix II. An effort has been made to all known water licensees downstream of proposed projects for the 2010-2015 time frame. The list is short as there are few defined streams in the NDT4 area. The Water branch supplied list of water licences and their location is, after three years of using it field, proving to be somewhat inaccurate in location and addresses.

Table 2.4 Timetable and Summary of referral and consultation process for Five Year Plan Ecosystem Restoration Program

| Activity | Group | Date | Location (and Media with respect to Pubic Review | Comments Received Y/N | Date |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| First Nation Consultation | K'tunaxa Nation Council | February 23rd 2010 | Invitational letter | | |
| First Nation Consultation | Shuswap Band Council | February 23rd 2010 | Invitational letter | | |
| Stakeholder referrals | | | | | |
| Forest Licensees referral | Galloway Timber Company Ltd.<br>BC Timber Sales<br>Tembec Industries Ltd<br>Canfor- Radium Division<br>Nupqu Development Corporation | October 28th, 2009 | Referral letter all licensees | See Appendix II | |
| Range Licensees | All affected by proposals (see list Appendix II) | October 28th, 2009 | Referral letters to affected ranchers | See Appendix II | |
| Utilities | BC Hydro and Power Authourity<br>Trans Canada Transmission<br>Ministry of Transportation and Highways | October 28th, 2009 | Referral letters | None, See Appendix II | |
| Trappers | All affected by plans see | October 27th, 2009 | Referral letters to | None | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Appendix II for total list 2010-2015 | | affected trappers | | |
| Guide Outfitters | All affected by plans 2010-2015, see Appendix II for complete list | October 28th, 2009 | Referral letters to affected guide outfitters | None | |
| Christmas Tree Permitees | All permitees, see Appendix II for complete list | October 28th, 2009 | Referral letters to active Christmas Tree Permitees | Omit part of Lake Eileen project. Meeting with Christmas Tree Association | Meeting February 25th |
| Water Licensees | All affected by plans 2010-2015 See Appendix II for list | February 22nd, 2010 | Referral letters to affected water licensees | See Appendix II | Note 11 licensees moved, 5 POD incorrectly mapped |
| Local Governments | City of Cranbrook<br>City of Kimberley<br>District of Invermere<br>Village of Radium<br>Regional District of East Kootenay<br>Interior Health-Health Protection Services | October 28th, 2009 | Referral letters to affected municipalities | None | |
| Associations/ NGOs | The Nature Trust<br>The Nature Conservancy of Canada<br>The Land Conservancy<br>East Kootenay Conservation Program<br>Cranbrook Community Forest chair | October 28th, 2009 | Referral letters | See Appendix II | Map meeting held February 3rd 2010 |
| Fire chiefs and concerned Citizens | See Appendix II for full list | October 30, 2009 | Referral Letters | See Appendix II | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Agencies | Kootenay National Park<br>Integrated Land Management Bureau<br>Ministry of Tourism, Sports and the Arts<br>East Kootenay Community Heath Services | October 27th, 2009 | Referral letters | See Appendix II | |
| Open Houses | Invermere<br>Cranbrook<br>Jaffray | November 27, 2009<br>November 24, 2009<br>November 26, 2009 | Open Houses in each town | See Appendix II | |
| Second intake of projects | Range Licensees affected NB proposed by local communities under Community Wildfire Plans | Week of March 4th, 2010 | Telephone | See Appendix II | |
| Second intake of projects | Forest Licensees, Ministry of Environment, The Nature Trust, The Nature Conservancy | February 5th, 2010 | Map meeting | Specific comments; Field trips set, See Appendix II | |
| Second intake of projects | Regional District of East Kootenay | March 16th, 2010 | Meeting with Trench Society, Wildfire Management Branch | See Appendix II | |
| Approval | Ministry of Environment Cranbrook | May 24, 2010 | Request for letter of authourity for East Columbia | Expected by May 31st, 2010 | |
| Expected Approval | Cranbrook, Ministry of Forests and Range District Manager | March 21 2010 | Meet to present plan | Expected by May 31st, 2010 | |

# Chapter 3 Protection of Resources

## 1. TIMBER:

O**bjective**:

1. For the treated areas reduce tree density, increase tree size and achieve a tree species composition that falls within the historical range of variability.

    **a. Legal Reference:** KLUP Management Guidelines for NDT4 ecosystems, Ungulate Winter Range (UWR) order 4-006 and 008, Forest Planning and Practices Regulation (FPPR) section 6 and 41-46.2 Forest and Range Practices Act 149 (1)

    **b. Measurable:** Open Forest stands shall produce 50% of their volume potential, this half production is estimated to be 70 m3/ha in a 100 year rotation. No merchantable volume is expected from Open Range stands.

    **c. Measurable:** Open Range stands are to maintain 0-75 stems/ha on site with a target of 20 stems/ha while maintaining largest trees on site emphasizing trees greater than 30cm DBH.

    **d. Measurable:** Open Forest stands are to maintain 76 to 400 stems/ha on sites with a target of 150 stems/ha while maintaining largest trees on site emphasizing trees greater than 30cm DBH. One third of trees retained are to be from largest diameter class present on site.

    **e. Discussion**

    i. Larch is to be reserved from cutting as its prevalence has been decreased by historic logging and fire suppression.

    ii. Aspen stands should be reserved from cutting given their wildlife and biodiversity value. Burning should rejuvenate the stand when the stand shows signs of rot or senescence or destructive wildlife impacts.

    iii. Further to the wildlife tree section; as a default all trees over 30cm DBH (40cm Diameter Stump Height (DSH)) should be reserved from cutting so as to recruit more wildlife trees. Cutting the trees over this diameter limit must be rationalised in the Ecosystem Restoration Prescription.

    iv. As a default trees should be retained in clumps rather than uniformly across the landscape. In Open forest areas retain clumps of trees to an average of 150 stems per hectare in clumps of 5 to 20 trees with 10 to 15 clumps/hectare. In Open Range units retain 5 to 10 stems per clump with 5 to 8 clumps per hectare spaced about one tree length apart. Vary this dependant on site and stand characteristics.

    v. Clumps of retained trees should be concentrated in wetter site series (riparian areas, swales, depressions, toe slope positions) or around clusters of veteran, large diameter or high value wildlife trees.

    vi. The KBLUP Implementation Strategy contains the equivalent for of guidelines for fire maintained ecosystems to be considered for management.

1. Re-entry for mechanical treatment or maintenance burns is targeted at 10% crown closure in Open Range and 40% in Open Forest.
2. Minimum inter tree spacing is set at 1.5 metres.
3. The early and late free growing window is set at 2-5 years after disturbance for all Open Range and Open Forest stands. Note that as per discussion with forest licensees the Ecosystem Restoration Program shall take over management of an NDT4 site of the forest licensee completes a survey showing that Open Forest or Open Range status has been achieved.
4. Reforestation in NDT4 sites shall be by natural regeneration.

vii. As per previous discussion with forest licensees the Ecosystem Restoration program shall manage a plantation established under previous silviculture obligations as managed forest until a commercial crop (sawlog or pulpwood) can be taken off the site. If the site can be classified as Open Range or Open Forest the site shall then be reclassified managed the appropriate standards. The intent is to recapture public investment in the plantation crop. If logistics of prescribed burning or other Ecosystem Restoration treatments require an earlier entry into the stand then the Ecosystem Restoration program will discuss this with the prescribing forest licensee.

viii. Classifying the NDT4 area of the RMT into Managed Forest Open Forest and Open Range was carried defined by the KBLUP Implementation Strategy Task force in 1998. Open Range was defined as forest cover polygons inside the Natural Disturbance Type 4 area with the following characteristics:

1. Open Range, meadow, cultivated, Non Productive Forest types
2. areas with Environmentally Sensitive Areas with classifications of p1 and p 2 (regeneration difficulty)
3. dry warm aspects (135-270 degrees) with a site index <13 and
4. neutral aspects (270-315 degrees or 90-135 degrees or flat land) with site index <13

ix. Open Forest types are defined in the same study as

1. dry warm aspects (135-270 degrees) with site index 13-17
2. neutral aspects (270-315 degrees or 90-135 degrees or flat land) with site index of 13-17
3. cool moist aspects (315-90 degrees) with site index<10
4. any other Ponderosa pine BEC units excluding those in Open Range classifications

x. Managed forests are defined in the same study as

1. dry warm aspects (135-270 degrees) with site index >17
2. neutral aspects (270-315 degree or 90-135 degrees or flat land) with site index >17
3. cool moist aspects (315-90 degrees) with site index >10
4. any other areas within NDT4 area not defined as open range open forest.

xi. Note also that the Ungulate Winter Range Orders 4-006 and 008 defines open range and forest through BEC units. This should be used as an the best methodology for defining open range and open forest and to distinguish both from Managed Forest.

Table 3.1.1 Open Range and Open Forest defined by Biogeoclimatic zone variant and sites series as per Ungulate Winter Range orders UWR-4-006 (Cranbrook) and 008 (Invermere)

| Habitat Type | Concept Definition | Intended Field Verified Ecosystem Units |
|---|---|---|
| Open Range | Lands ecologically suited to production of bunchgrass and dry land shrub species. Snow accumulations are typically low. (includes existing open range, meadows, cultivated and similar cover classes with </= 10% tree crown closure | PPdh2, 02a, 02b, 01<br>IDFdm2, un, 02, 03<br>IDFdm2a, un2, 02<br>MSdk 02<br>ICHdm, 02 (&rock talus sites) |
| Open Forest | Lands ecologically suited for production of large crowned trees in an open forest with bunchgrass and dry land shrub species. Snow accumulations are typically light. (typically </= 40% tree crown closure, multi-storied stand structure and low stocking levels) | PPdh2, 03, 04<br>IDFdm2, un, 01 warm and neutral sites <1000m (except in LUs I32, I35 and I38)<br>IDFdm2a, un2, 03 with Fd leading<br>MSdk 03 with Fd leading,<br>ICHdw 02<br>ICHdm, 03 with Fd leading<br>ICHmk1 except Golden 02<br>ESSFdk 02, ICHwk1, 02, ICHvk1 02 |

**f. Monitoring**

i. Effectiveness Monitoring: Over story retention shall be monitored as per Page 2006 Monitoring report (Page 2006)

ii. Routine Monitoring: Over story retention shall be counted after every tree modification treatment (thinning, burn or logging) by one 5.64 metre radius plot per hectare (maximum of 60 plots per treatment unit) coupled with a Basal Area Factor (BAF) 2 prism sweep. Trees are to be tallied by species, total stems/ ha, tree class and diameter to 5 centimetre diameter classes at breast height. Process shall be as per Rocky Mountain Forest District Standard Operating Procedure #8.

## 2. UNDERSTORY (GRASSES, FORBS SHRUBS):

**Objective**:

1. Maintain or increase fire adapted native vegetation in treated areas.
2. Maintain or increase palatable grass and shrub production in treated areas.
   - **a. Legal Reference**; None specific to grasses or forage production, Ministry of Forests and Range is to maintain the productivity of the forest and range resources of BC as per Ministry of Forests and Range Act preamble.
   - **b. Measurable:** Increase the native grass and forb plant cover by 25% within ten years of initial burn treatment. Measurement of the increase shall be determined by photo plots taken during routine monitoring that will be calibrated by effectiveness monitoring plots where actual measurements will be taken.
   - **c. Measurable:** Increase forage biomass production by 5% within 5 years of initial burn treatment.
   - **d. Measurable:** increase the forage biomass of valuable decreaser (e.g. Saskatoon berry, rose spp., ceanothus, chokecherry) shrubs by 25% cover in treated areas within 5 years. The need for these shrubs should be specified in site specific plans.
   - **e. Measurable:** Burn off and reduce 75% of shrub biomass in treated areas where site specific plans do not require the shrubs as forage component.
   - **f.** Discussion
     i. Grazing by wild and domestic ungulates should be modified to accommodate Ecosystem Restoration treatments by allowing a fine fuel build up the year before a fire. Similarly grazing use should be light the year following a broadcast burn to protect the new growth.
     ii. Range licensee to follow a sustainable Range Use plan as approved by Rocky Mountain Forest District Manager.
     iii. Initially, until better inventory data is available, the rough fescue/ Idaho fescue/ blue bunch wheatgrass is to be used as the default community to be increased. The figure of 25% is a program wide goal and it is recognised that this will vary by site.
     iv. Ministry of Environment should take action to reduce homesteading ungulates (i.e. elk that do not leave their winter range in the summer months) and reduce overgrazing by wildlife.
   - **g. Monitoring**
     i. Effectiveness Monitoring: Under story species composition and forage production shall be monitored as per Pandion 2002 report
     ii. Routine Monitoring: Additional monitoring of under story species composition and production on specified sensitive sites shall be monitored using the methodology in Pandion 2002 report. Prescribers are to carefully record pre treatment cover of all species, forage or not, in plot notes. Prescribers are to establish photo plots as per routine monitoring procedure to illustrate vegetative changes.

## 3. RIPARIAN/ WETLANDS:

**Objective:**

1. Maintain and or restore the integrity of riparian and wetland areas in and adjacent to treated areas.

**a Legal Reference:** Forest and Range Practices Act 149 (1) Forest Planning and Practices Regulation 8and 12 (3). Forest Planning and Practices Regulation Sections 47 – 58: 52(2) and 53 specify retention; section 57 identifies need to not damage stream, section 56 no damage to natural drainage pattern. No Lakeshore management zones under Forest and Range Practices Act section 7 and 1812 or FPC

i. EPR agrees to follow sections 47 to 51, 52 (2), 53-58 of FPPR with enhancements noted below

**b. Measurable:** All streams, wetlands and lakes shall be identified and classified in the Ecosystem Restoration Prescription for each treatment area as per Forest Practices Code (FPC) Stream Classification Guidebook and Riparian Management Guidebook.

**c. Measurable:** Where wetland management is called for wetlands shall be further classified with McKenzie, W.H. and J.H. Moran. 2004. Wetlands of British Columbia: a guide to identification. Res. Br., BC Min For., Victoria, BC Land Management Handbook No. 52.

**d. Measurable** Within each riparian management area, activities shall follow the best management practices contained in the Riparian Management Guidebook namely:

i. Retain all under story shrubs and suppressed and intermediate trees in all Riparian Management Areas.
ii. Retain all dominant and co-dominant trees in all Riparian Reserve Zones, except where provisions of FRPA require harvest. (i.e. safety or road construction)
iii. In general the Ecosystem Restoration program will not harvest or disturb the riparian management area unless there is an operational, windthrow control, riparian restoration or forest health reason to do so. Rationale to do so shall be specified in the Ecosystem Restoration Prescription
iv. If tree removal is required any on section of the Riparian Management Zones, Ecosystem Restoration Prescription will retain between 0 and 100% of the dominant and co-dominant trees but on average each Logical Burn Unit will maintain retention levels as per tables 3.3.1, 3.3.2 and 3.3.3:

**e. Discussion:**

i. In areas of heavy grazing or recreation pressure, trees or other obstacles may be placed into the riparian management zone to reduce trafficability so as to protect streams whose banks may be negatively impacted by trampling or vehicle traffic
ii. All streams are required to have the integrity of the bank maintained during and after operations. As a rule this is understood to be a 5 metre

machine free zone from the bank (as measured from the stream's high water mark) or to harvest on a snow pack sufficient to protect the bank.

iii. Natural drainage pattern shall be maintained for classified and non classified drainages.

iv. The intent of variable retention is to retain trees where they are most required. Streams with marginal fish habitat or no consumptive water use habitat could have lower rates of retention than areas of better fish or wildlife habitat potential. In general highest rates of retention should occur where:
   a) Stream is in a Community or Consumptive Use Watershed.
   b) The stream is known to be a temperature sensitive stream (none in Rocky Mountain Forest District)
   c) The stream is designated to be fishery sensitive (as of 2006 only the Palliser River in the Rocky Mountain Forest District is so designated)
   d) Large organic debris is critical to the functioning of the stream
   e) The stream is, or is directly tributary, to a stream of high fish value
   f) The control of water or stream bank protection is a priority on the stream (e.g. an S5 or S6 with a 30% gradient flowing directly into fish habitat where trees and are critical to stream bank stability)

v. Non Classified Drainages are water bodies that do not fit the legal definition of streams but may still pose water control problems. Objectives here are to maintain stream bank stability similar to classifiable streams and to retain all shrubs and co-dominant trees within 10 metres of the stream bank.

vi. Stream crossings should be at designated crossings. All S1 to S4 crossings should be crossed by a bottomless structure so that no in stream work is required and disruption to fish habitat and water quality is minimal. This will also negate the need for an in stream work permit from the Ministry of Environment. In non fish bearing streams the crossings should be by box culvert, pipe culvert or clean log bundles with appropriate sedimentation control. Removal of structures should occur before the first spring freshet following the harvest and the deconstruction should remove all likely sediment sources from the natural water course and restore the original bank and channel configuration

**f. Monitoring protocol**

i. Effectiveness Monitoring; monitor riparian integrity as per Pandion 2002 report.

ii. Routine Monitoring: Riparian tree and shrub retention shall be evaluated during all harvest, slashing and burning treatments inspections. Photo plots will be re-examined for riparian retention and deterioration during subsequent visits.

Table 3.3.1 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 (% of pre treatment basal area) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| S1A | > 100 m | Fish bearing, CW | 0 | 100 | 50 windfirm overall 20 |
| S1A | >20 < 100 | Fish bearing, CW | 50 | 20 | 50 windfirm overall 20 |
| S2 | >5 < 20m | Fish bearing, CW | 30 | 20 | 50 of windfirm overall 20 |
| S3 | >1.5 <5 m | Fish bearing, CW | 20 | 20 | 50 of windfirm overall 20 |
| S4 | < 1.5 m | Fish bearing, CW | 0 | 30 | 25 (10m reserve preferred) |
| S5 | > 3 m | Non fish | 0 | 30 | 25 of windfirm overall 10 |
| S6 | < 3 m | Non Fish | 0 | 20 | 5 of windfirm overall 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 3.3.2 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 | 40 wind firm overall 10 |
| W2 | > 1 ha | PP | 10 | 20 | 70 wind firm overall 25 |
| W3 | <5 >1 ha | IDFdm, MS | 0 | 30 | 40 wind firm overall 10 |
| W4 | < .25 > 1 ha | PP | 0 | 30 | 70 wind firm overall 25 |
| W5 | A wetland complex of over 5 ha size | All | 10 | 40 | 70 wind firm overall 25 |

Table 3.3.3 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 overall |
| L1 B | 5 to 1000 ha | All | 10 | | 25 overall |
| L2 | >1<5 ha | PP | 10 | 20 | 70 wind firm overall 25 |
| L3 | >1<5 ha | IDFdm, MS | 0 | 30 | 40 wind firm overall 10 |
| L4A | >.25<1 ha | PP | 0 | 30 | 70 wind firm overall 25 |
| L4B | >.5<1 ha | CDF, CWH dry | 0 | 30 | 40 wind firm overall 10 |

## 4. COMMUNITY AND CONSUMPTIVE USE WATERSHEDS:

**Objective**:

1. Do not impair the quality of domestic or irrigation water supplies

**a. Legal Reference:** Forest and Range Practices Act 149 (1) Forest Planning and Practices Regulation 8 .2 and 59 -63 speaks to community watersheds. Objective 6 Kootenay Boundary Land Use Plan (KBLUP) also establishes consumptive use stream. No water quality objectives have been set for Rocky Mountain Trench

**b. Measurable;** Referrals will be sent to water licensees, during the 5 year plan referral process, if a classifiable stream connects the POD to the Ecosystem Restoration treatment area.

**c. Measurable;** Notify the water licensee prior to commencing work in a designated community watershed.

**d. Measurable;** Ecosystem Restoration Program shall abide by watershed assessments created for any consumptive use or community watershed in the NDT4 area.

**e. Measurable:** As per section 59, 60 and 61 of FPPR Ecosystem Restoration program will control sediment through out project areas by grass seeding exposed mineral soil within one growing season of disturbance, carry out no soil disturbance works within 100 metres upstream of all consumptive water intakes and take care to damage no water works infrastructure.

**f. Measurable:** Increase riparian retention in consumptive use watershed and extend the streamside management zone to 30 metres from the high water mark of the stream or the top of an inner gorge as per section 6 of the Kamloops Boundary Higher Level Plan Order. Site specific recommendations to maintain soil and stream bank stability will be specified within the Ecosystem Restoration prescription for any block that occurs upstream of a water intake.

**g. Discussion**

i. Impact to watersheds typically come as a result of riparian reserve harvest and increased stream instability, input of sediment or increases in harvest causing a change in the peak flow (FPC 1995c). Ecosystem Restoration Program operations should not be creating a risk to watersheds as:

1. As per the riparian section of the Objectives matrix the Ecosystem Restoration Program shall be maintaining a enhanced riparian buffers in these watersheds. The Ecosystem Restoration Program shall be exposing mineral soil for fireguards with a minimum addition of roads for small scale harvesting. As per the Invasive Plants section of the Objectives Matrix Ecosystem Restoration Program is committed to rapid revegetation of denuded sites. The avoidance of sediment near water intakes has already been made and will be adhered to.

2. The Ecosystem Restoration Program does not produce clearcuts but a select harvest of trees. The select harvests will increase snow catch and subsequent spring runoff. The shading of the selectively harvested stand will slow the spring runoff and decrease the risk of creating an earlier higher peak in spring run off.

ii. Note that the elevation contour which 60% of the land area of a drainage is above, is called the H 60 line. When the elevation of melting snow climbs up the hill and the snow line reaches the H60 elevation, peak spring flow occurs. Tree removals below the H60 line have less impact to peak flow than tree removals above this line. Most of the consumptive streams in question originate in the higher portions of the Rocky and Purcell Mountains. Most of the Ecosystem Restoration operating area is well below the H60 for these creeks and impact to peak flows should be minimal (Gluns 2001).

iii. The removal of trees from these watersheds is will reduce evapotranspiration and this put more water in the groundwater (Hewlett 1982) system. This will make more water available for recharging wells, streams and wetlands. This would have a beneficial effect for water users and the red and blue listed species dependant ion riparian areas.

iv. Nearly all Ecosystem Restoration plan areas are downstream of the water intake for the consumptive streams shown on KBLUP map 6.1

v. To comply with the Domestic watershed objective of KBLUP, all Ecosystem Restoration prescriptions shall be reviewed for the presence of down stream domestic water Points of Diversion (POD) ARCVIEW map layer available from the Land and Resource Data Warehouse through MAPVIEW. There will no soil disturbance within 100 metres upstream of a point of diversion. The Ecosystem Restoration program will not treat into a 30 metre wide RMA upstream of a domestic water POD unless hydrologic opinion is sought. Referrals will be sent to water licensees, during the 5 year plan referral process, if a classifiable stream connects the POD to the Ecosystem Restoration treatment area.

**h. Monitoring:** Maintain referral and notification documentation on the 5 year plan file and opening file. The area around water intakes is to be checked during operations and the riparian monitoring process followed.

## 5. OLD GROWTH MANAGEMENT AREAS (OGMA):

**Objective**:

1. Maintain or recruit old growth characteristics on all treatment areas-

**a. Legal Reference**: Forest and Range Practices Act 149 (1) Forest Planning and Practices Regulation section 9 and 64-65. KBLUP Management Guidelines for NDT4 systems (Implementation Strategy). Objective 1 (Biodiversity Emphasis Option), 2 (Mature and Old forest), 4 (Greenup), 5 (Grizzly Bear Habitat and Connectivity Corridors) 8 (Fire Maintained Ecosystems) KBLUP. See variances for KBLUP objectives 2, 4 and 5

**b. Measurable** Ecosystem Restoration Program shall maintain the OGMAs as laid out by ILMB in a map product produced in 2006, and will thin and burn them only to maintain function and stand health.

**c. Measurable;** The Ecosystem Restoration program shall consult map 5.2 showing movement corridors in laying out retention strategies at the landscape and Range Unit level. These movement corridors shall not consist of unbroken dense forest canopy as intimated by the implementation strategy but denser concentrations of retained forests in Managed forest polygons, wildlife tree patches, draws, gulleys or imbedded retention areas so as to facilitate wildlife movement at a landscape level. Large unbroken closed forest in the NDT4 area would contradict direction given by Objective 8 of KBLUP Fire Maintained Ecosystems.

**d. Measurable** As per Objective 2 of the KBLUP From a current level of 26% of the stands in the NDT4 being > 100 years old and only 1% > 250 years old the Ecosystem Restoration area shall progress, over 100 years, to ;

i. 17% >100 years old and 13%>250 years old in low emphasis Landscape Units and
ii. 34%>100 years old and 13% > 250 years old in intermediate Landscape Units.

**e. Description**

i. Objective 1 of KBLUP establishes the Biodiversity Emphasis options of all the various landscape units in the Cranbrook and Invermere Timber Supply Areas. They will of course apply to the Ecosystem Restoration program as well as all other primary forest operations.
ii. Similarly Objective 4 applies to Ecosystem Restoration operations. As the Ecosystem Restoration program maintains a forest on site the green up height requirement should be a limiting factor in Ecosystem Restoration operations.
iii. Legally Old growth Management Areas are aspatial in the Rocky Mountain Trench NDT4 area. The spatial OGMAs provided by Integrated Land Management Bureau (ILMB) shall be respected as OGMA. Large trees will not be taken from them; any actions within their boundaries shall concentrate on thinning from below so as to maintain the function and health of the OGMA. In these cases:

1. All trees over 20cm diameter at stump height shall be reserved from cutting.
2. Piling of debris shall be more 10 metres or half a tree length from any tree over 30 centimetre at breast height or any high value wildlife tree.
3. Piling of debris shall be by hand or by machine on adequate snow cover or frozen soil conditions. The intent to prevent root damage.
4. Any machine use in an OGMA shall be on adequate snow cover or frozen soil conditions.
5. Excess fuel build up shall be screefed away from high value dead wildlife trees and tree over 50 centimetre diameter at breast height.

iv. As stands are spaced and thinned the average stand age will increase and speed the achievement of Objective listed in measurables above. The retention of larger trees in Ecosystem Restoration projects is expected to meet old growth requirements and characteristics for the Trench. Ecosystem Restoration treatment will create a healthier stand to be maintained in the long term.

v. As the retention strategy called for in the understory section of this plan is designed to mimic the natural pattern of forests the intent of the Movement Corridor Objective 5 under KBLUP should be met without a specific result or strategy. Retaining extra trees would contradict Objectives 8 Fire maintained Ecosystems.

vi. Ponderosa pine stems should be evaluated for their value as old growth using methodology pioneered in Colorado see:

1. Huckaby, Laurie Stroh; Kaufmann, Merrill R.; Fornwalt, Paula J.; Stoker, Jason M.; and Dennis, Chuck. 2003. **Field guide to old ponderosa pines in the Colorado Front Range.** Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-109. and
2. Huckaby, Laurie Stroh; Kaufmann, Merrill R.; Fornwalt, Paula J.; Stoker, Jason M.; and Dennis, Chuck. 2003a. **Identification and ecology of old ponderosa pine trees in the Colorado Front Range.** Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-110.

**f. Monitoring**: Interagency Management Committee is charged under KBLUP with monitoring the achievement of this goal. The Ecosystem Restoration program will provide information to the committee to this end.

## 6. PATCH SIZE DISTRIBUTION:

**Objective**:

1. Burn and treatment areas should approximate historic patch size distributions.

   **a. Legal Reference**: Forest and Range Practices Act 149 (1) Forest Planning and Practices Regulation section 9 and 64-65.; Objectives 1 (Biodiversity Emphasis) Objective 4 (Green up) KBLUP Management Guidelines for NDT4 Systems references Forest Practices Code Biodiversity guidebook targets.

   **b. Measurable**: The Ecosystem Restoration program is following the direction of the KBLUP NDT4 guidelines and the 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 and thus the Ecosystem Restoration program complies with the Forest and Range Practices Act as delineated in section 62 (2) (b) of the Forest and Range Practices Regulation.

   **c. Discussion**:

   i. The Biodiversity guidebook (FPC, 1995a) estimate of patch size distribution for NDT4 ecosystems specifies that 30-40% of the stands should be under 40 hectares in size, 30-40% of the stands between 40-80 hectares in size and 20-30% of the stands between 80 to 250 hectares in size.

   ii. Recent publications indicate that the NDT4 distribution may be simplistic and that the Rocky Mountain Trench may be a complex of mixed and low intensity fire regimes (RW Gray 2008; Blackwell et al, 2003) and that stand replacement patches may be much smaller than suggested by the biodiversity guidebook (Hessburg, et al 2007).

   iii. Recent studies in the Rocky Mountain Trench point to the open forest being created by the Ecosystem Restoration program is similar to the naturally occurring forests in the Trench (Gray 2001, Gray et al, 2002, Gray et al, 2004, Gray and Daniels, 2007, Gray, 2009, Stuart-Smith and Hendry, 1988).

   iv. The natural distribution is obscured by logging in the 1920's through 1970's, large fires in the 1930's, Christmas Tree Permit development from 1940's to the present as well as Douglas fir in growth and encroachment over the last 70 years. A base pattern and distribution must be researched and agreed to.

   **d. Monitoring:** This is a strategic landscape level analysis required every 5 years. Strong suggestion that ILMB and Ecosystem Restoration program co-operate to carry this out.

## 7. WILDLIFE TREES (WT):

**Objective**:

1. Increase or maintain the density and sizes of wildlife trees in treated areas.

**a. Legal Direction:** Forest and Range Practices Act 149 (1) and Forest Planning and Practices Regulation section 9.1 and 66. Section 66 requires to maintain 7% stand in Wildlife Tree Patch (WTP).

**b. Measurable:** Treatment will maintain or recruit 2 to 10 wildlife trees (over 30cm DBH, 40cm preferred) per hectare through out treatment cycle on open forest treated area. Tree species in descending order of preference are Ponderosa Pine, Western Larch, Douglas-fir, Trembling Aspen and Black Cottonwood (the latter if available).

**c. Measurable:** Recruited patches of snags and live trees will be in patches of .1 to 1.0 hectares rather than even distribution so as to proximate the natural occurrence of snags after a wildfire.

**d. Measurable:** The Ecosystem Restoration program shall maintain a Wildlife tree (WT) and WTP tracking layer as a feature class in the fmer database.

**e. Discussion**

i. The overstory retention of the Ecosystem Restoration program meets the retention of live green trees required by Section 66 of Forest Planning and Practices Regulation Ecosystem Restoration should meet the intent of Wildlife Tree retention as the trees reserved in Open Forests will be maintained and added to over the 100 year rotation of the stand to maintain 76 to 400stems per hectare. As well trees in Open Range Treatment Units will never be harvested. These trees must be live trees; the issue for Ecosystem Restoration to meet is to provide and recruit the snags required for cavity nesters and other wildlife

ii. Ecosystem Restoration program will set aside untreated areas or multi layered stand for site specific tied to a specific species or habitat need. There will be reserves set aside at the landscape level to reflect untreatable ground, Flammulated owl habitat, goshawk nests and riparian areas, but this figure is not likely to average out at 7% at the stand, but will be estimated at the Restoration Unit level. Some stands may require thinning from beneath to protect the entire stand from burning in a prescribed fire. This will be rationalised at stand level.

**e. Retention strategies**

i. The actual retention of snags and wildlife trees shall be documented by the Ecosystem Restoration program with landscape and stand level set asides recorded and mapped and the recording of stand structure retained after a broadcast burn is completed. A shortage of retention in one treatment due to windthrow or beetles shall be addressed by heavier retentions in remaining forests.

ii. All prescribers and contractors are required to note and work around high value wildlife trees and protect them with a no work zone.

iii. All Ecosystem Restoration prescriptions shall survey or inspect the treatment area prior to treatment to identify and ribbon out patches and trees with features important to cavity nesters. (see iv below) These features shall be recorded, the patches GPSd and protection or recruitment strategies specified in the prescription. Areas of good WTs or relatively dense snags should be prescribed as a WTP and ribboned out and protected during mechanical treatments. Location and boundaries should consider long term retention of the WTP with boundaries that can be easily defended during maintenance burns. The best location for a fire proof WTP would be 100 metres from south end of a burn, on the wet side of a burn (winds are generally prevailing from south an west) or on dry light fuel ridges or guarded by riparian areas or road systems. High value trees are to be retained wherever they are found, and protection strategies specified.

iv. Use tree species recommendations in Cooper et al 2004 when targeting WT retention or recruitment towards any Species at risk. Treatment should provide for future WT recruitment by leaving patches of the largest diameter stems available in the stand. The general high value trees to retain are:

i. Large diameter decay class 3-5 wildlife trees

ii. Trees with the presence of cavities, dead trees with broken tops, evidence of internal decay and largest available diameter classes (Machmer 2002)

iii. Reserve all class 1 to 5 wildlife trees with pileated woodpecker excavated holes.

iv. Large diameter thick bark Douglas-fir with thin crowned poor form “wolfy” trees with large branches and the bright yellow lichen *Letharia vulpina* growing on their stems and branches.

v. Smaller diameter Douglas-fir and Ponderosa pine should be conserved for growth into future WTs in all areas.

vi. Large senescent or dead top Ponderosa Pine should be reserved from harvest or cutting. With thick bark, they are relatively resistant to fire and can provide wildlife habitat for decades. Specifically protect trees >30cm DBH with flat red bark. See OGMA section for references.

**f. Burning Considerations**

i. Large diameter decay class 3-5 wildlife trees that lack intact bark on the lower portions of the bole are particularly susceptible to prescribed burning. These wildlife trees, especially those with existing cavities, should be protected during burning by raking duff and flammables away from the base of the tree, leaving a protective green curtain of younger stems to absorb the heat or by guarding the WTP.

ii. Burn boss can avoid a heavier burn in rich areas of WTs by dropping less Aerial Ignition Device (AID) balls near the WTP, back burning or black lining the boundary or reducing fuel adjacent to the WTP before light up by screefing light fuels away from the base.

iii. As a last resort (due to high treatment costs and access issues), foaming or wetting down high-value individual WTs might protect these ecological assets. Wrapping the tree in metal foil does not greatly increase the wildlife tree's ability to survive a prescribed burn (Gray, 2004, Gray, Blackwell, 2002)

**g. Recruitment Strategies**

i. In a shortage of snags following harvest or slashing about 5 to10 stems/ha of a merchantable size should be planned to be converted to snags by piling debris against them, ringing or damaging the tree or igniting them during the prescribed burn. Inoculating the trees with a fungus is a more sure way of producing a high value wildlife tree (Manning, 2008). Snags produced by inoculation take longer to form but may stand longer and will be planned for in specific areas where a need for them is identified.

ii. It is important to plan for the recruitment of snags by estimating the lifespan of wildlife trees Evidence from American reports suggests tree can rot from standing dead to decay stage 5 (equivalent of Canadian decay class 9) using following formulas (Cline 1980 as reported in Everett et al 1988). Report was based on retrospective study of 81 fires in Oregon state dry forest belt. The following formulas should be used to predict a snag shortfall on a restoration unit and a plan evolved to bridge "gaps' in the spacing or timing of snags in the restoration unit.

i. Douglas-fir years to decay state = (-2.052+ 2.2431* (decay state)) squared

ii. Ponderosa pine is Years to decay class = (-0.988 + 1.9325 * (decay state)) squared

**h. Monitoring protocol**

iii. Effectiveness Monitoring: Wildlife tree, species composition, diameter and density shall be monitored as per the Pandion 2002 report. The longevity and deterioration rates of snags should also be investigated.

iv. Routine Monitoring: Wildlife trees and snags are to be noted in all post burn and mechanical treatment surveys. Wildlife trees and WTP set asides are to be tracked in prescriptions and as an ARCVIEW mapping layer. Layer and database are defined in fmer Version 3.2 geodatabase.

## 8. COARSE WOODY DEBRIS (CWD):

**Objective:**

1) Maintain a naturally occurring level of large sized (>30cm diameter) CWD in treated areas.
   a) **Legal Reference**: Forest and Range Practices Act 149 (1) and Forest Planning and Practices Regulation section 9.1 an 68. Section 68 requires 4logs /ha > 5 metres long, 7.5cm diameter at small end
   b) **Measurable**: Maintain and recruit 3 cubic metres of CWD (over 30cm DBH and all rot stages not just sawlog grade) per hectare through out treatment cycle on the treated area. Number and distribution shall, at least, meet minimums set by FPPR namely as minimum of 4 logs per hectare, greater than 5 metres long and 7.5cm diameter at small end.
   **c) Discussion**
      i) The life span or CWD in the dry interior is not firmly known but Douglas fir of >30cm DBH appears to cycle from CWD decay Class 1 to 5 in a 15 to 25 year cycle. This should be considered when planning CWD recruitment. It's anticipated that prescribed burns will be prescribed about every 15 to 25 years; CWD should be recruited on every prescribed burn pass.
      ii) Evidence from American reports suggests tree can rot from standing dead to decay stage 5 (equivalent of Canadian decay class 5) using following formulas (Cline 1980 as reported in Everett et al 1988). Report was based on retrospective study of 81 fires in Oregon state dry forest belt. These formulas should be used to estimate the lifespan of existing CWD and to plan the recruitment of more.
         (1) Douglas-fir years to decay state = (-0.102+ 1.99949* (decay state)) squared
         (2) Ponderosa pine is years to decay class = (-.075 + 1.5254 * (decay state)) squared
      iii) It is almost impossible to protect soft wood snags (WT class 4 to 9) or coarse woody debris (CWD class 3 to 5) through even a light intensity maintenance burn. Soft wood must be recruited continuously between burns. Use above numbers as a guide.
   **d) Monitoring protocol**
      i) Effectiveness Monitoring: CWD composition and density shall be monitored as per the Pandion 2002 report. The longevity and deterioration rates of CWD should also be investigated further than this protocol (Pandion 2002) requires. The natural occurring amount of CWD needs to be more firmly established.
      ii) Routine Monitoring: Photo plots will be re-examined for CWD retention and deterioration during subsequent visits. The fuel management plots and FIREMON and FMA photo guides described in the Routine Monitoring protocol needs to be followed and expanded to allow CWD to be estimated by prescribers. Estimates to be compared before and after treatments.

## 9. WILDLIFE SPECIES AT RISK

**Objective:**

3. Maintain or increase the species richness and population density of endemic wildlife species in treated areas; with special emphasis in species listed as being red or blue listed by the Conservation Data Centre (CDC).

   **a. Legal Reference**: Section 149.1 FRPA, Section 7 Forest Planning and Practices Regulation section 7, Government Action Regulation (GAR) Section 13, Wildlife Habitat Area (WHA) Orders (see attached table) and Wildlife Habitat Features (WHF) (none to date). Objective 3 (Caribou) Objective 5 (Grizzly Bear and Connectivity Corridors)

   **b. Measurable**; Prior to any Ecosystem Restoration prescription being prepared the prescriber shall check the CDC database for occurrence of red and blue listed species and the Ministry of Environment website for WHAs in the area prescribed for treatment. Prescriptions shall be consistent with the General Wildlife Measures contained in the WHA orders.

   **c. Measurable**; All Prescriptions with WHA shall be referred to ecologists and biologists knowledgeable in the species of concern for comment and recommendation. All prescriptions prepared shall be reviewed by a biologist either under hire or through government.

   **d. Discussion**;

   i. The Ecosystem Restoration Program doesn't manage wildlife populations nor have the mandate to complete the full inventories to effectively measure this objective. The measures described for overstory, understory, riparian and stand level biodiversity should be treated as coarse filter measures to manage for the species listed in table #4. Fine filter measures such as ground and call back surveys in areas of known and confirmed red and blue-listed species shall be carried out when necessary.

   ii. These plans and prescriptions are reviewed at various levels by the Ministry of Environment Species at Risk Specialist. The opportunity to carry out more detailed monitoring or surveys for Species at Risk should be assessed at an annual basis and practicable or funded opportunities taken with the results fed back into the Ecosystem Restoration program.

   iii. The list of species at risk in the Rocky Mountain Trench is attached. The Best management Practices prescribed by *Cooper, J.M., C. Steeger, S .M. Beauchesne, M. Machmer, L. Atwood and E.T. Manning. 2004. Habitat attribute targets for red and blue listed wildlife species and plant community conservation* and various Ministry of Environment publications (specifically the Identified Wildlife Accounts and Measures documents), shall be considered prior to submission for review by a biologist.

   iv. Prescribers and administrators of the Ecosystem Restoration Program shall report unusual habitat features or wildlife sightings to Team Leader Ecosystem Restoration or contract administrator. These unusual habitat features or wildlife sightings will be discussed with Ministry of

Environment (Ministry of Environment) in case there is a need for changes in operations, practices or monitoring protocols.

v. As yet no wildlife features have been identified through a Government Actions Regulation. Should the Ecosystem Restoration program find any in the field management will be prescribed for it with guidance from a biologist and *Wildlife Habitat Features Summary of Management Guidelines, Southern Interior Forest Region* (Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection, 2004).

vi. A draft Memorandum of Understanding regarding the management of the Dutch Findlay Range Unit has recently been negotiated between the Ecosystem restoration Program, the Nature Conservancy of Canada, the Nature Trust of Canada and Thunder hill Ranch. This may become the first of several memoranda to set up joint management of large landscape areas between land owners. A specific goal of this program is to retain and develop habitat for Lewis' Woodpecker through open forests and Snag creation. Several more areas could benefit from similar management as this. Table 3.9.2 lists possible Lewis' Woodpecker Areas areas

**d. Monitoring**:

i. Effectiveness Monitoring. Monitoring for red and blue-listed species shall be as per the Pandion 2002 report with extra monitoring for yellow badger and Bighorn sheep in areas of known habitat use as per Page 2006. Habitat reports by Nancy Newhouse (Newhouse 2006) shall be incorporated into monitoring strategies.

ii. Routine Monitoring: All practitioners and prescribers on site shall report wildlife sightings to Team Leader Ecosystem Restoration who will forward the information to the CDC.

Table 3.9.1 List of potential Lewis' Woodpecker Management Units (areas of Crown Land)

| Management Unit | Range Units | Pasture | Estimated Area (ha) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Dutch Findlay | Dutch Findlay/ Findlay Basin | Spur, Sun, Thunder/ Stinky Saddle | 4500 |
| Gold Creek | Gold-Plumbob/ Newgate | Wakefield, Gorrie, Hansen East, Hansen West/ Ash Fire, Alkali, Burlott's, Sharptail, Demers | 3700 |
| Elko-Highway 95 | Waldo | Burnt Bottom, Sheep Mtn South, Sheep Mtn North, Cutts, Airport, Fusee East, Fusee West | 2500 |
| St Mary's Prairie | St Mary's Prairie | Rouse, Artesian Springs, Deep Springs, Sheep Camp, Pine Butte | 1650 |
| Grasmere | Grasmere | AI, Bagley's Seeding, Bagley | 1450 |
| | | | |

Table 3.9.2 List of Red Blue listed wildlife species for Rocky Mtn Trench as recommended June 2007 by Conservation Data centre

| Scientific Name | English Name | RISC Code | BC Status | SA RA | Nest/Den | Foraging | Guidelines | WHA? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Amphibians | | | | | | | | |
| *Ascaphus montanus* | Rocky Mountain Tailed Frog | A-ASMO | Red | 1 | aquatic/ Riparian, fast clean streams | aquatic/ Riparian, fast streams | BMP for Coastal | WHA-4-046-063 |
| *Plethodon idahoensis* | Coeur d'Alene Salamander | A-PLID | Blue | 1 | | | | |
| *Rana pipiens* | Northern Leopard Frog | A-RAPI | Red | 1 | Aquatic, Riparian, wetlands | Aquatic, Riparian, wetlands | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| *Birds* | | | | | | | | |
| *Botaurus lentiginosus* | American Bittern | B-AMBI | Blue | | Riparian, marshes, cattail, emergent vegetation | | | |
| *Hirundo rustica* | Barn Swallow | B-BASW | Blue | | Mud nests in overhangs, buildings | Open meadows fields, farmland | | |
| *Dolichonyx oryzivorus* | Bobolink | B-BOBO | Blue | | | Pasture and farmland | | |
| *Spizella breweri breweri* | Brewer's Sparrow, *breweri* subspecies | B-BRSP-BR | Red | | | Open forest and brush | BMP | |
| *Athene cunicularia* | Burrowing Owl | B-BUOW | Red | 1 | Badger dens | | BMP | |
| *Buteo platypterus* | Broad-winged Hawk | B-BWHA | Blue | | | | | |
| *Otus flammeolus* | Flammulated Owl | B-FLOW | Blue | 1 | Cavity nester, multi layered closed forest | | Cooper et al, 2004, BMP | WHA-4-077-085 and 099-101 |
| *Ardea herodias herodias* | Great Blue heron, *herodias* subspecies | B-GBHE-HE | Blue | | Rookeries | Aquatic, Riparian, wetlands | BMP | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Numenius americanus* | Long-billed Curlew | B-LBCU | Blue | 1 | Open Grasslands | Open grasslands | Cooper et al, 2004, BMP | WHA-4-065-075 |
| *Ammodramus leconteii* | Le Conte's Sparrow | B-LCSP | Blue | | | | | |
| *Melanerpes lewis* | Lewis's Woodpecker | B-LEWO | Red | 1 | Cavity nester Open Forests | Open Forests, feeds on the wing | Cooper et al, 2004, BMP | WHA-4-001, 002,086,087 |
| *Grus canadensis* | Sandhill Crane | B-SACR | Blue | | Ground nest riparian areas | Feeds riparian areas, meadows, fields, wetlands, lakes | BMP | |
| *Asio flammeus* | Short-eared Owl | B-SEOW | Blue | 3 | Cavity nester | | BMP | |
| *Tympanuchus phasianellus columbianus* | Sharp-tailed Grouse, *columbianus* subspecies | B-STGR-CO | Blue | | | Open grasslands | Cooper et al, 2004, BMP | |
| *Sphyrapicus thyroideus nataliae* | Williamson's sapsucker, *nataliae* subspecies | B-WISA-NA | Red | 1 | Cavity nester, closed forest? | Insectivore, closed forest? | Cooper et al, 2004, BMP | |
| *Megascops kennicottii macfarlanei* | Western Screech-Owl, *macfarlanei* subspecies | B-WSOW-MA | Red | 1 | Cavity Nester | | BMP | Proposed Gold Creek |
| | | | | | | | | |
| *Fish* | | | | | | | | |
| *Acrocheilus alutaceus* | Chiselmouth | F-ACAL | Blue | | | | | |
| *Oncorhynchus clarkii lewisi* | Cutthroat Trout, *lewisi* subspecies | F-ONCL-LE | Blue | | pea gravel or better, clean substrate highly oxygenared | Fast clear streams | BMP | |
| *Salvelinus confluentus* | Bull Trout | F-SACO | Blue | | pea gravel or better, clean substrate highly oxygenared | Fast clear streams | BMP | |
| | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Mammals* | | | | | | | | |
| *Corynorhinus townsendii* | Townsend's Big-eared Bat | M-COTO | Blue | | Loose bark, Cavities Wildlife trees | Insectivore on the wing | BMP | |
| *Gulo gulo luscus* | Wolverine, *luscus* subspecies | M-GUGU-LU | Blue | | | | BMP | |
| *Martes pennanti* | Fisher | M-MAPE | Blue | | | | BMP | |
| *Ovis canadensis* | Bighorn Sheep | M-OVCA | Blue | | Open forests with escape habitat | Open range/ Forest, escape habitat | Cooper et al, 2004, BMP | |
| *Taxidea taxus* | Badger | M-TATA | Red | 1 | Subterranean, grasslands | Grasslands; ground squirrel areas, sandy light soils | Cooper et al, 2004, BMP | WHA-4-088-092, 102, 103 |
| *Ursus arctos* | Grizzly Bear | M-URAR | Blue | | Sub alpine Krummholtz | | BMP | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| *Reptiles* | | | | | | | | |
| *Chrysemys picta pop. 2* | Western Painted Turtle - Intermountain - Rocky Mountain Population | | Blue | | Sandy soils; open forest, clear of shrubs | Aquatic | BMP | |

*NB since the publication Cooper et al 2003 ( JM Cooper, C Steeger, SM Beauchesne, M Machmer, L Atwood, ET Manning, 2003 Habitat Attributes Targets for Red and Blue Listed Species and Plant Community Conservation, Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife conservation Program*

The following species have been delisted for consideration for management in Rocky Mountain District by the Conservation Data Centre: Northern goshawk, white headed woodpecker, Consider adding Common Night hawk

## 10. RARE PLANT SPECIES AND ECOLOGICAL COMMUNITIES AT RISK

**Objective**:

1. Maintain or increase the species richness and population density of endemic plant species in treated areas.

    **a. Legal Reference**: Forest and Range Practices Act Section 149.1, Forest Planning and Practices Regulation , Section 7, Government Action Regulation Section 13, WHAs in process

    **b. Measurables**; Prior to any Ecosystem Restoration prescription being prepared the prescriber shall check the CDC database for occurrence of red and blue listed plants or Ecological Communities in the area prescribed for treatment.

    **c. Measurable**: Should the 6 red and blue listed plant communities (now known as Ecological Communities) described in Cooper et al. (2004) be found on site, the prescriber shall use guidance contained in Cooper et al. while developing the prescription.

    **d. Discussion**;

    i. The Ecosystem Restoration Program doesn't have the mandate to complete the full inventories to effectively measure this objective. The measures described for overstory, understory, riparian and stand level biodiversity should be treated as coarse filter measures to manage for these plants and communities. Fine filter measurables such as biologic investigation of known confirmed red and blue listed plants and ecological communities shall be considered.

    ii. The list of species and plant communities (now known as ecological communities) at risk in the Rocky Mountain Trench is found in Cooper et al. (2004). Cooper et al's report expands on the ecological community information contained in the CDC lists.

    iii. Prescribers and administrators of the Ecosystem Restoration Program shall report unusual plant and ecological community sightings to Team Leader Ecosystem Restoration or the contract administrator. These sightings will be discussed with the NDT4 Operations Committee in case there is a need for changes in operations, practices, or monitoring protocols.

    **e. Monitoring**:

    i. Effectiveness Monitoring for red and blue-listed plant and ecological communities shall be as per the Pandion 2002 report

    ii. Routine Monitoring: All practitioners and prescribers on site shall report plant sightings to Team leader Ecosystem Restoration who will forward the information to Conservation Data Centre.

Table 3.10.1 List of Plant Communities (now called Ecological Communities) found in Rocky Mountain Forest District. List is based on Conservation Data Centre list and is found in Cooper, J.M., C. Steeger, S .M. Beauchesne, M . Machmer, L . Atwood and E.T. Manning. 2004. Habitat attribute targets for red and blue listed wildlife species and plant community conservation.

| Plant community | Usually occurs in BEC sub zone/ Variant/ site series | Ecosystem Restoration treatment usually acceptable |
|---|---|---|
| Douglas-fir/ Snowberry/ balsamroot | IDFdm2/03 | Cool fire |
| Antelope brush/ blue bunch wheatgrass | IDFdm2/02<br>PPdh2/00 | Cool fire |
| Western snowberry- Idaho fescue | IDFdm2/00 | No prescribed fire, Idaho fescue not resistant |
| Blue bunch wheatgrass junegrass | IDFuu/00<br>PPdh2/02a; PPdh2/02b | Cool fire |
| Douglas fir Larch- spruce/ pinegrass | IDFdm2/04 | Fire interval 90-150 years |
| Ponderosa pine trembling aspen/ rose /Solomon's Seal | PPdh2/03 | Cool fire |
| Ponderosa pine/ bluebunch wheatgrass-lupine | PPdh2/01 | Cool fire |

## 11. UNGULATES:

**Objective:**

1. Maintain or increase the species richness and population density of endemic wildlife species in treated areas;

- **a. Legal References**: FPRA 149 (1) Forest Planning and Practices Regulation Section 7, Ungulate Winter Range (UWR) Orders U-006 (Cranbrook TSA) and U-008 (Invermere TSA)
- **b. Measurables** The Ecosystem Restoration program shall follow the direction of : Ungulate Winter Range (UWR) Orders U-006 (Cranbrook TSA) and U-008 (Invermere TSA)
- **c. Discussion**
  - i. For the NDT4 area the Ungulate Winter Range Order prescribes Open Range and Open Forest stands which closely resemble the Timber measurable guidelines already mentioned.
  - ii. Ministry of Environment shall give direction to all prescriptions covering the UWR. They shall also specify which Range Units require Bighorn sheep visibility protocols at the 5 year plan stage.
  - iii. Note that the UWR specifies that tree retention shall include 5-20 trees /ha in Open Range sites 1/3 of which must be in the largest diameter range. Further it specifies 76 to 400 stems per hectare to be retained on site with a target of 250 stems /ha in Open Forest types. Further 20 to 50 trees/ha of shall be from the largest diameter range in open forest types. This varies from the Blue Print for Action.
  - iv. The UWR order provision for larger diameter trees shall prevail when numbers of trees on site are low and the retention rate specified in the Blue Print for Action would fall below 5-20 (Open Range) or 20-50 (Open Forest) large stems per hectare.
  - v. Remaining tree cover retention requirements are not placed on Open Range and Open Forest but the division of the land base into Open Range, Managed Forest and Open Forest based on site series is recommended for field procedures. (see objective 1 Timber)
- **d. Monitoring protocol**
  - i. **Effectiveness monitoring** as per Pandion 2002. Bighorn sheep shall require extra monitoring as the addition of the bighorn sheep visibility monitoring protocol shown in Page 2006.
  - ii. **Routine Monitoring** Ungulate use of the site is to be qualitatively estimated when the prescription is being prepared as well as during and after the slashing and burning stages. The bighorn sheep visibility protocol shall be measured at the prescription, slashing and burn stages as per Page 2006.

## 12. FOREST HEALTH:

**Objective**:

1. Reduce the incidence of insect and disease incidence and spread in the treated stands.

    **a. Legal Reference:** Forest Planning and Practices Regulation 41-46.2

    b. **Measurable**: Keep root rot incidence to less than 8% of stand affected based on ocular estimates undertaken during routine monitoring surveys of the Ecosystem Restoration blocks.

    c. **Measurable**: Action 50% of all Mountain Pine Beetle infestations within one year of detection, as per the Cranbrook and Invermere Timber Supply Area Forest Health Strategy. Action may not necessarily be taken by Ecosystem Restoration program due to forest licensing constraints.

    d. **Discussion**:

        i. Reducing stand densities to historic levels will over all improve the health of the stands.

        ii. Ministry of Forests and Range does carry out a district wide detection program for all insects and diseases. Small scale salvage or major licensees are typically tasked with harvesting the infestations. The Ministry of Forests Forest Health program deals with other infestations by single tree disposal, lethal funnel traps or trap tree programs dependant on funding levels. Note that as per government policy all forest activities in Rocky Mountain Forest District must follow the approved Forest Health Strategies for both Invermere and Cranbrook TSAs. Currently this strategy (Ministry of Forests and Range 2009a and 2009b) calls for action on

            1. Mountain pine beetle,
            2. Douglas fir bark beetle
            3. armillaria root rot
            4. Dwarf mistletoe,
            5. commandra blister rust,
            6. western gall rust,
            7. northern twig pitch moth and
            8. sequoia pitch moth

        iii. The Ecosystem Restoration Program will participate in the district forest health effort and report forest health concerns discovered by the monitoring actions of the Ecosystem Restoration Program will be reported to the forest health officer. Infestations that can be controlled by the slashing and burning actions of the Ecosystem Restoration Program will be carried out. Forest Health concerns will be considered in all Ecosystem Restoration prescriptions..

        iv. The Rocky Mountain Trench is regarding by the TSA Forest Health Strategy (Ministry of Forests and Range 2009a and 2009b) as being a “holding” Beetle Management Unit due to the low

amount of Mtn Pine beetle in the Trench. Aggressive control action is called for. The Rocky Mountain Forest District is covered by the Emergency Bark Beetle regulation and priority there is placed on suppressing the bark beetles in areas adjacent to the Alberta border so as to avoid he spread of Mtn Pine beetle across the Rocky Mountains. Note as per table 3.4 the bark beetle epidemic is expected to peak in the Rocky Mountain Trench in 2010 and 2011.

**Table 3.12.1** Observed (2004 – 2006) and projected (2007 – 2011) annual **green-attack** volume (millions $m^3$) for the 22 "pine units" (peak year of kill is highlighted by an outlined box). Note that the mortality caused by MPB (green-attack) occurs in the year prior to that in which it is observed by the Provincial Aerial Overview of Forest Health (observed as red-attack). From Walton et al 2004

| | Year | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Pine Unit** | **2004** | **2005** | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** |
| Vanderhoof (District) | **25.0** | 7.2 | 3.9 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Quesnel | **23.8** | 11.7 | 5.1 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Lakes | **15.0** | 9.9 | 6.2 | 3.4 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Prince George (District) | **12.5** | 8.3 | 7.7 | 3.3 | 1.8 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 0.4 |
| Williams Lake | 19.4 | **20.8** | 17.5 | 12.9 | 8.6 | 5.0 | 2.7 | 1.3 |
| 100 Mile House | 8.6 | **18.0** | 7.1 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| Kamloops | 6.0 | **9.1** | 6.8 | 5.1 | 3.9 | 2.7 | 1.8 | 1.2 |
| Ft. St. James (District) | 10.7 | 8.9 | **14.7** | 10.8 | 9.3 | 7.7 | 6.3 | 4.5 |
| Morice | 3.7 | 6.4 | 5.8 | **6.5** | 6.0 | 4.3 | 2.7 | 1.6 |
| Lillooet | 0.4 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 2.2 | **2.9** | 2.7 | 2.0 | 1.3 |
| Merritt | 1.3 | 2.5 | 3.9 | 6.1 | 7.8 | **8.3** | 6.7 | 4.6 |
| Dawson Creek | 0.0 | 0.1 | 2.7 | 3.4 | 4.3 | **4.6** | 3.6 | 2.3 |
| Bulkley | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 1.5 | **2.2** | 2.1 | 1.5 |
| Robson Valley | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.6 | **0.7** | 0.6 | 0.4 |
| Arrow | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.6 | **0.8** | **0.8** | 0.6 |
| Mackenzie | 0.6 | 2.1 | 4.8 | 5.5 | 7.9 | 11.6 | **14.2** | 13.5 |
| Okanagan | 1.0 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 2.6 | 4.5 | 6.3 | **6.6** | 5.6 |
| Invermere | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 1.1 | **1.3** | 1.1 |
| Golden | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.4 | **0.5** | **0.5** |
| Cranbrook | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 1.9 | 2.9 | **3.5** |
| Boundary | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 1.3 | 2.0 | **2.1** |
| Kootenay Lake | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 1.4 | **1.5** |
| Grand Total | 130.3 | 109.8 | 90.5 | 70.8 | 66.7 | 65.5 | 59.9 | 48.1 |

v. The Nelson Forest Region policy (Norris et al 1998) directs operators to stump and take aggressive action on Armillaria root rot areas. The Ecosystem Restoration Program does promote a

"gappy forest" with a significant wildlife tree component that Armillaria can facilitate (Steeger, Machmer 1995). Much of the NDT4 operating area is on sensitive calcareous soils that can be degraded by stumping (Curran et al 2000). As well, with its decreased volume expectation, the Ecosystem Restoration Program will not take aggressive action as well on root rot pockets. If an ocular estimate at the time of prescription shows the root rot infestation to affect less than 8% of the stand the Ecosystem Restoration Program will prescribe to leave root rot pockets to create as wildlife tree patches but slash the area outside the safe work zone to avoid spread. If the ocular estimate places the root rot level above 8% the Ecosystem Restoration Program shall clear and burn off the root rot centres and burn the site to keep them clear of growing trees for 20 years so as to diminish the root rot infestation.

vi. Dwarf mistletoe, commandra blister rust, western gall rust, northern twig pitch moth and sequoia pitch moth in lodgepole pine are serious forest health concerns in the Rocky Mountain Forest District. Lodgepole pine is a minor stand component in the NDT4 operations area. The standard practice of the Ecosystem Restoration treatment regime is to slash this species to the ground or prescribe fire which should lead to the death of any remaining lodgepole pine trees. As such the Ecosystem Restoration Program will note the occurrence of these diseases and follow its normal treatment prescription.

vii. Rhizina root rot and black army cutworm have also been reported in the district and they do follow forest fires. So far their occurrence has only been on pine and white spruce plantations in the ESSF ad ICH biogeoclimatic zones; not in the IDF and PP zones where the Ecosystem Restoration program operates (Ministry of Forests and Range 2009a and 2009b). If found they will be reported and dealt with.

viii. So far Douglas fir and western pine beetle are in low levels of infestation in the Rocky Mountain Trench. As these trees specifically attack the Douglas fir and Ponderosa Pine forests that the Ecosystem Restoration Program manages for, the Ecosystem Restoration Program will take aggressive control action such as accelerated thinning, funnel traps or trap trees (dependant on funding levels) should the incidence of these pests increase.

**e. .Monitoring protocol**

i. Effectiveness Monitoring Forest health shall be monitored as per Pandion 2002 report

ii. Routine Monitoring: Photo plots will be re-examined for forest health issues during subsequent visits and during all surveys of the treatment areas. The Ecosystem Restoration Program will participate in district bark beetle detection and suppression program.

## 13. INVASIVE PLANTS:

**Objective**:

1. Minimise the establishment and spread of priority non-native invasive plant species, particularly noxious species, in treated areas. Priority species are determined through collaboration with the East Kootenay Invasive Plant Program Committee.

    **a. Legal Reference**: Forest and Range Practices Act Section 47 and Weed Control Act

    **b. Measurable**: Invasive plant infestations of priority species should not increase from those recorded by the Ministry of Forests and Range, Range Branch for the Range Unit being treated. The Invasive Alien Plants (AIP) application website shall be consulted prior to the writing of any prescription and the invasive plant species found on site shall be noted and a map of all infestations forwarded to the East Kootenay Invasive Plant Program Committee (or its successor). See website:
    http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hfp/invasive/index.htm

    **c. Measurable**: Ecosystem Restoration program shall prescribe treatment for invasive plant infestations in the Ecosystem Restoration Prescription.

    **d. Discussion**:

    ii. . Management shall follow Table 6: Synopsis of Invasive plants and Management Implications for Ecosystem Restoration Program in Rocky Mountain Forest District (per Val Miller 2007)

    iii. Bare soil exposed for fireguards shall be reseeded immediately following burn activity or at the next available seeding window, which ever is less. A suitable forage mixture composed of the species listed in Table 3.5 Seeding rate is 12 to 20 kilograms per hectare. This mix is designed to be non persistent, erosion controlling, fast growing to decrease the invasive plant establishment and provide good fuel bed for subsequent firs. It is to a nurse crop for longer term recovery of native grasses.

Table 3.13.1 The Rocky Mountain Forest District preferred grass seed mix a Fescue blend with annual and perennial ryegrass.

| Species | % by Weight | % by Species |
|---|---|---|
| Slender Wheatgrass | 35% | 21% |
| Perennial Ryegrass | 25% | 23% |
| Annual Ryegrass | 20% | 16% |
| Rocky mountain Fescue | 10% | 19% |
| Hard Fescue | 10% | 21% |

iv. The mix in table 3.5 shall also be used in areas of high conservation value and low risk to invasive plant infestations. Note that native species have a very low germination rate so that higher seeding rates of natives or planting of native grass seedling plugs may be in order if naïve seeding is prescribed.

v. Prescribed burn areas will be assessed after the fire to see if grass seeding is required.
vi. Areas proposed for prescribed burns that have large incidence of invasive weeds shall be considered for sloop or pile burning and shall be grass seeded or planted with native grass seed plugs immediately following burn activity or at the next available seeding window, which ever is less.
vii. More detailed description of plant response to fire can be found at In: Fire Effects Information System, [Online]. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory (Producer). Available: http://www.fs.fed.us/database/feis/.

Table 3.13.2: Synopsis of Invasive plants and Management Implications for Ecosystem Restoration Program in Rocky Mountain Forest District (per Val Miller 2007)

| **Plant Species** | **Management Option** | **Response to Logging or Thinning** | **Response to Prescribed Burn** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Blue weed | Chemical spray: Tordon, Grazon – must treat early in spring (pre-bolt is best), or in fall. | Increase expected through introduction to site by equipment (graders, skidders). Tap-rooted species that spreads by heavy seed. | Unknown - more research is needed. |
| Common Tansy (*Tanacetum vulgare*) | Chemical spray: Escort | Readily increases along road systems and skid trails. Spreads by seed. | Unknown – more research is needed. |
| Dalmatian toadflax (*Linaria dalmatica)* | High success rate with biological control agents, although some delay in success on colder sites. Do not rule out chemical spray (Tordon with a surfactant) on small infestation patches | Expect rapid or explosive growth response. Spreads by rhizomes and seed. | Explosive growth of new seedlings onto exposed mineral soil |
| Diffuse knapweed (*Centaurea diffusa*) | Chemical spray: Milestone, Transline Biological Control: numerous bioagents available – good success on hot, dry sites. Use in areas in East Kootenay where herbicides are not a viable option. | Expect moderate increase if seed source present, exposed soil evident, and canopy is removed. Spreads by seed. | More research is needed. Low severity fires will likely not impact plants or seed bank. |
| Hoary Alyssum (*Berteroa incana*) | Chemical spray: Dyvel DS, Banvel II, 2,4-D amine. Must be treated early in the season. | Expect Dramatic increase in plant density and distribution if established populations are disturbed while in seed. Shallow rooted annual to short-lived perennial. Spreads by heavy seed – prolific seed producer over an extended period of time. | Unknown – more research is needed. |
| Hounds tongue (*Cynoglossum officinale)* | High success with biological agent *Mogolones cruciger* | Expect Significant increase on landings, burn piles, and exposed mineral soil sites. | Initial increase if seed source previously on site or close by. Potential to resprout from root crowns. More research is needed. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Leafy Spurge (*Euphorbia esula*) | Chemical spray:<br>Tordon,<br>Grazon | Expect dramatic increase in plant density and distribution as a result of disturbance. Deep rooted species that readily resprouts and spreads by rhizomes. | Plants will likely resprout from root crown, taking full advantage of increased availability of nitrogen. |
| Orange Hawkweed (*Hieracium aurantiacum*) | Chemical spray:<br>Milestone, Transline – most effective when used with surfactant and N fertilization | Expect explosive increase if seed source present or nearby, or if established plants disturbed by equipment. Spreads by seeds, rhizomes, stolons, adventitious root buds. Slower to establish and spread on extremely dry sites. | Unknown – assume ready colonization due to windborne seed. More research is needed. |
| Rush Skeletonweed (*Chondrilla juncea)* | Chemical spray:<br>Tordon;<br>Transline (only gives partial control). | Expect significant increase in population following ground disturbance. Spreads by windborne seed and root fragments; a deep rooted plant that can resprout from 1 m depth. | Unknown - Plants will readily resprout from deep root system. Likely to spread into burned areas via windborne seed if seed source nearby. Research is needed. |
| Spotted knapweed (*Centaurea biebersteinii*) | Chemical spray:<br>Milestone, Transline<br>Biological Control: numerous bioagents available – good success on hot, dry sites. Use in areas in East Kootenay where herbicides are not a viable option. | Expect moderate to significant increase if seed source present, exposed soil evident, and canopy removed. Spreads by seed. | Significant increase in plant density, distribution and vigour. Low severity fires provide limited impact to plants or seed bank. Seeds may not affected by higher intensity fires. |
| Sulphur Cinquefoil (*Potentilla recta*) | Chemical spray:<br>Milestone | Expect moderate rate of response dependant upon level of disturbance, existing seed source, and amount of shading. Spreads by seed. | Rapid expansion and dense colonization |
| Yellow, non-native Hawkweeds (*Hieracium piloselloides, H. flagellare, H. floribundum, H. praeltum, H. caespitosum, H. glomeratum* ) | Chemical spray:<br>Milestone, Transline – most effective when used with surfactant and N fertilization | Expect explosive increase if seed source is present or nearby, or if established plants are disturbed by equipment. Spreads by seeds, rhizomes, stolons, adventitious root buds. Slower to establish and spread on extremely dry sites. | Unknown – assume explosive colonization due to windborne seed and speed at which species are spreading in province. More research is needed. |

**e. Monitoring protocol**

i. **Effectiveness Monitoring** The under story species composition and production shall be completed following Pandion 2002 report

ii. **Routine Monitoring**: Photo plots and plot data will be re-examined for invasive plants during subsequent visits.

## 14. SOILS:

**Objectives**:

1. Maintain soil fertility and minimize soil erosion and compaction in treated area.

**a. Legal Reference**: Forest and Range Practices Act 149 (1) Forest Planning and Practices Regulation 5 and 35 -38. EPR shall abide by FPPR direction

**b. Measurable**: Permanent access in treatment areas is to be kept below 7% of the gross area of the area under prescription. Increases above this number may be made but only the cases listed in FRPA (e.g. very small block, mainline located in centre of the block) and documentation of the rationale kept on file.

**c. Measurable**: Temporary disturbance is to be less than 10% of the area under prescription on medium or low hazard soils and under 5% on sensitive or high hazard soils.

**d. Measurable**: Maintain natural drainage patterns and do not contribute to landslide hazards.

**e. Measurable** Bladed soil created by Ecosystem Restoration projects shall be revegetated within one growing season of the disturbance.

**f. Discussion**

i. It is almost impossible to measure the soil fertility and productivity aspects of soil management during standard operations. Above measurables are FRPA standards required by all licensees.

**g. Monitoring protocol**

i. Effectiveness Monitoring soil issues shall be monitored as per Pandion 2002 report

ii. Routine Monitoring: On any treatment area soil erosion and compaction shall be monitored qualitatively during all Ecosystem Restoration and range monitoring visits. The areas disturbed on any treatment area shall be measured and evaluated after any equipment pass on a treatment unit and documentation will be kept on the opening file.

## 15. RECREATION:

**Objective**:

1 Meet declared recreation objectives.

- **a. Legal Reference** Forest and Range Practices Act Section 180/181 and 56 , Forest Practices Code Section 6
- **b. Measurable**: Access control is to be considered in each prescription and appropriate action prescribed and implemented. Actions are to be documented and kept on Opening or Ecosystem Restoration Plan files. (see Section 21)
- **c. Measurable**: Ecosystem Restoration Program shall be consistent with the Management Plan for the Cranbrook Community Forest when active in the Alkali or Cranbrook Fort Steele Range Unit pastures that fall within the Community Forest.
- **d. Measurable** Ecosystem Restoration program shall manage consistent with the objectives for any recreation sites or trails falling with the NDT4 area and act in concert with the District Recreation Officer for Ministry of Tourism, Sport and the Arts.
- **e. Discussion**
  - i. List of Recreational Trail objectives is on file at the Ministry of Forests and Range office at: G:\!Workgrp\wpdocs\ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION\Plans & Planning\Higher Level Plans
  - ii. This document is to considered in every prescription falling in or near a recreational site or trail.
- **e. Monitoring protocol** All Ministry of Forests and Range and Ministry of Environment staff shall monitor treated areas for the need for access management and recreation use management with every site visit.

## 16. PRESCRIBED BURNS:

**Objective**

1) Rank 3 burn during initial prescribed burn and a rank 2 burn during maintenance burns. Rank 3 burns have rate of spread of 1.5 to 3 metres per minute, with 2 metre high flames and an organised front and may display candling. Rank 2 fires spread at less than 1.5 metre per minute with a disorganised head and virtually no candling.

**a.** Legal Reference: Wildfire Regulation requires all possible man made fire hazards to be evaluated and acted upon. Open burning Regulation controls venting and air quality concerns. Ecosystem Restoration program will follow direction in regulation.

**b. Measurable of initial burn**;

i. reduce 80% fuels < 5cm diameter,
ii. kill 80% of trees under 3 metre tall,
iii. maintain seed bank and nutrients by creating a moderate fire over 75% of the burn area as determined by a post fire evaluation using the US National Parks Service Fire monitoring Handbook FMH 21 And FMH 22 criteria. (National Parks Service, 2003)
iv. time the burn to avoid killing grass growing points,
v.do not burn more than 10% of pole and co-dominant trees,
vi. cover 70% of area with burn,
vii. lift live canopy to 1.5 metres

**c. Measurable of maintenance burn**;

i. kill 80% trees under 3 metre tall,
ii. maintain seed bank and nutrients by creating a moderate fire over 75% of the burn area as determined by a post fire evaluation using the US National Parks Service Fire monitoring Handbook FMH 21 And FMH 22 criteria. (National Parks Service, 2003)
iii. time the burn to avoid killing grass growing points,
iv. do not burn more than 10% of pole and co-dominant trees (need 5% for recruitment as WT and CWD),
v.cover 70% of area with burn,
vi. lift live canopy to 1.5 metres

**d. Discussion**

i. Light up requires a burn plan accepted by Ministry of Forests and Range Wildfire Management Branch and under venting conditions set by Ministry of Environment Open Burning Smoke Control Regulation. This legislation requires that the burn come off safely, with minimal risk to public or private resources and that the smoke be vented away within 4 days of light up.
ii. Majority of prescribed burns are to be carried out by Ministry of Forests and Range district staff but Ecosystem Restoration Program shall reach

out to contractors, other agencies and the Ministry of Forests and Range Protection branch to increase capacity for burns in the narrow windows available.

iii. Only low intensity fires (less than 20% of standing co-dominant trees burnt) to be considered here due to proximity to habitations and high risk area with large existing fuel build ups. The High severity fires in the mixed fire spectrum are still occurring naturally even with strenuous suppression activities.

iv. Spring burn fire weather indices are currently Duff Moisture Code (DMC) of less than 40, Fine Fuel Moisture Content (FFMC) of 88 to 93, Drought Code of 200 to 700, Minimum temperature of 18 degrees centigrade, wind speed of no more than 20 kilometres an hour, Relative humidity of 20%. The intent is a low intensity fire with a slow rate of spread of up to 3 meters/minute is desired. Flame height may vary from 0.5 to 2 meters. Venting must be good for at least 48 hours after the burn light up and smoke mostly extinguished with 96 hours of light up.

v. Indices for fall burns must be developed with a suggestion that FFMC should be 55 and a higher DMC. Intent is to consume larger fuels and heavy slashing areas. Typically achieving a good venting window can be a larger issue in fall burns.

**d. Monitoring protocol**

i. Intensive Monitoring: As per draft Routine Monitoring protocol. Fuel plots recording down and standing fuels are to be established including photo points. This is to build on existing data bases (FMA plus or Kamloops fuel plot index) and create a district data base of photo plots to allow burn bosses to predict fuel loading, fire behaviour and track the evolution of CWD and WTs. Plots are to be fed into fire behaviour prediction models (FMA plus and Prometheus) so as to expand our ability to predict fire behaviour.

ii. Routine Monitoring: Five photo plots per fire are to be revisited pre and post burn, data recorded for fuel reduction and vegetative response as per draft Routine Monitoring protocol. Fire behaviour to be recorded during burn and this data fed into all other aspects of monitoring and research. Post fire evaluation plots are to be carried out on all fires within one growing season of ignition. Fuel loading is to be estimated pre and post fire by photo plots found in FMA plus and the Kamloops fuel plot index.

## 17. ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES:

**Objective**

1. Is to maintain unimpaired all known archaeological sites within treatment areas and comply with the Heritage Conservation Act.
   - **a. Measurable** During the 5 year plan submission the Ecosystem Restoration program shall suggest strategies (i.e. avoidance, machine operation only on snow pack or frozen soils, or preliminary field reconnaissance) to address all overlaps between Ecosystem Restoration prescriptions and high to medium archaeological polygons.
   - **b. Measurable**: All Ecosystem Restoration Prescriptions that overlay medium to high potential archaeological polygons will be considered for examination by an archaeologist acceptable to First Nations. Recommendations for treatments (e.g. avoidance, treat only under sufficient snow pack) will be discussed with the archaeologist and incorporated into the Ecosystem Restoration Prescription.
   - **c. Measurable**; further to b above an archaeological assessment shall be completed for any Ecosystem Restoration operation that requires the exposure of earth (i.e. the constriction of new road, landing, fireguard or reopening an existing road) within a medium to high archaeological polygon prior to work commencing. Operations shall respect the recommendations of the assessment.
   - **d. Discussion**
     - i. Archaeologist will decide if excavation and archaeological permits are needed.
     - ii. Ecosystem Restoration Program will maintain standing contract with archaeologist who will carry out surveys on an ongoing basis throughout the summer or snow free period.
     - iii. Where pile and burn operations are proposed within medium and high potential archaeological polygons Ecosystem Restoration operations shall follow guidelines worked out with Robert Williams of the K'tnuaxa Land Resources. These guidelines involve piling and burning on:
       - **c.** Piles are on previously disturbed areas
       - **d.** Piles are not on terrace edges/bench edges, but on slopes or at base, preferably on slopes.
       - **e.** Tree throws that have no obvious cultural materials.
       - **f.** Rock outcrops if no cultural significance is identified (i.e. pictographs, rock quarries, petroglyphs)
       - **g.** In smaller piles because heat intensity would be less but the placement of the piles must also be considered
     - iv. The Ecosystem Restoration program shall incorporate into its planning
       - **c.** Where deemed necessary half day training sessions where a archaeologist or a First Nations Lands and Resource staff can training up machine operators as to how best carry out operations in sensitive archaeological areas.

**d.** Follow-up monitoring inspections by archaeologists to ascertain impact of Ecosystem Restoration operations to archaeological resources where it appears to the Ecosystem Restoration inspector that an impact may have occurred to archaeological resources..

**e. Monitoring protocol**. Ministry of Forests and Range will keep all archaeological reports in the opening file for future monitoring and guidance. Starting in 2008 the Ecosystem Restoration program shall hire and work with an archaeologist to establish pre and post treatment plots to ascertain any impacts to archaeological resources that Ecosystem Restoration treatments specifically pile burning may have on archaeological resources.

## 18. CULTURAL AND HERITAGE RESOURCES:

**Objective**

1. Is to maintain unimpaired all known First Nations Cultural and Heritage Resources within treatment areas.

   **a. Legal reference**: Forest and Range Practices Act 149 (1), Forest Planning and Practices Regulation Section 10 a) and b)

   **b. Measurable** Strategy Ecosystem Restoration Program will meet at least once annually with First Nations and discuss all proposed Ecosystem Restoration treatments on all areas of the Trench. Recommendations from First Nations shall be reviewed and considered for incorporation into the Ecosystem Restoration Prescriptions.

   **c. Measurable:** Ecosystem Restoration prescribers shall note, in the Ecosystem Restoration prescription the occurrence of plant species noted by experts as being "cultural keystone species". The current list (by Mike Keefer, personal communication, 2008) is blue camas, bitter root, Soopallalie, Saskatoon berry. See table below

   **d. Discussion**
   Cultural and Heritage resources from European settlers with be discussed with local residents and those concerns addressed in the prescription.

   **d. Monitoring protocol**. Ministry of Forests and Range will keep all records of these discussions on five year plan file for future auditing and follow up. The performance of cultural keystone species shall be noted through photo plots taken under routine and effectiveness monitoring.

Table 3.18.1 Probable effects of light frequent fires actions on cultural keystone species (Source Fire Effects Information system http://www.fs.fed.us/database/feis/plants/index.html)

| Common name | Latin name | Effect of light frequent fire |
|---|---|---|
| Blue camas or Small Camas | Camassia quamash | Top kills camas especially in spring, one report lists camas increases with burning. Frequent fires known to be a First Nations cultivation technique. Maybe present in Wigwam RU |
| Bitter root | Lewisii rediviva | No data found but plant is known to gown in very dry soils under open range conditions. |
| Soopallalie (russet buffalo berry) | Shepherdia canadensis | Resprouts or reseeds after fire; fire increase density and vigour. Fairly resistant to burning. |
| Saskatoon berry | Amelanchier alnifolia | Resprouts easily from root collar even after severe fires. In forests it is fire dependant as fire decreases competing vegetation. Fire return periods for western Montana were 2 to 48 years. In general plant usually increases or is unaffected by fire. |

## 19. REMOVING NATURAL RANGE BARRIERS

**Objective**

1. Maintain range barriers so that range licensees can control and manage the distribution and forage use of their cattle.

    a. **Legal reference**: Forest and Range Practices Act Section 48, Forest Planning and Practices Regulation Section 18
    b. **Measurable** Ecosystem Restoration program shall not open up closed forests that would change the distribution of cattle and shall ensure that any fence damaged by Ecosystem Restoration practices is repaired to acceptable standards.
    **c. Discussion**
        i. This is more a strategic level direction. Ecosystem Restoration program shall meet with ranchers, or at least refer projects to them, 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 Ecosystem Restoration program, shall designate strips of timber or ravines to be left untreated so as to maintain natural barriers between pastures. Fence construction shall only be considered if priorities are high and there is no other option; Ecosystem Restoration program cannot really under take large scale fence reconstruction projects.
        ii. Range improvements (fences, water troughs etc.) are to be protected during ecosystem restoration operations (logging slashing and especially prescribed burns). If damage is created, the Ecosystem Restoration Program is to finance repairs in consultation with the range licensees.
    d. **Monitoring protocol**. Ministry of Forests and Range will keep all records of these discussions on five year plan file for future auditing and follow up. Fence lines and natural barrier corridors shall be inspected as a matter of course during the final inspection of any project undertaken under Ecosystem Restoration.

## 20. VISUAL QUALITY

**Objective**:

1 Meet declared visual quality objectives.

1. **Legal Reference** KBLUP Management Guidelines for NDT4 systems Objective 9 KBLUP, Forest and Range Practices Act 9.2
2. **Measurable**; All tree harvesting prescriptions should meet existing declared visual quality objectives (VQO) due to retention strategies of Ecosystem Restoration program.
3. **Discussion**
    a. Note that the KBLUP management Guidelines for NDT4 systems notes that it is the unlikely that Ecosystem Restoration actions will create a VQO conflict. Further, if a conflict arises the NDT4 guidelines prevail.
    b. As most Ecosystem Restoration treatments retain trees and site and recreate a historic mosaic of grasslands, open forests and treed grasslands it is unlikely the impact of Ecosystem Restoration treatments will degrade the existing viewscape or fail to meet retention or partial retention VQOs.
    c. The VQO shall be noted in each prescription; source of information shall be by reviewing the FDP or FSP maps of the major Forest Licensee for the area. The majority of VQOs for the Rocky Mountain Trench are modification and partial retention.
4. **Monitoring protocol** Ecosystem Restoration program shall review VQO issues with the Ministry of Forests and Range and MOTSA staff during the annual submission of the five year plan and take action as required.

.

## 20. ACCESS MANAGEMENT:

**Objective**:
1 Meet declared access management objectives and manage access so as to decrease off road vehicle damage to the open forests and grasslands.

- **f. Legal Reference** Forest and Range Practices Act Section 180/181 and 56 , Forest Practices Code Section 6
- **g. Measurable**: Access control is to be considered in each prescription and appropriate action prescribed and implemented. Actions are to be documented and kept on Opening or Ecosystem Restoration Plan files.
- **h. Measurable**: Ecosystem Restoration Program shall be consistent with declared access management orders issued under the Wildlife and Forest and Range Practices Acts.
- **i. Discussion**
  - i. Access management requires legal action and referral process from Ministry of Forests and Range or Ministry of Environment. Access restrictions and management plans are a process separate from Ecosystem Restoration operations. Ecosystem Restoration operations will close off and grass seed what new trails or fire guards are constructed during operations. Ecosystem Restoration Program will participate in all access management discussions.
  - ii. Ecosystem Restoration Program shall, as a matter of course, abide by existing access restrictions. Table 3.20 is to be consulted during prescription development time and the MOE website checked prior to sealing of prescriptions.
  - iii. Refrain from treated an site with high recreation use and damage to the grasslands until the recreation and access use issues are addressed in higher level access planning processes.
- **f. Monitoring protocol** All Ministry of Forests and Range and Ministry of Environment staff shall monitor treated areas for the need for access management and recreation use management with every site visit. Documentation is to be in the prescription or in inspections forms stored on the opening file.

Table 3.20.1 List of Wildlife Act Access Management Areas in the NDT4 Ecosystem Restoration operating area (as per 2009 Hunting Regulation synopsis http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/fw/wildlife/hunting/regulations/)

| Restoration Unit | Ministry of Environment Management Unit | Dates of Closures | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| Wigwam Flats | 4-2 | Year round | See map most main roads open |
| Grasmere (east of Highway 95) | 4-2 Galton Range | Year round | See map main roads open |
| Cranbrook- | 4-3 Elizabeth Lake | Year round | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Elizabeth Lake | | | |
| Gold Plumbob-Pinchecks | 4-3 Linklater Lakes | Year round | See map, main roads open |
| East Columbia | 4-25 East Columbia WMA | Most minor roads December 1-April 30 | Check maps, main roads open year round, minor open May 1 November 30 |
| Stoddart Creek | 4-25 Shuswap Creek to Kootenay National park | Year round | See map only road up Shuswap Creek is open |
| Dutch Findlay-Spur, Sun, Thunder, stinky, Saddle pastures | 4-26 Dutch Findlay | Most minor roads December 1-April 30 | Check maps, main roads open year round, minor open May 1 November 30 |
| Waldo- | 4-22 Baynes Lake Koocanusa | April 15-June 30 | No public access at all, dogs must be leashed April 1 to 15 and July 1-August 1st |
| Cherry Tata-TNT property | 4-21- Cherry Creek ranch and Bummers Flats | Year round | Highway three access roads open, see map |
| Premier Ridge-All | 4-21 Premier Ridge | December 1-April 30 | See map |
| Pickering Hills; all | 4-22 Pickering Hills | Year round | Check maps, main roads open year round, |
| Waldo-Sheep Mtn north, Cutts Road | 4-22 Sheep Mountain | Year round | Check maps, main roads open year round, |
| Powerplant; all | 4-22 Powerplant | Most minor roads December 1-April 30 | Check maps, main roads open year round, minor open May 1 November 30 |
| | | | |

## 22. PROTECTION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES

**Objective**:
1 Carry out operations so as to minimize the risk of destroying or harming telephone lines, pipelines, public highways or power transmission lines..

**A Legal reference**: Utilities can be considered as Resource features as per section 70 of the *Forest Planning and Practices Regulation*, although they are not specifically mentioned as such in the Act. In general they are of value and should be protected.

**e. Measurable** The five year plan shall be referred to all known public utilities within the Rocky Mountain Trench. Recommendations from public utilities shall be reviewed and considered for incorporation into the Ecosystem Restoration Prescriptions.

**f. Discussion**

MINISTRY OF HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION
Ecosystem Restoration Program will follow the locally negotiated memorandum of understanding with the Ministry of Transportation and Highways regarding prescribed burns and Highways. A copy may be obtained from Dean Draper at the Ministry of Forests and Range Cranbrook office.

BC HYDRO
Rocky Mountain Trench primary contact at BC Hydro is Darcy Johnson (tel 250-489-6806, cell 250-919-7511) email darcy.johnson@bchydro.com Secondary Contact is Ian Kozicky (tel 250-489-6857 cell 250-417-7316) email l: Ian.Kozicky@bchydro.com

These are parameters as to how Ecosystem Restoration can carry out tree thinning and burning operations around BC Hydro Transmission and distribution lines without impacting the operations of either agency. Our guidelines:

1) General Conditions:

- Do not park underneath hydro lines for any length of time; electrical discharge can occur. Parking, tying down loads, slash piles, decking / loading areas, etc are typically not allowed underneath the powerlines
- Equipment with extended reach or loads must use extreme caution when working near powerlines. At all times the 'Limits of Approach' must be obeyed. Do not work closer to the powerlines than the distances listed in the table below
- In certain situations, specific equipment may not be allowed to work within the powerline area
- Flagging guy wire locations and placing warning signs at all powerline crossing is also recommended

- Contact BC Hydro at least 3 days prior to any work commencing around the powerlines. BC Hydro will send a representative to act as a safety watch and to supervise any activities around the powerlines
- Review the Worksafe BC publication "Overhead high-voltage electricity" and BC Hydro "High Voltage Systems" with all crews prior to start of work near lines.

2) Tree felling

- All trees that can touch a line or come within the limits of approach should be felled
- Feller bunchers are preferred for felling so as to best control trees and keep them out of the Limits of approach.
- If no feller buncher is available use a Certified Utility Arborist, BC Hydro has a list of CUAs and our local contractors are Scott Wills and Asplundh
- Use general crew to buck up trees and pile near the transmission line so long as operations do not encroach into the limits of approach.
- Remove all trees with 5 metres radius of any pole or anchor
- There is to be no fuel build up on the right of way. No pile burning on or within 20 metres of the RW
- Remove any trees within a 5m radius of any pole or anchor prior to the main burn

3) Tree hauling;

- Trees can be hauled on a right of way road, but this is site specific and MOFR must contact BC Hydro ahead of time for an evaluation. All BC Hydro roads to be used must be treated on an individual bases between BC Hydro and the contractor using the roads. A permission to use/construct form (PTC) will be filled out at that time.
- Dean Draper MOFR office Cranbrook has copies of forms (permission to Use or construct works within BC Hydro Transmission Lines Right of way) to be submitted to BC Hydro prior to any road building or hauling operations
- In general clearance between truck and line should be 11 metres. To be confirmed with a field visit with BC Hydro. In general heights over 4.02 metres should be avoided and a vertical distance of 4.5 metres should be maintained between vehicles and overhead lines.
- No new road or landing constriction with 10 metres of poles, guy wires or other transmission infrastructure

4) Prescribed Burning

- Water trucks and hoses can be used on the line; do not spray with 4.5 metres of an energised line to avoid arcing.
- The transmission poles are to be protected during a burn by raking, wrapping or black lining. Black lining is not limited to wood poles only, it must include the entire structure (i.e. Pole and guy wires)
- Do not spray or soak any pole or anchor without the supervision of a BC Hydro representative. Use of water around Hydro poles is extremely dangerous and should be avoided.
- Black lining may be required along the ROW edge where there is an abundant amount of fuel adjacent to the ROW.

- A water truck must be on-site while any burning is underway
- No personnel or aircraft should spray or dump water or retardant on or near any BC Hydro plant (building) without previous permission or supervision of a BC Hydro representative
- It may be necessary to remove vegetation or other fuels prior to burning near a power pole or within the rights-of-way
- Burning onto the guard is permitted so long as infrastructure and other values are protected (e.g. a Christmas tree permit under the lines as per Eager Hills) Access road can make a fireguard, This is to be confirmed during planning stage by field inspection with BC Hydro
- The Burn Boss is to contact BC Hydro prior to light up and they will send a line man out to monitor the line (no cost to us).
- Good venting is needed for light up as smoke can cause arcing. Conditions which could allow for dense smoke within the power line rights-of-way should be avoided as this could create a serious electrical hazard. In general remove all slash and debris from within 20 metres of a hydro right of way.
- Note that the line from Indian Springs pasture due east to Kimberley is currently unenergised.
- If MOFR has information about rare and endangered species, such as a Lewis' Woodpecker nesting in a Hydro pole, we are to pass this information onto Hydro so that they can do their due diligence in environmental protection.

## General limits of approach (Table 3.22.1)

| Voltage, phase to phase | | Minimum distance | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Kilovolts | Volts | Metres | Feet |
| Over 750 V to 75 kV | Over 750 V to 75,000 V | 3 | 10 |
| Over 75 kV to 250 kV | Over 75,000 V to 250,000 V | 4.5 | 15 |
| Over 250 kV to 550 kV | Over 250,000 V to 550,000 V | 6 | 20 |

TRANSCANADA PIPELINE

The main Trans Canada Pipeline contact for the Rocky Trench is Darren Mitchell, phone 529-7724 or cell 421-7348 email: darren_mitchell@transcanada.com

The general conditions are:

1) Trans Canada Pipelines do not want any debris, slash piles or log decks on their pipeline right of way.

2) Vehicles over 55,000 kilogram Gross vehicle weight (nothing over a 1 ton truck) should not be operating on the pipeline, although pick up truck and water trucks are acceptable.
3) Crossings of the pipeline should only be undertaken at existing crossings. If more crossings are required Tarns Canada Pipeline is to be contacted for the specifications required for the crossing construction.
4) A one time emergency crossing of the pipeline by a larger vehicle is possible. This intended to deal with environmental emergencies such as wildfire control or attacking an escaped prescribed burn.
5) Usually burning is not an issue around the pipeline but above ground structures such as pump houses may be at risk. As a precaution TransCanada Pipeline must be contacted prior to any prescribed burn being ignited adjacent to the pipeline. Even if there are no issues Trans Canada pipeline would appreciate being kept informed.

TELUS Telephone Lines

The main contact for TELUS is 1-800-474-6886 which only grants information about digging near TELUS underground lines or Trans Canada pipelines. For above ground powerlines contact Dave Bulford Cable Manager in Cranbrook at 250-489-8636 email dave.bulford@telus.com

Recommendations' are to protect the lines and power poles during operations, they do have the arcing potential of powerlines but the lines will not withstand much pressure and the poles have the same potential to burn as power poles. A fibre optic line runs under most telephone lines; assume there is one there for road or landing construction. Specific recommendations are:

1) During Tree felling ensure the trees are felled away from the line; a feller buncher or a certified faller is required. Do not fall trees onto the line.
2) Remove all trees with 5 metres radius of any pole or anchor.
3) There is to be no fuel build up on the right of way. No pile burning on or within 20 metres of the RW
4) In general heights over 4.02 metres should be avoided and a vertical distance of 4.5 metres should be maintained between vehicles and overhead lines.
5) No new road or landing constriction with 10 metres of poles, guy wires or other transmission infrastructure

**d. Monitoring protocol**. Ministry of Forests and Range will keep all records of any discussions or permissions for operations on five year plan file for future auditing and follow up.

## 22. PROTECTION OF RESEARCH TRIALS, GROWTH AND YIELD PLOTS, RANGE REFERENCE AREAS

**Objective**:
Carry out operations so as to minimize the risk of destroying or harming Research Trials, Growth and Yield Plots, Range Reference areas

**A Legal reference**: Research Trials, Growth and Yield Plots and Range reference Areas can be considered as Resource features as per section 70 of the *Forest Planning and Practices Regulation*, although the Government Action Regulation order for their protection did not go through. In general they are of value and should be protected.

- **g. Measurable:** Prescribers shall check the mapping layers available for occurrence of any of these features within a treatment area. Field crews as well must check for their occurrence. Actions must be prescribed to protect each feature.
- **h. Discussion**
- **i.** Discussion with Ministry of Forests and Range Inventory Branch shows that a 100 metre buffer is required around all growth a yield plots. Contact Bob MacDonald Growth and Yield Forester Southern Interior Forest Region, Ministry of Forests and Range, 1265 Dalhousie Drive, Kamloops BC Canada V2C 5Z5 telephone ( (250) 371-5211 Facsimile: (250) 371-5293
- **j.** The Ministry of Forests and Range Research Branch prefers that all activities close (within 500 metres) to their active research site be referred to them for site specific conditions. In general nothing may be touched within the research plot area and buffering may be required on some specific projects. Fire guarded with reseeding may be an acceptable protection action. Contact Ryan Jordan or Frank J. van Thienen Field and Database Technician, BC Ministry of Forests, Research Branch Kalamalka Research Station, Vernon BC voice 250-260-4760 fax 250-542-2230
- **k.** Range Reference areas are to be treated to treated the same within the fence line as without. The exclosures are tied to changes inside as outside and measure the effects of grazing on the plant community. Excluding the range exclosures from fire could confound the results. The fence posts are to reserved and protected from fire preferably by black lining, presoaking or foam. It is definitely not approved to expose mineral soil, and the attendant risk of invasive plants or other plant community changes near a range reference area. Contact Rick Tucker Range Agrologist, Ministry of Forest and Range, Southern Interior Region telephone 250-828-4141

**Table 3.23.1 List of Growth and Yield Plots in Rocky Mountain Forest District Source: MOFR Research Branch, stored in Land and Resource Data Warehouse.**

| Growth & Yield SAMPLE Number | 50K_Map sheet | LONG_ | LAT | Area (ha) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18-26-23G | 082F.120 | 116.0199 | 49.6149 | 0.8 |
| 18-1-64G | 082G.102 | 115.2815 | 49.0547 | 0.8 |
| 18-2-94G | 082G.102 | 115.5355 | 49.0270 | 0.8 |
| 18-2-95G | 082G.102 | 115.5004 | 49.0305 | 0.8 |
| 18-2-96G | 082G.102 | 115.4928 | 49.0521 | 0.8 |
| 18-17-3G | 082G.106 | 115.9436 | 49.2633 | 7.2 |
| 18-17-4G | 082G.106 | 115.9458 | 49.2621 | 7.2 |
| 18-17-5G | 082G.106 | 115.8980 | 49.2696 | 7.2 |
| 18-17-6G | 082G.106 | 115.8997 | 49.2691 | 7.2 |
| 18-17-50G | 082G.106 | 115.9270 | 49.3058 | 7.2 |
| 18-17-51G | 082G.106 | 115.9134 | 49.2966 | 7.2 |
| 18-9-34G | 082G.107 | 115.3382 | 49.2400 | 0.8 |
| 18-21-14G | 082G.111 | 115.8811 | 49.5449 | 7.2 |
| 18-22-1G | 082G.111 | 115.9711 | 49.4615 | 7.2 |
| 18-22-2G | 082G.111 | 115.9732 | 49.4622 | 7.2 |
| 18-22-3G | 082G.111 | 115.9755 | 49.4630 | 7.2 |
| 18-22-25G | 082G.111 | 115.9574 | 49.4311 | 7.2 |
| 18-26-22G | 082G.111 | 115.9179 | 49.5639 | 7.2 |
| 19-21-7G | 082G.113 | 115.0269 | 49.5803 | 0.8 |
| 21-3-12G | 082G.121 | 115.6796 | 49.8380 | 0.8 |
| 21-6-10G | 082G.121 | 115.8238 | 49.9749 | 0.8 |
| 21-7-100G | 082G.121 | 115.8469 | 49.9789 | 0.8 |
| 21-6-9G | 082G.121 | 115.7390 | 49.9701 | 7.2 |
| 21-28-80G | 082J.103 | 115.1628 | 50.1693 | 0.8 |
| 21-28-84G | 082J.107 | 115.3195 | 50.3469 | 0.8 |
| 21-28-86G | 082J.107 | 115.3234 | 50.3501 | 0.8 |
| 21-26-56G | 082J.107 | 115.4719 | 50.2114 | 7.2 |
| 21-28-78G | 082J.107 | 115.2975 | 50.3187 | 7.2 |
| 21-28-83G | 082J.107 | 115.2717 | 50.2495 | 0.8 |
| 21-17-50G | 082K.119 | 116.4485 | 50.6434 | 7.2 |
| 21-17-51G | 082K.119 | 116.4489 | 50.6446 | 7.2 |
| 21-17-57G | 082K.120 | 116.3178 | 50.6315 | 7.2 |
| 21-17-58G | 082K.120 | 116.3182 | 50.6308 | 7.2 |

**Table 3.23.2 List of Research Trials in Rocky Mountain Forest District Source; MOFR Research Branch, stored in Land and Resource Data Warehouse.**

| Trial Number | Project_Title | Study_Site | 50K Mapsheet | LONG_ | LAT | Area (ha) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| EP0670.71.06 | Studies of Englemen Spruce Genetics | Lamb Creek | 082F.110 | 116.0084 | 49.2574 | 2.4 |
| EP1020.02.01.04 | Western Larch Progeny Trials | Sawmill Creek | 082F.115 | 116.0213 | 49.5650 | 4.4 |
| EP1209.12 | Skid Trail Rehabilitation Effects on Soil Properties and Resulting Forest Productivity | Bloom Creek | 082G.102 | 115.4423 | 49.1168 | 1.0 |
| EP1209.12 | Skid Trail Rehabilitation Effects on Soil Properties and Resulting Forest Productivity | Caven Creek | 082G.102 | 115.4836 | 49.1771 | 0.9 |
| EP0670.02.03.02 | Genetic Improvement of Interior Spruce | Bloom Creek Site 1 & 2 | 082G.102 | 115.4519 | 49.0144 | 3.6 |
| EP0670.02.03.19 | Genetic Improvement of Interior Spruce | Roche Creek Site 1 & 2 | 082G.105 | 114.3101 | 49.1812 | 2.8 |
| EP1020.02.01.03 | Western Larch Progeny Trials | Semlin Creek | 082G.106 | 115.9639 | 49.3918 | 4.4 |
| EP1020.02.01.02 | Western Larch Progeny Trials | Lamb Creek | 082G.106 | 115.8503 | 49.3577 | 12.2 |
| EP1020.02.03.02 | Western Larch Progeny Trials | Upper Lamb Creek | 082G.106 | 115.8612 | 49.3350 | 3.2 |
| EP0670.02.03.31 | Genetic Improvement of Interior Spruce | Gold Hill Creek Site 2 | 082G.106 | 115.8995 | 49.3282 | 1.8 |
| EP0670.02.03.21 | Genetic Improvement of Interior Spruce | Lamb Creek Site 2 | 082G.106 | 115.8733 | 49.3376 | 3.3 |
| EP1209.05 | Longterm soil productivity - rehabbed landing | Tait Creek Block 1 | 082G.106 | 115.8806 | 49.3293 | 0.8 |
| EP1209.05 | Longterm soil productivity - rehabbed landing | Tait Creek Block 2 | 082G.106 | 115.8756 | 49.3260 | 0.8 |
| EP0670.02.03.01 | Genetic Improvement of Interior Spruce | Lamb Creek Site 1 | 082G.106 | 115.8664 | 49.3393 | 2.0 |
| EP0886.01.12 | Fertilization Trials in the BC Interior | Gold Creek | 082G.107 | 115.4992 | 49.3161 | 15.1 |
| EP0886.01.04 | Fertilization Trials in the BC Interior | Gold Creek | 082G.107 | 115.5325 | 49.3085 | 27.7 |
| EP0886.01.47 | Fertilization Trials in the BC Interior | Teepee Creek | 082G.107 | 115.5325 | 49.3121 | 27.6 |
| EP1020.02.03.04 | Western Larch Progeny Trials | Semlin Creek 95 | 082G.111 | 115.9544 | 49.4105 | 2.8 |
| EP0511.01 | Crop-tree thinning of Western Larch | Perry Creek | 082G.111 | 115.9171 | 49.5694 | 12.4 |
| EP0670.71.12.05 | White/Engelman Spruce Genecology Climate Change Trial | Cranbrook | 082G.111 | 115.9586 | 49.4103 | 1.9 |
| EP0657.03 | Exploratory studies with 30 Lodgepole pine provenances | Negro Creek | 082G.111 | 115.9532 | 49.4238 | 11.8 |
| EP0657.06 | All range lodgepole pine provenance trials | Wuho Creek | 082G.111 | 115.9506 | 49.4541 | 6.6 |
| EP0976.02.08.04 | Interior Douglas-fir Progeny Trials | Lumberton | 082G.111 | 115.9054 | 49.4315 | 4.9 |
| EP0670.02.04.02 | Second Generation Breed Production Trial | Bull River | 082G.112 | 115.4572 | 49.4655 | 3.6 |
| EP1365 | Residual Basal Area Study in a | St Marys East | 082G.116 | 115.9765 | 49.6212 | 6.4 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | mixed conifer stand | | | | | |
| EP1365 | Residual Basal Area Study in a mixed conifer stand | St Marys Centre | 082G.116 | 115.9860 | 49.6273 | 8.4 |
| EP0607.01 | Ponderosa Pine Spacing Trials | Cherry Creek | 082G.116 | 115.8404 | 49.6943 | 3.0 |
| EP1333 | Monitoring Restoration of Fire-Maintained Ecosystem | Sheep Creek North | 082G.121 | 115.6989 | 49.9866 | 396.9 |
| EP1333 | Monitoring Restoration of Fire-Maintained Ecosystem | Wolf Creek | 082G.121 | 115.6958 | 49.8432 | 154.6 |
| EP0770.20.20.03 | Lodgepole pine OP/full-sib progeny testing | Pommier Creek | 082G.121 | 115.8417 | 49.8795 | 2.4 |
| EP1209.12 | Skid Trail Rehabilitation Effects on Soil Properties and Resulting Forest Productivity | Grave Creek Site 1 | 082J.102 | 115.3003 | 50.1931 | 1.7 |
| EP0670.02.04.03 | Second Generation Breed Production Trial | WhiteSwan Lake | 082J.102 | 115.4593 | 50.1576 | 2.7 |
| EP0670.02.03.17 | Genetic Improvement of Interior Spruce | Grave Creek Site 1 & 2 | 082J.102 | 115.2961 | 50.1929 | 4.1 |
| EP0670.02.03.13 | Genetic Improvement of Interior Spruce | East White River Site 1 | 082J.103 | 115.1092 | 50.1512 | 1.8 |
| EP0670.02.03.22 | Genetic Improvement of Interior Spruce | East White River Site 2 | 082J.103 | 115.1080 | 50.1502 | 1.7 |
| EP1209.12 | Skid Trail Rehabilitation Effects on Soil Properties and Resulting Forest Productivity | Grave Creek Site 2 | 082J.107 | 115.3093 | 50.2034 | 1.7 |
| EP0886.01.39 | Fertilization Trials in the BC Interior | South Jack Creek | 082J.107 | 115.4825 | 50.2647 | 9.1 |
| EP0657.06 | All range lodgepole pine provenance trials | Elk Creek | 082J.107 | 115.4663 | 50.2517 | 6.4 |
| EP0670.02.03.07 | Genetic Improvement of Interior Spruce | Horsethief Creek Site 1 | 082K.114 | 116.5529 | 50.5180 | 1.8 |
| EP0670.02.03.15 | Genetic Improvement of Interior Spruce | Horsethief Creek Site 2 | 082K.114 | 116.5546 | 50.5159 | 1.7 |
| EP0922.07 | Juvenile Spacing Trials | Driftwood Creek | 082K.124 | 116.5862 | 50.9196 | 5.1 |
| EP1209.12 | Skid Trail Rehabilitation Effects on Soil Properties and Resulting Forest Productivity | McMurdo Creek | 082N.103 | 117.0936 | 51.1227 | 8.5 |

# Chapter 4 Monitoring

## GOALS

The goals of the Ecosystem Restoration (ER) - Effectiveness Monitoring (EM) Program are as follows:

1) To create an EM framework that is consistent with the goals of the Ecosystem Restoration program and can be realistically applied throughout the Rocky Mountain Trench (RMT) by all proponents of the Ecosystem Restoration program.

2) To monitor the effects of Ecosystem Restoration treatments on the flora and fauna in the treatment areas.

3) To provide Ecosystem Restoration program managers and practitioners with empirical data to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of Ecosystem Restoration treatments, and to determine if restoration program goals and objectives are being met.

4) To use this data to adapt practices and procedures to better meet the program goals.

5) To sample fuel loading and burn behaviour to determine if Ecosystem Restoration program is decreasing fire hazards through its treatments and to allow calibration of fire predictive models so risk can be easily assessed on a landscape level.

## OBJECTIVES

"An Effectiveness Monitoring Plan for NDT4 Ecosystem Restoration in the East Kootenay Trench" (Pandion, 2002) identifies the following 13 monitoring objectives and prioritizes them as high, medium or low.

| **Monitoring Objective** | **Priority** |
|---|---|
| 1. Monitor tree density, size, and species composition. | High |
| 2. Monitor cover and species composition of native grass, herb, and shrub species. | High |
| 3. Monitor number and cover of non-native and noxious weed species. | High |
| 4. Monitor existing density and cover of rare plants. | Low |
| 5. Monitor the species richness and population density of endemic wildlife. | High |
| 6. Monitor number and population density of vertebrate species of special interest. | High |
| 7. Monitor forage production. | High |
| 8. Monitor wildlife tree densities and sizes. | High |
| 9. Monitor large-sized coarse woody debris. | Medium |
| 10. Monitor the integrity of riparian and wetland areas. | Medium |

| | |
|---|---|
| 11. Monitor soil fertility. | Low |
| 12. Monitor soil erosion and compaction. | Low |
| 13. Monitor insect and disease incidence. | Medium |

Faced with a limited budget the NDT4 Steering committee pared the 13 monitoring objectives down to the following 4 high priority objectives. As documented in "Blue print for Action' these 4 would be examined first before expanding to other objectives:

1) Monitor stand structure and over story vegetation: crown closure, tree density, diameter, species and decay class.
2) Monitor under story structure and composition: grass, herb and shrub percent cover by species, species richness and composition.
3) Monitor forage production: kilograms per hectare by species, grazed and ungrazed.
4) Monitor status of invasive plant species: percent cover by species, number of species.

Some discretion will be left up to Ecosystem Restoration practitioners and proponents as to whether it would be more beneficial to implement a higher level of monitoring in a given treatment area or carry out monitoring for the other objectives. However, it is critical that all practitioners and proponents use consistent data collection and storage approaches so that all data can be analysed and compared in a robust, scientifically credible manner.

## LAYERS OF MONITORING

Routine Monitoring is one of three tiers of effectiveness monitoring called for in Pandion Ecological Research Ltd. "An Effectiveness Monitoring Plan for NDT4 Ecosystem Restoration in the East Kootenay Trench" 2002 and by Hillary Page's paper "An Update to the Trench Effectiveness Monitoring Plan for NDT4 Ecosystem Restoration in the East Kootenay Trench" in 2006. These two reports are accepted by all proponents in the Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration program as the key documents for effectiveness monitoring. The reports set out objectives and an outline methods for an Effectiveness Monitoring program, but they do not define routine monitoring beyond photo plots. A summary from the page 14 of the 2002 notes:

Based on our review, it appears that considerable monitoring of restoration treatments has already been undertaken, but results of these efforts have not consistently been documented, summarized, and communicated to promote adaptive management. Future monitoring efforts might benefit from a more strategic and consistent approach, particularly in light of reduced provincial funding projections in future years. Such an approach might involve three tiers:

(1) *intensive* monitoring at a subset of operational restoration sites to quantify treatment effects on key resources;
(2) *routine* monitoring at the majority of operational restoration sites to provide qualitative ecosystem recovery data that can support intensive findings; and
(3) parallel research studies involving replicated treatments and controls to investigate causal mechanisms underlying monitoring results

A distinction must be made between Routine and Implementation and Effectiveness monitoring. Implementation monitoring is simply assessing if the treatments being carried out in a given unit comply with the Ecosystem Restoration Prescription and terms that were laid out in agreed upon contracts. Implementation monitoring asks the question- Was the plan that was set out to achieve, achieved in full? Effectiveness monitoring on the other hand, assesses the degree to which Ecosystem Restoration practices are achieving specific objectives of the Ecosystem Restoration program. Here the question is asked- What was the biological response to a given treatment, and was that response in-line with meeting set Ecosystem Restoration objectives? Effectiveness and Implementation monitoring are not the same thing but the program aims to take normal, routine implementation monitoring protocols and upgrade them to integrate them with the intensive monitoring and research programs.

A separate Report by the Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Program Operations Committee sets out details of 6 routine protocols based on the two existing monitoring documents. The protocols are defined in the document as 6 levels and the objectives of the routine Monitoring Protocols are as follows:

1) to apply Level 1, 2, 3 routine monitoring to 100 % of the Ecosystem Restoration treatment areas;
2) to apply Level 4 or 5 routine monitoring to selected Ecosystem Restoration treatment areas with bighorn and badger populations.
3) Establish 30 Fuel management plots in all types of fuel, aspects and forest types throughout the Ecosystem Restoration treatment areas to meet level 6 by 2013

As per the recommendations of Pandion, 2002, routine monitoring procedures should be carried out in the summer growing season, one year prior to treatment and again the year following a treatment. Data collection in the terms of photo plot revisits should also occur 1, 3, 5 and 10 years following a prescribed burn as well as immediately prior to and after Restoration prescribed burn.

## ASSUMPTIONS

The ability to monitor the effectiveness of Ecosystem Restoration work is contingent upon funding, resources, and time allocation. Available funding for the Ecosystem Restoration program will vary from year to year, therefore the monitoring program must be able to expand or contract based upon funding for each fiscal year. As a general guideline it is recommended that 6-10% of a program's budget be allocated for monitoring (Pandion, 2002).

As no two treatment units are identical, a decision must be made for each treatment unit for the level of monitoring to be applied. The decision to apply intensive monitoring will be made at the program level, it is expected that a level of routine monitoring will be made on every treatment unit. The effort required will be set at the Ecosystem Restoration Prescription level.

After 10 years of monitoring efforts these two framework reports are being revisited by a newly struck subcommittee of the NDT4 Steering Committee. A new protocol will draw on the objectives outlined here, but will include more detailed and standardized data collection, storage, and analysis methods that allow for varying levels of effort and detail in effectiveness monitoring activities. These new protocols for effectiveness monitoring are hoped to be in place by January 2010.As well by March 2010 the Ecosystem Restoration program hopes to have in place:

- A synopsis of the 57 monitoring reports completed to date (list attached) below
- An on line searchable library that all partners and Ecosystem Restoration researchers can access should be available by January 2010
- A 10 year work plan to revisit and re measure existing monitoring sites or to re establish new ones. Table .1 shows current active sites and table 4. Shows inactive sites that could be revisited. Goal from Page 2006 is to have 10 intensive sites in both PPdh2 and IDF Biogeoclimatic zones.

Table 4.1 List of all Active Ecosystem Restoration monitoring sites in the Rocky Mountain Trench. Updated from Page 2006

| Land Owner | Biogeoclimatic Zone | Report Citation | Range Unit/Location | Pasture | Monitoring Measured | Objective | Agency/Proponent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Crown | IDFdm2 | Newman et al, 2004, 2005, 2006, Page 2002, Powell et al 1999 | Sheep Creek North | Central | Research EP 1333 | understory | Ministry of Forests |
| Crown | PPdh2 | Newman et al, 2004, 2005, 2006, Page 2002, Powell et al 1999 | Wolf-Sheep (Premier) | Wolf Creek | Research EP 1333 | understory | Ministry of Forests |
| Crown | PPdh2 | Page 2004 | Powerplant | North Fontaine | due 2009, 2010 | overstory/understory | Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program |
| Crown | IDFun | Page 2004 | Windemere Fairmont | Stoddart Creek North | Due 2010 | overstory/understory | Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program |
| Crown | IDFdm2 | Page and Machmer 2003 | Wolf Premier | Gina Lake | due 2010 | overstory/understory | Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program |
| Crown | IDFdm2 | Page and Machmer 2003 | Newgate | Rock's | Due 2009, 2011, 2016 | overstory/understory | Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program |
| TNT | IDFun/IDFdm 2 | Page 2005 | Hoodoo/Hofert | Hawke Road | forage each year | overstory/understory | Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program |
| TNT | IDFdm2 | Page 2005 | Hoodoo/Hofert | Hoodoo | forage each year | overstory/understory / Wildlife Trees | Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program |
| Federal | IDFun | Page 2004; Page 2005 | Kootenay National Park | Redstreak | 2007 | overstory/understory | Kootenay National Park |
| federal | IDFun | Osprey Communication | Kootenay National Park | Redstreak | 2001 | Bighorn Sheep visuals | Kootenay National Park |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | s | | | | | |
| Crown | IDFun | Page 2007 | Windemere Fairmont | Stoddart Creek South (Juniper Heights) | due 2010, 2012, 2014, 2019 | overstory/understory | Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program |
| Crown | IDFdm2 | Not yet | Lewis Wolf | Lewis Badlands | Establishe d 2008 | overstory/understory | Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program |
| Crown | IDFdm2 | Not yet | Cherry Tata | Airport | Establishe d 2008 | overstory/understory / Badgers/ Old Growth | Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program |
| Crown | IDFdm2/PPdh 2 | Ross 2005 | Waldo North | Colvalli, Twin Lakes, Pipeline | due 2010 | overstory/understory | Trench Society |
| TNT | IDFdm2 | Machmer 2002c | Cherry Tata | Cherry Creek Ranch | | Birds/ wildlife ttrees | The Nature Trust |
| TNT | IDFdm2 | Wager and Ross 2001, Ross 2001d, Ross 2007 | Cherry Tata | Cherry Creek Ranch | 2007 | Overstory/ Understory | The Nature Trust |
| crown | PPdh2 | Ross 1999a, b, 2002a, b | Waldo | Kikomun Provincial Park | 2002 | Effectiveness overstory/understory | BC Parks Branch |
| NCC | IDFdm2 | N/A | Sheep Creek North | Kootenay River Ranch | 2008 baseline | overstory/understory | Nature Conservancy of Canada |
| NCC | IDFdm2 | Cooper some time soon | Sheep Creek North | Kootenay River Ranch | due 2012 | Bird life | Nature Conservancy of Canada |

Table 4.2 List of Existing Ecosystem Restoration Monitoring Sites that could be remeasured. Source Paige 2006

| Land Owner | BEC Zone | Report Citation | Range Unit/Location | Pasture | Monitoring Measured | Type of Monitoring | Objective | Agency/Proponent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| crown | PPdh2 | Ross et al 1998 | St. Mary's Prairie | ? | 1998 | Research | overstory/understory | Ministry of Forests |
| crown | PPdh2 | Ross et al 1998 | Cherry-TaTa Creek | ? | 1998 | Research | overstory/understory | Ministry of Forests |
| crown | PPdh2 | Ross et al 1998 | TaTa Skook | ? | 1998 | Research | overstory/understory | Ministry of Forests |
| crown | IDFdm2/ PPdh2 | Smith 199 et al | Wolf-Sheep Creek | Sheep | 1998 | Effectiveness | overstory/understory | Ministry of Forests |
| crown | PPdh2 | Machmer 2001, 2002b | East Columbia Lake | | 2002 | Effectiveness | wildlife | Pandion Ecological Research |
| crown | IDFdm2 | Machmer 2001, 2002b | Grasmere | Dump | 2002 | Effectiveness | wildlife | Pandion Ecological Research |
| crown | IDFdm2/ PPdh2 | Machmer | Cherry-TaTa Creek | TaTa Creek? | 2001 | Effectiveness | Wildlife | Pandion Ecological Research |
| crown | IDFdm2/ PPdh2 | Ross | Cherry-TaTa Creek | Miller Road | 2001 | Effectiveness | overstory/understory | Rocky Mountain Natural Resources Society |
| crown | IDFdm2/ PPdh2 | Ross 1998 b, c | Cherry-TaTa Creek | Tata Creek? | 2001 | Effectiveness | overstory/understory | Rocky Mountain Natural Resources Society |
| crown | IDFdm2/ PPdh2 | Penniket and Associates 1998 | Cherry-TaTa Creek | TaTa Creek? | 2001 | Effectiveness | overstory structure | Rocky Mountain Natural Resources Society |
| Crown | IDFdm2/ | Ross 2001c, | Waldo- | Fusee | | Effectiveness | verstory/Understory | Tembec, Steering |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | PPdh2 | Ross 2005a, Ross 2008 | | East and North-Baynes Lake | | | (3 retention levels) | Committee |
| crown | IDFdm2 | Dyskstra et al, 1995 ; Kayl 1997 | Gold PlumBob | Strauss Road | Inactive Research | Effectiveness | overstory/understory | Ministry of Forests |

Table 4.3 List of East Kootenay Trench monitoring reports and literature (as per Page 2006, updated by Harris, 2009)

Berg, G 2001 Vegetation Change Following Restoration Treatments 1995-2001, unpublished, Ministry of Forests and Range, Rocky Mtn District

Berg, G . 2005. An update of vegetation change following burning and/or thinning 1995-2005. Rocky Mountain Forest District, Cranbrook, BC. 41p.

Demarchi, Dennis and Susan Lofts, The Effects of Spring Burning on the Productivity and Nutrient Concentration of Several Shrub Species in the Southern Rocky Mtn. Trench. Ministry of Environment, Wildlife Branch, Victoria, Jan., 1985

Dykstra, P., D. DeLong, T. Braumandl and C. Steeger. 2002. Old Growth Restoration in the IDFdm2: Monitoring Plot Installation and Five Year Results - Strauss Road Site. Prepared for Forest Renewal BC Terrestrial Ecosystem Restoration Programme by the BC Ministry of Forests and Pandion Ecological Research Ltd, Nelson, BC.

EMBER 1995. Ecosystem Maintenance Demonstration Burns Research Project: General Work Plan and establishment report for Picture Valley and Findlay Creek sites. B.C. Ministry of Forests, Nelson Forest Region, Nelson, B.C. 53pp.

Gayton, D., T. Braumandl and R. Stewart. 1995. Ecosystem maintenance burning evaluation and research programme (EMBER) pilot project, Nelson Forest Region (1993-1997): Problem Analysis and Working Plan. BC Ministry of Forests, Nelson Region. 52pp.

Hawe, A. and D. Delong. 1997. Case study: partial cutting to restore old-growth forest conditions in the East Kootenay Trench. Research Summary RS-032, B.C. Ministry of Forests, Nelson Forest Region, Nelson, BC. 4pp.

Kayll, A.J. 1995. EMBER: an interim assessment. Report by Appropriate Forestry Services, Nelson, British Columbia. 18pp.

Machmer, M.M. 2000. The ecological role of fire for cavity nesting birds. Final Technical Report to the Forest Renewal British Columbia and the BC Science Council, Burnaby, BC. 55pp.

Machmer, M.M. 2002a. Effects of Ecosystem Restoration Treatments on Cavity-Nesting Birds, Their Habitat and Their Insectivorous Prey in Fire-Maintained Forests of Southeastern British Columbia. Proceedings of the “Ecology and Management of Dead Wood in Western Forests Symposium, Nov. 2-4, 1999, Reno, Nevada. USDA Forest Service Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-GTR-181. 2002. pp. 121-133.

Machmer, M.M. 2002b. Development and Testing of Fine-filter Prescriptions for Listed and Fire-adapted Species in Conjunction with NDT4 Ecosystem Restoration Treatment: Site Establishment Report. Terrestrial Ecosystem Restoration Program, Ministry of Water, Land & Air Protection. 20 p.

Machmer, M.M.. 2002c. Baseline biodiversity inventory for the Cherry Creek property: final report. The Nature Trust of British Columbia. 34 p.

Machmer, M ., H .N. Page and C. Steeger. 2002. East Kootenay Trench restoration effectiveness monitoring plan. Submitted to Habitat Branch, Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection. Forest Renewal British Columbia Terrestrial Ecosystem Restoration Program. Pandion Ecological Research. Nelson, B C. 50p.

Newman, R.F., S. Wurtz and J. Parminter. 2006. Understory Succession following Ecosystem Restoration of Ingrown Dry Forests. Forest Science Programme 2005/06 Annual Technical Report. FSP Project Number: Y062069

Newman, R.F., J. Parminter and S. Wurtz. 2005. Understory Succession following Ecosystem Restoration of Ingrown Dry Forests. Forest Science Programme. 2004/05 Annual Technical Report. FSP Project Number: Y051069

Newman, R.F., H. Page and J. Parminter. 2004. Understory Succession following Initial Ecosystem Restoration Treatments in Ingrown Dry Forests. 16th International Conference, Society for Ecological Restoration, August 24-26, 2004, Victoria, Canada. 4pp.

Osprey Communications. 2001. Bighorn In Our Backyard – Monitoring and Restoration Programme Results 2000 – 2001. Bighorn In Our Backyard. Invermere, BC. 32P.

Page, H.N. 2002. Monitoring Mechanical Restoration Effectiveness in Fire-Maintained Ecosystems of the East Kootenay. M.Sc Thesis, Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

Page, H.N.. 2004a. Monitoring Ecosystem Restoration Treatments at North Stoddart Creek and North Fontaine. Prepared for: Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Compensation Programme. Nelson, BC. 32p.

Page, H.N. 2004b. Monitoring Ecosystem Restoration Treatments in Kootenay National Park. Site Establishment Report. Submitted to: Kootenay National Park, Lake Louise Kootenay Yoho Field Unit. Radium Hot Springs, BC. October, 2004. 28P.

Page, H.N.. 2005a. Hoodoo/Hofert Restoration Treatment Monitoring. Site Establishment Report. Submitted to: Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Compensation Programme. Nelson, BC. November, 2005. 28p.

Page, H.N.. 2005b. Monitoring Ecosystem Restoration Treatments in Kootenay National Park. Year one post-fire monitoring. Submitted to: Kootenay National Park, Lake Louise Kootenay Yoho Field Unit. Radium Hot Springs, BC.. November, 2005. 28P.

Page, H 2006a An update to the Trench Effectiveness Plan for NDT4 Ecosystem Restoration in the East Kootenay Trench (Draft) Submitted to BC Ministry of Environment 86 pages

Page, H.N.. 2006b. Monitoring Ecosystem Restoration Treatments in Kootenay National Park. Year two post-fire monitoring. Submitted to: Kootenay National Park, Lake Louise Kootenay Yoho Field Unit. Radium Hot Springs, BC.. November, 2006. 28P.

Page, H.N.. 2007a. Hofert Control Site Monitoring Site Establishment and Summary Report. Submitted to: Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Compensation Programme. Nelson, BC. January 2007. 14p.

Page, H.N.. 2007b Stoddart Creek Ecosystem Restoration Monitoring and Site Establishment and Summary Report. Submitted to: Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Compensation Programme. Nelson, BC. January 2007. 25p.

Page, H.N., E.W. Bork and, R.F. Newman. 2005. Understory Responses to Mechanical Restoration and Drought Within Montane Forests of British Columbia. BC Journal of Ecosystems and Management. 6: 8 – 21.

Page, H.N. and M.M. Machmer. 2003. Monitoring Ecosystem Restoration Treatments in the Rocky Mountain Trench. Site Establishment Report. Submitted to: Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Compensation Programme and Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection. Prepared by: Pandion Ecological Research. 32p.

Penniket & Associates Ltd. 1998. East Kootenay Trench restoration treatments monitoring project: general work plan and establishment report for the Tata Creek site. Rocky Mountain Trench Natural Resources Society and Forest Renewal BC Research Programme. 41pp.

Powell, G., R. Newman, D. White, D. Smith and B. Nyberg. 1999. Monitoring restoration of fire-maintained ecosystems in the Invermere Forest District. Working Plan Version 3.0, Ministry of Forests, Research Branch, Victoria. 29pp.

Ross, T.J. 1997a. Vegetation Monitoring Program Final Report to the East Kootenay Trench Agriculture Wildlife Committee. EKTAWC, Cranbrook 364 pages

Ross, T.J. 1997b. Kikomun Creek Provincial Park grassland/open forest ecosystem restoration management plan. BC Parks, East Kootenay District, Wasa, BC. 50 p.

Ross, T.J. 1998a. Forest ingrowth and encroachment on the Grasmere Range Unit between 1958 and 1994. BC Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Kootenay/Boundary Grazing Enhancement Fund, Grasmere Grazing Association. 54 p.

Ross, T.J. 1998b. Rampart/Mayook Range Unit ecosystem restoration management plan. The Grazing Enhancement Fund, Rampart/Mayook Range Permittees. 57 p.

Ross, T.J. 1998c. East Kootenay Trench restoration programme: Plant community response following dry forest ecosystem restoration. Final Report. Forest Renewal BC and Science Council of BC. 50 p.

Ross, T.J. 1998d. East Kootenay Trench restoration programme: Plant community response following dry forest ecosystem restoration. Final Report. Rocky Mountain Trench Natural Resources Society, Forest Renewal BC and Science Council of BC. 77 p.

Ross, T.J. 1999a. Kikomun Creek Provincial Park grassland/open forest ecosystem restoration monitoring programme. BC Parks, East Kootenay District, Wasa, BC. 20 p.

Ross, T.J. 1999b. Kikomun Creek Provincial Park grassland/open forest ecosystem restoration monitoring programme. BC Parks, East Kootenay District, Wasa, BC. 50 p.

Ross, T.J. 2000a. East Kootenay Trench restoration programme: Plant community response following dry forest ecosystem restoration. Interim Report. Rocky Mountain Trench Natural Resources Society, Forest Renewal BC and Science Council of BC. 77p.

Ross, T.J. 2000b. Norbury Pasture ecosystem restoration monitoring programme. Rocky Mountain Trench Natural Resources Society, Cranbrook, BC. 53 p.

Ross, T.J. 2001a. East Kootenay Trench restoration programme: Plant community response following dry forest ecosystem restoration. Final Report. Rocky Mountain Trench Natural Resources Society, Forest Renewal BC and Science Council of BC. 90 p.

Ross, T.J. 2001b. A comparison of three residual distributions of conifers for enhancing ungulate forage. Prepared for Tembec Industries Ltd.

Ross, T.J. 2001c Cherry Creek Wildlife Area Hayfields. Prepared for the Nature Trust of Canada

Ross, T.J. 2002. Kikomun Creek Provincial Park grassland/open forest ecosystem restoration management plan programme. BC Parks, East Kootenay District, Wasa, BC. 50 p.

Ross, T.J. 2005, A comparison of Three Residual Distributions of conifers for Enhancing Ungulate Forage and Timber Values. Prepared for Rocky Mountain Trench Natural Resources Society

Ross, T.J. 2005a Cherry Creek Wildlife Area Wildfire Monitoring Survey. Prepared for the Nature Trust of Canada

Ross, T.J. 2007 Cherry Creek Property Monitoring Report. Prepared for the Nature Trust of Canada

Ross, T.J. 2008, A comparison of Three Residual Distributions of conifers for Enhancing Ungulate Forage and Timber Values, prepared for BC Ministry of Forests and Range

Ross, T.J., G.W. Powell and C. DeMaere. 1998. The effect of thinning and burning on PPdh2 understory plant cover. BC Ministry of Forests, Research Branch, Kamloops, BC. 43 p.

Ross, T.J. and Wikeem B, 1993. Vegetation Monitoring Program Preliminary Report to the East Kootenay Trench Agriculture Wildlife Committee. EKTAWC, Cranbrook 364 pages

Smith, Darrell and Gary Tipper, Premier Ridge Ecosystem Restoration Project Final Report. Report to Habitat Conservation Trust Fund, Jan. 1999

Wager, A.M., Ross, T.J. 2001 Cherry Creek Wildlife Area Ecosystem Restoration Plan. Prepared for the Nature Trust

## Bibliography; References cited

Bawtree, A.H., Milroy, J.E. 1957 Nelson Forest District, Report of Grazing Reconnaissance of the Windermere Stock Unit (see Grazing Map Y-2), Ministry of Forests and Range, Cranbrook, BC, unpublished

Berg, G . 2005. An update of vegetation change following burning and/or thinning 1995-2005. Rocky Mountain Forest District, Cranbrook, BC. 41p.

Beswick, S . and A .J. Fontana. 2003. East Kootenay elk population inventory 2003. Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection, Cranbrook, BC.

Beswick, S . and A .J. Fontana. 2004. East Kootenay Trench winter range elk population technical report 2004. Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection, Cranbrook, BC.

Bircher, N ., D. Janz, I . Hatter and R . Forbes. 2 001. East Kootenay elk management plan 2000-2004. B C Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks, Wildlife B ranch.

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.

Braumandl, T, Curran, M., eds. 1992 A Field guide for site identification and interpretation for the Nelson Forest Region, Research Branch, Ministry of Forests, Victoria BC

Cannings R and Cannings S. 1996 British Columbia: A Natural History. Greystone Books, Douglas and McIntyre, Vancouver, BC

Choquette, W. Ecological Archaeology *In* Ecological Restoration in Southeastern British Columbia—Grasslands to Mountaintops October 12–13, 2007 in Cranbrook, British Columbia, *www.cmiae.org*

Cline, S A. Berg and H. Wright. 1980 Snag characteristics and dynamics in Douglas-fir forests, Western Oregon Journal Wildl. Manage. 44:773-786 as reported in Everett, R. Baumgartner, D. Ohlson, P. Schelhaas, R, Harrod, R. 2007 Development of current stand structure in dry fir-pine forests of Eastern Washington, Journal of the Torrey Botanical Society, 134 (2) 2007 pp 199-214

Cooper, J.M., C. Steeger, S .M. Beauchesne, M . Machmer, L . Atwood and E.T. Manning. 2004. Habitat attribute targets for red and blue listed wildlife species and plant community conservation. Unpublished report prepared for the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program, Nelson, B C. 95p.

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.

Curran, M. Sacenieks, K. and Begin, E. 2000 Effects of Harvest and Root Rot Treatment on Sensitive Soils in the Rocky Mountains; trial establishment. Extension Note EN-49. Nelson Forest regions, BC MOF, Nelson BC

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

East Kootenay Land Use Plan. 1994. Commission on Resources and Environment (Commissioner Stephen Owen), Victoria, BC. 176p.

Firestorm 2003 provincial review. 2004. Prepared by the Review Team (Chair Gary Filmon) for the Government of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC. 100p.

FORSITE, 2008, Pickering Hills Resource Management Plan: A tactical Guide to the management of the Pickering Hills Range Unit; Final Report February 15, 2008; submitted to the BC Ministry of Agriculture and Lands, BC Ministry of Environment, BC Ministry of Forests and Range; available at http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/drm/

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, 1995b, Fish Stream Identification Guidebook
http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/tasb/legsregs/fpc/FPCGUIDE/Guidetoc.htm

Forest Practices Code of BC, 1995c, Interior Watershed Assessment Procedure (IWAP) 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

Forest Practices Code of BC, 1999, Identified Wildlife Strategy
http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/tasb/legsregs/fpc/FPCGUIDE/Guidetoc.htm

Gayton, Don, Preliminary Calculation of Excess Forest Ingrowth and Resulting Forage Impact in the Rocky Mountain Trench. Unpublished Report, 1997 (historical airphoto comparisons)

Gayton, D. and M . Hansen. 1998. Final report, East Kootenay Trench Agriculture Wildlife Committee. Ministry of Forests, Nelson, BC. 96p.

Gayton, D.V. 2001. Ground work: Basic concepts of ecological restoration in British Columbia. Southern Interior Forest Extension and Research Partnership, Kamloops, B C, and Society for Ecological Restoration, B C Chapter, Victoria, BC. 25p.

Gayton, D.V. 2 003. British Columbia grasslands: monitoring vegetation change. FORR EX, Kamloops, BC. 49p.

Gluns, D, R. 2001 Snowline pattern during the Melt Season: Evaluation of the H60 concept; Regrowth as reported in Watershed Assessment in the Southern Interior of British Columba; Workshop Proceedings, March 9-10, Penticton BC, Canada; Ministry of Forests Research Program Toews D.A.A, Chatwin S (eds)

Grasslands Conservation Council of British Columbia. 2003.Changes in the grassland-forest interface: a B C grasslands conservation risk assessment communication tool. Grasslands Conservation Council of British Columbia, Kamloops, BC. 18p.

Grasslands Conservation Council of British Columbia.2004 BC grasslands mapping project: a conservation risk assessment. 2004. Final report, Grasslands Conservation Council of British Columbia, Kamloops, BC. 108p.

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.,2008, personal communication; R.W. Gray and Associates, Chilliwack, BC

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. **,** Blackwell B.A. **,2002** Maintenance Strategies for Fire-Scarred Ponderosa Pine and Douglas-fir Prescribed Fire Research Notes, Squamish Forest District Small Business Forest Enterprise Program

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

The guide-outfitting industry in B C: an economic analysis of 2002. 2003. Prepared by Pacific Analytics Inc. for the Guide Outfitters Association of British Columbia, Victoria, BC. 43p.

Heitzmann R. J**.** 2001 Identifying Human Ignited Fires In The central Canadian Rockies Over The Last Millennium *In* A Collection Of Papers Presented At The 33rd Annual Meeting Of The Canadian Archaeological Association. Edited by Jean-Luc Pilon, Michael W. Kirby and Caroline Theriault The Ontario Archaeological Society Inc. Toronto Ont

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

Hewlett, J.D. 1982, Principles of Forest Hydrology. University of Georgia Press, Athens, Georgia

Huckaby, Laurie Stroh; Kaufmann, Merrill R.; Fornwalt, Paula J.; Stoker, Jason M.; and Dennis, Chuck. 2003. **Field guide to old ponderosa pines in the Colorado Front Range.** Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-109. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. 43 p.

Huckaby, Laurie Stroh; Kaufmann, Merrill R.; Fornwalt, Paula J.; Stoker, Jason M.; and Dennis, Chuck. 2003a. **Identification and ecology of old ponderosa pine trees in the Colorado Front Range.** Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-110. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. 47 p.

Hurtak, F .J. 2 005, September 2nd,. 2005 season brings several changes. The Daily Townsman, Cranbrook, BC, p. 11 .

Hurtak, F .J. 2 005, September 9. Reflections on populations. The Daily Townsman, Cranbrook, BC, pp. 9-10.

Keefer, M. 2008, personal communication; Keefer Consulting Ltd., Kimberley, BC

Klenner, W ., I . Cameron and R . Walton. 2003. Evaluating habitat and timber consequences of implementing the ungulate winter range habitat management objectives and best management practices in the Rocky Mountain Forest District. Preliminary report prepared for the Rocky Mountain Forest District, Cranbrook, BC. 13p.

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

Lacelle, L.E.H., 1990. Biophysical Resources of the East Kootenay Area: Soils. BC Ministry of Environment, Victoria B.C. Wildlife Technical Monograph TM-1, Report No. 20 British Columbia Soil Survey

Manning, T., March 2008 Fungal Inoculation of Trees as a Habitat Enhancement Tool in Second-Growth Forests TFL 37 and TFL 44 Operational Trial Final Report , Prepared for Western Forest Products Inc. Corporate Forestry Campbell River, BC or Manning, Cooper & Associates Ltd. Victoria, BC

Manning T., 2008Hoodoo Hofert Property Wildlife Tree Creation . Prepared for Fish Wildlife Compensation Program and the Nature Trust of Canada.

McLean, A. and J.H.G. Smith (1973) Effects of Climate on Forage Yields and Tree-Ring Widths in British Columbia. Journal of Range Management

McKenzie, W.H. and J.H.Moran. 2004. Wetlands of British Columbia: a guide to identification. Res. Br., BC Min For., Victoria, BC Land Management Handbook No. 52.

Medinger, M Pojar, J. eds 1991. Ecosystems of British Columbia, research Branch, Ministry of Forests, Victoria BC

Miller, Val, 2007, Personal Communication, Alien Invasive Plants Officer, Ministry of Forests and Range, Nelson, BC

Ministry of Forests and Range. 2009a. Cranbrook TSA Forest Health Strategy 2009 Ministry of Forests and Range, Cranbrook, BC. 32p.

Ministry of Forests and Range. 2009b. Invermere TSA Forest Health Strategy 2009. Ministry of Forests and Range, Cranbrook, BC. 32p.

Ministry of Water, Land:and Air Protection, 2004; Wildlife Habitat Features; Summary of Management Guidelines; Southern Interior Region; DRAFT Revised April 15, 2004; unpublished; Ministry of Environment; Biodiversity Branch, Kamloops, BC

Munson, Thomas, 2007. Assessing impacts on K'tunaxa Nation cultural resources from ecological restoration, timber thinning and prescribed burning in the Rocky Mountain Trench in Ecological Restoration in South eastern BC Grasslands to Mountain tops October 12-13, 2007, Columbia Mountains Institute of Applied Ecology, Revelstoke BC and Society of Ecological Restoration- BC Chapter)

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

Newhouse, N., Kinley, T. 2006,. East Kootenay Badger Project 2005-2006 Progress Report: Ecology, Translocation, Communication, Sightings and Habitat Use. Submitted to Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program Nelson, BC and Parks Canada, Radium Hot Springs, BC. 59p

Norris, D., McLaughlin, J. and Curran M. 1998 Armillaria root disease management guidelines for the Nelson Forest Region. Technical Report 14, Nelson Forest Region, BCMOF, Nelson BC

Page, H . 2005. Monitoring ecosystem restoration treatments at North Stoddart Creek and North Fontaine. Monitoring Update 2 004. Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program, Nelson, BC. 34p.

Page, H. 2006 An update to Effectiveness Monitoring Plan for NDT4 Ecosystem Restoration in the Rocky Mountain Trench Submitted to Ministry of Environment, Nelson, BC 45p

Page, H ., E.W. Bork and R . Newman. 2 005. Understory responses to mechanical restoration and drought within montane forests of British Columbia. B .C. Journal of Ecosystems and Management. 6(1): 8-21 .

Pandion Ecological Research 2002. Machmer, M ., H .N. Page and C. Steeger. East Kootenay Trench restoration effectiveness monitoring plan. Submitted to Habitat Branch, Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection. Forest Renewal British Columbia Terrestrial Ecosystem Restoration Program.. Nelson, B C. 50p.

Pitt, M .D. 1982. East Kootenay problem analysis: the interactions among grass, trees, elk and cattle. Research Branch, Ministry of Forests, Victoria, BC. 64p.

Ross, T.J. 1997. Vegetation monitoring program. Final report prepared for the East Kootenay Trench Agriculture/Wildlife Committee, Cranbrook, BC. 347p.

Ross, T.J. 1998. Plant community response following dry forest ecosystem restoration. Final report prepared for Forest Renewal British Columbia and Science Council of British Columbia. 32p.

Ross, T.J. 2001b. Wildhorse-Lewis Range Unit ecosystem restoration plan. BC Ministry of Forests, Cranbrook Forest District. 86 p.

Ross, T.J. 2006. A comparison of three residual distributions of conifers for enhancing ungulate forage and timber values. Prepared for Rocky Mountain Trench Natural Resources Society, Kimberley, BC. 23p.

Ross, T.J. and B .M. Wikeem. 2002. W hat can long-term range reference areas tell us? Rangelands. 24(6): 21 -27.

Ross, T.J., Keefer, M, and Jamieson, B., 2006 Development and Testing of a Reconnaissance Level Wetland Evaluation Assessment Form on the Tata Skookumchuck Range Unit. Prepared for Columbia Basin Fish Wildlife Compensation Program.

Steeger, C. Machmer M.M. 1995 Wildlife Trees and their Use by Cavity Nesters in Select Stands of the Nelson Forest Region, BCMOF Technical Report Number 10

Strategy for management of rangeland ecosystems in the East Kootenay. 2005. Unpublished draft report prepared by Ministries of Forests; Water, Land and Air Protection; and Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. 6p.

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

Trench Plan, 1990. The Trench Integrated Renewable Resource Management Plan, Cranbrook Forest District Component, unpublished, Ministry of Forests and Range, Cranbrook, BC

Walton, A. Hughes, J., Eng, M., Fall, A., Shore, T., Riel, B. 2007 Provincial-Level Projection of the Current Mountain Pine Beetle Outbreak: Update of the infestation projection based on the 2007 Provincial Aerial Overview of Forest Health and revisions to the “Model” (BCMPB.v5), Ministry of Forests, Victoria, BC

Wikeem, B .M. and T.J. Ross. 2002. Plant succession in the Rocky Mountain Trench: influence of historical factors. Rangelands. 24(6): 17-20.

Wikeem, B .M. and T.J. Ross. 2002. Forage allocation: science or politics? Rangelands. 24(6): 28-33.

Wikeem, B . and S . Wikeem. 2004. The grasslands of British Columbia. Grasslands Conservation Council of BC, Kamloops, BC. 479p.

Wilson, S. and R . Morley. 2004. Draft Elk Management Plan 2005-9. B C Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection, Cranbrook, BC. 29p.

Winkler, R. 2001 Forest Effects on Snow; Preliminary Results on Effects f Regrowth as reported in Watershed Assessment in the Southern Interior of British Columba; Workshop Proceedings, March 9-10, Penticton BC, Canada; Ministry of Forests Research Program Toews D.A.A, Chatwin S (eds)

**Websites**

Agriculture in the East Kootenay: www.agf.gov.bc.ca/resmgmt/sf/agbriefs/

Conservation Data Centre: http://maps.gov.bc.ca/imf50/imf.jsp?site=cdc

East Kootenay profile: www.rdek.bc.ca/

Ecosystem restoration in the Rocky Mountain Forest District, including monitoring results from Premier Ridge: www.for.gov.bc.ca/drm/erp/erp.htm

Fish and wildlife conservation and enhancement projects in the Canadian portion of the Columbia Basin: http://www.cbfishwildlife.org/

Ministry of Forests and Range; Range Branch, Invasive Plants Website:
http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hfp/invasive/index.htm

Ministry of Forests and Range; Rocky Mountain Forest District website
http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/drm/

Rocky Mountain Trench Natural Resources Society
http://www.trenchsociety.com/whatsnew.php

The Nature Trust
http://www.naturetrust.bc.ca/

The Nature Conservancy
http://www.natureconservancy.ca/site/PageServer?pagename=ncc_main

The Land Conservancy
http://www.conservancy.bc.ca/

Kootenay Boundary Higher Level Plan, including Kootenay Boundary Land Use Plan Implementation Strategy: srmwww.gov.bc.ca/kor/hlp/main.htm

Species and ecosystems at risk in BC: www.env.gov.bc.ca/wld/serisk.htm

Ungulate winter ranges in BC: www.env.gov.bc.ca/wld/uwr/index.html

Wildlife Habitat Areas: http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/cgi-bin/apps/faw/wharesult.cgi?search=wlap_region&wlap=Kootenay

**ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE TEXT**

AAC allowable annual cut
cm centimeter (1 cm = .394 inch)
CORE Commission on Resources & Environment

EKTAWC East Kootenay Trench Agriculture/Wildlife Committee
Ecosystem Restoration fire-maintained ecosystem restoration
(*range*, *rangeland*, *open range*, *grassland*, *open forest*, *savanna* and *NDT4*
are used interchangeably to identify the ecosystems being restored)
ha hectare (1 ha = 2.471 acres)
kg kilogram (1 kg = 2.205 pounds)
km kilometre (1 km = .621 mile)
KBLUPIS Kootenay Boundary Land Use Plan Implementation Strategy
m3 cubic metre
NDT4 Natural Disturbance Type 4
RMFD Rocky Mountain Forest

Appendix I Schedule of Ecosystem Restoration Projects
Sorted by Project Type and Year

| RESTORATIO | LOGICAL_BU | TREATMENT_ | TOTAL_ARE | NET_AREA_ | MAPSHEET | OPENING | FOREST TYP | TU_STATUS | PRIORITY | INSIDE_AIA | ARCHAEOLO | TIMBER_LIC | SPECIES_AT | LOG_TYPE | LOG_TREATM | LOGCALENDA | LOG_MONTH | LOG_ESTIM | LOG_ACTUA | LOG_FUND | LOG_CONTRA | LOG_CONT_1 | LOG_LOCAL_ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grasmere | Dump | TSLA45087 | 900.0 | 99.0 | 82G015 | 1300 | OR | Initiated | NR | Y | Y | BCTS | | log | BCTS | 2007 | 4 | 11868 | | BCTS | | | |
| Waldo North Pilot | Munson Slough | Munson Slough | 294.0 | 57.0 | 82G034 | 178 | OR | Maintenance | 103 | | | Galloway | | Log | Trench So | 2007 | 12 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grasmere | Dump | TSLA81351 | 900.0 | 143.0 | 82G015 | 1301 | OR | Initiated | NR | Y | Y | BCTS | | log | BCTS | 2008 | 12 | 17100 | | BCTS | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Beacon West | NRFL | 762.2 | 239.0 | 82G071 | 121 | OR | Unmanaged | 106 | Yes lake | Licensee | BCTS | | Log | NRFL2 CBK | 2008 | 5 | | 100 | NRFL | Prairie Holdings | | Y |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Old Airport | Old OGMA A19042-CP14 | 707.6 | 345.2 | 82G072 | 91 | OF | Initiated | 106 | By road | No-Avoid | Galloway | Yellow Ba | Log | Tembec Er | 2008 | 5 | 31150 | 100 | | | | |
| Waldo | East Kootenay-Eimer | East Kootenay-Eimer | -2.0 | 556.0 | 82G034 | 178 | OF | Maintenance | 103 | | | Galloway | | Log | Trench So | 2008 | 12 | | | | | | |
| Waldo North Pilot | Pipeline | Pipeline | 358.0 | 358.0 | 82G034 | 178 | OR | Maintenance | 103 | | | Galloway | | Log | Trench So | 2008 | 5 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grasmere | Dump | DumpA | 900.0 | 0.0 | 82G015 | | OF | Initiated | NR | Y | Licensee | BCTS | | log | BCTS | 2009 | 12 | 17100 | | BCTS | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Old Airport | Old Airport A81787-CP1 | 707.6 | 35.2 | 82G072 | 91 | OR | Initiated | 106 | By road | No-Avoid | Galloway | Yellow Ba | Log | Tembec Er | 2009 | 5 | NRFL 1 CBK | 100 | | | | |
| Waldo North Pilot | North, South Lake | North, South Lake | 250.0 | 250.0 | 82G034 | 178 | OF | Initiated | 103 | | | BCTS | | Log | Trench So | 2009 | 12 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Rouse | Rouse TU 4 | 365.3 | 18.7 | 82G062 | 41 | OF | Unmanaged | 108 | N | | Galloway | Yellow ba | Log | NRFL 2 | 2010 | 5 | 14400 | | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Rouse | Rouse TU 5 | 365.3 | 46.5 | 82G062 | 41 | OF | Unmanaged | 108 | N | | Galloway | Yellow ba | Log | NRFL 2 | 2010 | 5 | 14400 | | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Rouse | Rouse TU 6 | 365.3 | 13.3 | 82G062 | 41 | OF | Unmanaged | 108 | N | | Galloway | Yellow ba | Log | NRFL 2 | 2010 | 5 | 14400 | | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Rouse | Rouse TU 7 | 365.3 | 13.6 | 82G062 | 41 | OF | Unmanaged | 108 | N | | Galloway | Yellow ba | Log | NRFL 2 | 2010 | 5 | 14400 | | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Rouse | Rouse TU 8 | 365.3 | 58.0 | 82G062 | 41 | OF | Unmanaged | 108 | N | | Galloway | Yellow ba | Log | NRFL 2 | 2010 | 5 | 14400 | | | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Lost Spring | Lost Spring F | 500.0 | 323.0 | 82G072 | 93 | OF | Unmanaged | 106 | Snowpack- | | Galloway | Yellow Ba | Log | NRFL 2 CBK | 2010 | 11 | 25252.5 | | | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | China North South | China North South | 491.0 | 491.0 | 82G062 | | OF | Unmanaged | 106 | | | Galloway | Yellow ba | Log | NRFL 2 Cran | 2010 | 5 | | | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Sheep Camp | Sheep Camp TU1 | 353.3 | 38.0 | 82G061 | 64 | OF | Unmanaged | 108 | yes ripar | Winterlog | Galloway | Yellow ba | Log | NRFL 2 Cran | 2010 | 5 | | | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Sheep Camp | Sheep Camp TU2 | 353.3 | 25.2 | 82G061 | 64 | OF | Unmanaged | 108 | yes ripar | Winterlog | Galloway | Yellow ba | Log | NRFL 2 Cran | 2010 | 5 | | | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Sheep Camp | Sheep Camp TU3 | 353.3 | 66.1 | 82G061 | 64 | OF | Unmanaged | 108 | yes ripar | Winterlog | Galloway | Yellow ba | Log | NRFL 2 Cran | 2010 | 5 | | | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Sheep Camp | Sheep Camp TU8 | 353.3 | 34.1 | 82G061 | 64 | OF | Initiated | 108 | yes ripar | Winterlog | Galloway | Yellow ba | Log | NRFL 2 Cran | 2010 | 5 | | | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Sheep Camp | Sheep Camp TU9 | 353.3 | 17.2 | 82G061 | 64 | OF | Initiated | 108 | yes ripar | Winterlog | Galloway | Yellow ba | Log | NRFL 2 Cran | 2010 | 5 | | | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Steer | Steer | 252.0 | 252.0 | 82G062 | 59 | OF | Unmanaged | 108 | yes ripar | Winterlog | Galloway | Yellow ba | Log | NRFL 2 CRBJ | 2010 | 5 | 30240 | | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Indian North-South | Indian North-South | 424.0 | 424.0 | 82G061 | 60 | OF | Unmanaged | 108 | yes ripar | Winterlog | Galloway | Yellow ba | Log | NRFL 2 CRBK | 2010 | 11 | 50880 | | | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | 42 A | 42 A1 | 305.0 | 78.0 | 82G082 | 151 | OF | Initiated | 119 | | | Tembec | Yellow ba | Log | NRFL 2 In | 2010 | 11 | 12200 | | | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | Foster | Foster | 308.0 | 308.0 | 82G082 | 141 | OF | Unmanaged | 119 | | | Tembec | Yellow ba | Log | NRFL 2 In | 2010 | 11 | 12320 | | | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | Plot | Plot 2A | 503.7 | 60.8 | 82G082 | 99 | OF | Initiated | 119 | | | Tembec | Yellow ba | Log | NRFL 2 In | 2010 | 11 | 204 | | | | | |
| Waldo North Pilot | Colvali-Waldo | Colvali-Waldo | 376.0 | 376.0 | 82G034 | 178 | OF | Maintenance | 103 | | | Galloway | | Log | Trench So | 2010 | 12 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Gold Creek Canyon | CP157-330 | 146.0 | 146.0 | 82G014 | 65 | OF | Initiated | 95 | | | Tembec | | Relog Strip | Tembec | 2011 | 11 | 17520 | | TEMBEC | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Gold Creek Canyon | CP157-328 | 217.0 | 217.0 | 82G014 | 63 | OF | Initiated | 95 | | | Tembec | | Relog Strip | Tembec | 2011 | 11 | 26040 | | TEMBEC | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Gold Creek Canyon | CP157-332 | 208.0 | 208.0 | 82G014 | 67 | OR | Initiated | 95 | | | Tembec | | Relog Strip | Tembec | 2011 | 11 | 24960 | | TEMBEC | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rampart - Mayook | City | City | 188.0 | 188.0 | 82G052 | 9 | OR | Unmanaged | 86 | | | BCTS | | Log | BCTS | 2012 | 9 | | | | | | |
| Newgate | Demar-Sharptail | Demar | 307.0 | 307.0 | 82G004 | 34 | OF | Unmanaged | 114 | Yes | snowpack/ | BCTS | LEWO WHA | Log | BCTS | 2012 | 11 | | | | | | |
| Newgate | Demar-Sharptail | Sharptail | 407.0 | 407.0 | 82G004 | 34 | OF | Unmanaged | 114 | Yes | snowpack/ | BCTS | Lewo, sha | Log | BCTS | 2012 | 11 | | | | | | |
| Cranbrook Fort Steele | Highway Overpass | Overpass-tu7 | 336.4 | 80.0 | 82G052 | 40 | OF | Initiated | | Yes-lake | | BCTS | | Log | BCTS | 2012 | | | | | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Old Airport | Old Airport A81787-CP1 | 707.6 | 66.1 | 82G072 | 91 | OR | Initiated | 106 | By road | No-Avoid | Galloway | Yellow Ba | Log | Galloway | 2012 | 5 | NRFL 1 CBK | | | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | Echo | Echo | 707.0 | 657.0 | 82G082 | 147 | OF | Initiated | 119 | | | Tembec | Yellow ba | log | NRFL 3 In | 2012 | 11 | 39420 | | | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | Pulpmill | Pulpmill | 393.0 | 285.2 | 82G082 | 153 | OR | Initiated | 119 | | | Tembec | Yellow ba | log | NRFL 3 In | 2012 | 11 | 23580 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Premier Ridge | Alkali North | Alkali South | 366.0 | 366.0 | 82G082 | 156 | OF | Initiated | 101 | Yes lake | | BCTS | | Log | BCTS | 2013 | 11 | | | | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Buck West | Dilts-Cut | 350.0 | 350.0 | 82G024 | | OF | Initiated | 95 | | | Tembec | | Log | Tembec | 2013 | 11 | 42000 | | TEMBEC | | | |
| Waldo | Cemetery Hills | Cemetary Hills TU A CP2 | 582.0 | 67.4 | 82G024 | 131 | OF | Unmanaged | 103 | | | Tembec | | Log | Tembec | 2013 | 5 | | | | | | |
| Waldo | Cemetery Hills | Cemetary Hills TU C | 582.0 | 168.2 | 82G024 | 131 | OF | Unmanaged | 103 | | | Tembec | | Log | Tembec | 2013 | 5 | | | | | | |
| Waldo | Cemetery Hills | Cemetary Hills TU D1 | 582.0 | 24.4 | 82G024 | 131 | MF | Unmanaged | 103 | | | Tembec | | Log | Tembec | 2013 | 5 | | | | | | |
| Waldo | Cemetery Hills | Cemetary Hills U D2 | 582.0 | 30.4 | 82G024 | 131 | OF | Unmanaged | 103 | | | Tembec | | Log | Tembec | 2013 | 5 | | | | | | |
| Waldo | Fusee West | Fusee West Alpa TU 1 | 339.0 | 30.0 | 82G024 | 75 | OF | Unmanaged | 103 | Yes | Licensee | Tembec | | Log | Tembec | 2013 | 5 | CP 292 | | | | | |
| Waldo | Fusee West | Fusee West Alpa TU 1 | 339.0 | 40.0 | 82G024 | 75 | OF | Unmanaged | 103 | Yes | Licensee | Tembec | | Log | Tembec | 2013 | 5 | CP 292 | | | | | |
| Waldo | Fusee West | Fusee West Alpa TU 1 | 339.0 | 60.0 | 82G024 | 75 | OF | Unmanaged | 103 | Yes | hand slas | Tembec | | Log | Tembec | 2013 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Garbutt Norbury | Norbury | 536.0 | 536.0 | 82G053 | | OF | Unmanaged | 92 | | | BCTS | | Log | NRFL 3 | 2014 | 11 | 64320 | | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Garbutt Norbury | Garbutts | 390.0 | 390.0 | 82G053 | 66 | OF | Unmanaged | 92 | No | | BCTS | | Log | NRFL 3 CBK | 2014 | 11 | 46800 | | | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | Reed A | Reed A | 316.0 | 316.0 | 82G081 | 146 | OR | Initiated | 119 | | | Tembec | Yellow ba | log | NRFL 4 In | 2014 | 11 | 18960 | | | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | Reed B | Reed B | 303.0 | 303.0 | 82G082 | 154 | OF | Initiated | 119 | | | Tembec | Yellow ba | log | NRFL 4 In | 2014 | 11 | 18180 | | | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | Reed C | Reed C | 250.0 | 250.0 | 82G082 | 155 | OR | Initiated | 119 | | | Tembec | Yellow ba | log | NRFL 4 In | 2014 | 11 | 15000 | | | | | |
| Waldo | Baynes Lake North | Baynes Lake North | 269.0 | 269.0 | 82G025 | 70 | OF | Unmanaged | 103 | Y | | Tembec | | Log | tembec | 2014 | 5 | 32370 | | | | | |
| Waldo | Fusee North | Fusee North A | 360.0 | 140.0 | 82G025 | 74 | OF | Unmanaged | 103 | Yes | Licensee | Tembec | | Log | Tembec | 2014 | CP 292 | | | | | | |
| Waldo | Sheep Mtn | Sheep Mtn AB | 327.0 | 327.0 | 82G025 | | OR | Unmanaged | 103 | Yes | No, need | Tembec | | Log | Tembec | 2014 | 11 | | | | | | |

| RESTORATIO | LOGICAL_BU | TREATMENT_ | TOTAL_ARE | NET_AREA_ | MAPSHEET | OPENING | FOREST TYP | TU_STATUS | PRIORITY | INSIDE_AIA | ARCHAEOL | TIMBER_LIC | SPECIES_AT | LOG_TYPE | LOG_TREATM | LOGCALENDA | LOG_MONTH | LOG_ESTIM | LOG_ACTUA | LOG_FUND_ | LOG_CONTRA | LOG_CONT_1 | LOG_LOCAL_ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rampart - Mayook | Whiskey Creek North | Whiskey Creek North | 173.0 | 173.0 | 82G053 | 65 | OF | Unmanaged | 86 | Yes | Yes, 2007 | BCTS | | Log | BCTS | 2015 | 11 | 20760 | | | | | |
| Waldo | Duck A | Duck A | 506.1 | 180.0 | 82G025 | 76 | OF | Unmanaged | 103 | Yes, poth | No, Avoid | Tembec | | Log | Tembec | 2015 | 5 | | | | | | |
| Waldo | Duck B | Duck B | 506.0 | 180.0 | 82G025 | 76 | OF | Unmanaged | 103 | Yes, poth | No, Avoid | Tembec | | Log | Tembec | 2015 | 5 | | | | | | |
| Waldo | Duck C | Duck C | 506.0 | 138.0 | 82G025 | 76 | OR | Unmanaged | 103 | Yes, poth | No, Avoid | Tembec | | Log | Tembec | 2015 | 5 | | | | | | |
| Waldo | Fusee West | Fusee West Beta | 323.7 | 323.7 | 82G024 | 71 | OF | Unmanaged | 103 | Yes | hand slas | Tembec | | Log | Tembec | 2015 | 5 | CP 542 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Alkaline purvis | Deep Springs TU 1 | 491.0 | 412.0 | 82G053 | 20 | OF | Unmanaged | 92 | | | BCTS | | Log | NRFL 4 | 2016 | 11 | 49440 | | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Alkaline purvis | Purvis | 238.0 | 238.0 | 82G053 | | OF | Unmanaged | 92 | | | BCTS | | Log | NRFL 4 | 2016 | 11 | 28560 | | | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Highway North | Highway North | 704.0 | 704.0 | 82G071 | 123 | OF | Unmanaged | 106 | Y-riparia | | BCTS | | log | nrfl 4 | 2016 | 11 | 35200 | | | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Highway South | Highway South | 176.0 | 176.0 | 82G071 | 122 | OF | Unmanaged | 106 | N | | BCTS | | log | nrfl 4 | 2016 | 11 | 8800 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Beacon West | Non-NRFL | 762.6 | 523.0 | 82G071 | 121 | OF | Unmanaged | 106 | Y-riparia | No-Winter | BCTS | | Log | BCTS | 2017 | 11 | 14280 | | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot North | Hot Foot TU 1a | 658.3 | 45.0 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | Initiated | 92 | yes ripar | Winterlog | BCTS | | Log | BCTs | 2017 | 5 | | | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot North | Hot Foot TU 1b | 658.3 | 25.2 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | Initiated | 92 | yes ripar | Winterlog | BCTS | | Log | BCTs | 2017 | 5 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Rock Lake | Rock Lake | 616.0 | 616.0 | 82G072 | 93 (85-6 | OF | Unmanaged | 106 | | | BCTS | Yellow ba | Log | NRFL 5 | 2018 | 11 | 36960 | | | | | |

| RESTORATIO | LOGICAL_BU | TREATMENT_ | TOTAL_ARE | NET_AREA_ | MAPSHEET | OPENING | FOREST TYP | INSIDE_AIA | ARCHAEOLO | TIMBER_LIC | SLASH_TYPE | SLASH_TREA | SLASH_CALE | SLASH_MO | SLASH_ESTI | SLASH_ACT | SLASH_FUN | SLASH_CONT | SLASH_CO_1 | SLASH_LOCA | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Premier Ridge | Gina | Gina TU 1 | 300.000 | 31.200 | 82G082 | 111 | OF | Yes | Yes on fi | BCTS | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2008 | 11 | 14085 | 30956 | FIA | ER09SMJ003 | Scott Wills | y | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Old Airport | Old Airport NSR TU 1 | 707.600 | 16.200 | 82G072 | 91 | OR | By road | No-Avoid | Galloway | thin | Sell Pulp | 2008 | 12 | 10500 | 13107.5 | FIA | ER09SMJ-005 | Scott Wills | Y | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Old Airport | Old Airport Select Log TU | 707.600 | 68.200 | 82G072 | 91 | OR | By road | No-Avoid | Galloway | Thin | sell pulp | 2008 | 12 | 42000 | 86181 | FIA | ER09SMJ-005 | Scott Wills | Y | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Old Airport | Old Airport OGMA TU 3 | 707.600 | 63.000 | 82G072 | 91 | OF | By road | No-Avoid | Galloway | Thin | sell pulp | 2008 | 12 | 41400 | 83230 | FIA | ER09SMJ-005 | Scott Wills | Y | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | Clear Lake 180D | 231.400 | 10.700 | 82G034 | 180 | OF | | | Galloway | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2008 | 10 | 8025 | 7998.9 | FIA | FS09SMJ-004 | Scott Wills | Y | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | Clear Lake177B | 295.000 | 8.200 | 82G034 | 177 | OF | | | Galloway | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2008 | 10 | 2050 | 6919.35 | FIA | FS09SMJ-004 | Scott Wills | Y | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | Clear Lake177C | 295.000 | 5.400 | 82G034 | 177 | OF | | | Galloway | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2008 | 11 | 1350 | 4493.18 | FIA | FS09SMJ-004 | Scott Wills | Y | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | Clear Lake177D | 295.000 | 0.900 | 82G034 | 177 | OF | | | Galloway | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2008 | 11 | 225 | 737.81 | FIA | FS09SMJ-004 | Scott Wills | Y | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | Clear Lake177E | 295.000 | 5.100 | 82G034 | 177 | OF | | | Galloway | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2008 | 11 | 1275 | 4321.41 | FIA | FS09SMJ-004 | Scott Wills | Y | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | Clear Lake177F | 295.000 | 6.300 | 82G034 | 177 | OF | | | Galloway | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2008 | 11 | 1580 | 5365.68 | FIA | FS09SMJ-004 | Scott Wills | Y | |
| | | | | 215 | | | | | | | | | | | 122490 | 30956 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Premier Ridge | Gina | Gina TU 2 | 300.000 | 8.400 | 82G082 | 111 | OF | Yes | Yes on fi | BCTS | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2009 | 3 | 120000 | 7971 | FIA | ER09SMJ003 | Scott Wills | y | |
| Premier Ridge | Gina | New Gina TU 4 | 342.000 | 120.700 | 82G082 | 158 | OF | Yes | Yes on fi | BCTS | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2009 | 3 | 120000 | 78330 | FIA | ER09SMJ003 | Scott Wills | Y | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Community Forest | Sylvan lakes | Sylvan LakesD | 812.000 | 156.000 | 82G052 | | OF | Potholes | | BCTS | Thin | Scatter | 2010 | 11 | 5000 | | Interface | | | | |
| Waldo | Cutts Road | Cutts Road 2B | 629.000 | 26.400 | 82G025 | 34 | OF | Yes, ripa | No, winte | Tembec | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 11 | 26400 | | MOFR-ERP | | | y | |
| Waldo | Cutts Road | Cutts Road 2D | 629.000 | 48.600 | 82G025 | 34 | OF | Yes, ripa | No, winte | Tembec | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 11 | 48600 | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Cutts Road | Cutts Road 2E | 629.000 | 17.800 | 82G025 | 34 | OF | Yes, ripa | No, winte | Tembec | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 11 | 17800 | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Cutts Road | Cutts Road 2F | 629.000 | 0.500 | 82G025 | 34 | OF | Yes, ripa | No, winte | Tembec | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 11 | 500 | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Cutts Road | Cutts Road 2G | 629.000 | 11.700 | 82G025 | 34 | OF | Yes, ripa | No, winte | Tembec | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 11 | 11700 | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Cutts Road | Cutts Road 2H | 629.000 | 6.100 | 82G025 | 34 | OF | Yes, ripa | No, winte | Tembec | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 11 | 6100 | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Elko-Airport west | Elko-Airport west | 250.000 | 250.000 | 82G025 | | OR | | | Tembec | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 11 | 150000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Burnt Bottom | Not slashed | 362.000 | 204.000 | 82G015 | 104 | OF | | | Tembec | Thin | sell pulp | 2010 | 12 | 122400 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Rabbit mtn | Rabbit mtn TU 1 | 330.000 | 35.000 | 82G025 | 73 | OF | Yes | No, need | Tembec | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 11 | 35000 | | Inteface | | | | |
| Waldo | Rabbit Mtn | Rabbit mtn TU 2 | 330.000 | 50.000 | 82G025 | 73 | OF | Yes | No, need | Tembec | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 11 | 50000 | | Interface | | | | |
| Premier Ridge | Quartz | CTP 165 | 161.000 | 161.000 | 82G082 | New | OR | | | BCTS | Thin | sell pulp | 2010 | 11 | 120450 | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Dry Lake-Artesian | Dry Lake TU 1 | 274.000 | 57.300 | 82G061 | 58 | OF | yes ripar | Winterlog | Galloway | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 12 | 57300 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| | | | | 1024 | | | | | | | | | | | 651250 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Second Uptake of Projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cranbrook Fort Steele | Gravel Pit | | 250 | 250 | 82G052 | | OF | Y | Snowpack/ | | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 10 | 325000 | | UBCM | | | | |
| Cranbrook Fort Steele | MM20 | | 1200 | 1200 | 82G052 | | OF | Y | Snowpack/ | | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 10 | 1560000 | | UBCM | | | | |
| Rampart Mayook | Isadore-Butte | | 889.5 | 889.5 | 82G053 | | OF | Y | Snowpack/ | | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 10 | 1156350 | | UBCM | | | | |
| Peckhams Lake | Wallcam | | 100 | 100 | 82G053 | | OF | Y | Snowpack/ | | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 10 | 130000 | | UBCM | | | | |
| Peckhams Lake | Hatchery Ridge | | 590 | 590 | 82G043 | | OF | Y | Snowpack/ | | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 10 | 767000 | | UBCM | | | | |
| Power Plant | Little Bull | | 181.6 | 181.6 | 82G043 | | OF | Y | Snowpack/ | | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 10 | 236080 | | UBCM | | | | |
| Power Plant | MOE-Bull River | | 150 | 150 | 82G043 | | OF | Y | Snowpack/ | | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 10 | 195000 | | UBCM | | | | |
| Premier Ridge | 3 Sons North | | 500 | 500 | 82G082 | | OF | Y | Snowpack/ | | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 10 | 650000 | | UBCM | | | | |
| Dutch Findlay | saddle | | 1403.6 | 1403.6 | 82J011 | | OF | Y | Snowpack/ | | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 10 | 1824680 | | UBCM | | | | |
| East Side Columbia | Sabine bench | | 250 | 250 | 82J011 | | OF | Y | Snowpack/ | | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 10 | 325000 | | UBCM | | | | |
| East Side Columbia | Camp 1 | | 450 | 450 | 82J021 | | OF | Y | Snowpack/ | | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 10 | 585000 | | UBCM | | | | |
| Watson | Watson-Mud | | 300 | 300 | 82J011 | | OF | Y | Snowpack/ | | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 10 | 390000 | | UBCM | | | | |
| St May's Prairie | South Wycliffe crridor | | 350 | 40 | 82G061 | | OF | Y | Snowpack/ | | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 10 | 52000 | | UBCM | | | | |
| Grasmere | Adolph's | | 1164.6 | 1164.6 | 82G005 | | OF | Y | Snowpack/ | | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 10 | 1513980 | | UBCM | | | | |
| Grasmere | Loon Lake | | 1444.2 | 1444.2 | 82G005 | | OF | Y | Snowpack/ | | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 10 | 1877460 | | UBCM | | | | |
| Grasmere | Bagley's | | 1030.0 | 1030.0 | 82G005 | 17 | OF | Y | Snowpack/ | BCTS | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 10 | 1339000 | | UBCM | | | | |
| Grasmere | A.I. | | 827.0 | 827.0 | 82G005 | 1 | OF | Y | Snowpack/ | BCTS | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 10 | 1075100 | | UBCM | | | | |
| Alkali | Cranbrook Reservoir | | 350 | 350 | 82G052 | | OF | Y | Snowpack/ | | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 10 | 455000 | | UBCM | | | | |
| Alkali | Mt Baker Road | | 250 | 250 | 82G042 | | OF | Y | Snowpack/ | | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2010 | 10 | 325000 | | UBCM | | | | |
| | | | | 11371 | | | | | | | | | | | 14781650 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Newgate | Earl Ranch | Earl Ranch | 250.000 | 250.000 | 82G004 | | OF | Yes | snowpack/ | BCTS | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2011 | 11 | 250000 | | HCTF | | | | |
| Premier Ridge | Alkali South | CTO 126 | 344.000 | 344.000 | 82G082 | 142 | OF | Yes, poth | | BCTS | Thin | sell pulp | 2011 | 12 | 258000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| | | | | 594 | | | | | | | | | | | 508000 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sheep Creek North | Kootenay Ranch Addendum | Dragons Tail | 703.000 | 400.000 | 82J002 | | OF | | | Tembec | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2012 | 2 | 260000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Gold Creek Canyon | CP157-332 | 208.000 | 208.000 | 82G014 | 67 | OR | | | Tembec | Thin | sell pulp | 2012 | 9 | 52000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | South Lakit Ridge | South Lakit Ridge SU1 | 132.000 | 132.000 | 82G063 | 64 | OR | Y | Tembec | Tembec | Thin | sell pulp | 2012 | 9 | 32000 | | CBFWCP | | | | |
| Newgate | Demar-Sharptail | Demar | 307.000 | 307.000 | 82G004 | 34 | OF | Yes | snowpack/ | BCTS | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2012 | 11 | 184200 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |

| RESTORATIO | LOGICAL_BU | TREATMENT_ | TOTAL_ARE | NET_AREA_ | MAPSHEET | OPENING | FOREST TYP | INSIDE_AIA | ARCHAEOLO | TIMBER_LIC | SLASH_TYPE | SLASH_TREA | SLASH_CALE | SLASH_MO | SLASH_ESTI | SLASH_ACT | SLASH_FUN | SLASH_CONT | SLASH_CO_1 | SLASH_LOCA | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Newgate | Demar-Sharptail | Sharptail | 407.000 | 407.000 | 82G004 | 34 | OF | Yes | snowpack/ | BCTS | Thin | pile/burn | 2012 | 11 | 184200 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| PowerPlant | Bull River Property | Bull River Property | 100.000 | 100.000 | 82G053 | | OF | | | BCTS | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2012 | 11 | 100000 | | HCTF | | | | |
| | | | | 1554 | | | | | | | | | | | 812400 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Wakefield-Gorrie | Wakefield | 274.000 | 274.000 | 82G004 | 147 | OR | | | Tembec | Thin | sell pulp | 2013 | 9 | 68500 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Premier Ridge | Alkali North | Alkali South | 366.000 | 366.000 | 82G082 | 156 | OF | Yes lake | | BCTS | Thin | sell pulp | 2013 | 12 | 274500 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Premier Ridge | Alkali North | CTP126 | 150.000 | 150.000 | 82G082 | 156 | 0 | Yes lake | | BCTS | Thin | sell pulp | 2013 | 12 | 112500 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot South | Hot Foot TU 3 | 658.300 | 69.600 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | yes ripar | Winterlog | BCTS | Thin | sell pulp | 2013 | 11 | 62640 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot South | Hot Foot TU 4 | 658.300 | 15.900 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | yes ripar | Winterlog | BCTS | Thin | sell pulp | 2013 | 11 | 14310 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot South | Hot Foot TU 7 | 658.300 | 14.000 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | yes ripar | Winterlog | BCTS | Thin | sell pulp | 2013 | 11 | 12600 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| | | | | 890 | | | | | | | | | | | 545050 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grasmere | A.I. | A | 827.000 | 827.000 | 82G005 | 1 | OF | Y | Snowpack/ | BCTS | Thin | Scatter | 2014 | 10 | 100000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Rampart - Mayook | City | City | 188.000 | 188.000 | 82G052 | 9 | OR | | | BCTS | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2014 | 11 | 65800 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Labb | A | 73.000 | 73.000 | 82G024 | | OF | Yes | hand slas | Tembec | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2014 | 11 | 69350 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Newgate | Newgate-Alkali | Newgate-Alkali | 153.000 | 153.000 | 82G004 | | OR | Yes | snowpack/ | BCTS | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2014 | 11 | 91800 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Pickering Hills | Bronze Lake | Bronze Lake | 687.000 | 687.000 | 82G043 | 1 | OR | | | Galloway | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2014 | 11 | 560000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Pickering Hills | Pickering Pasture | Pickering Pasture | 577.000 | 577.000 | 82G043 | | OR | | | Galloway | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2014 | 11 | 577000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Colvalli North | Frenchman's pasture | Frenchman's pasture | 250.000 | 250.000 | 82G034 | | OF | Yes- Lake | Avoid-res | BCTS | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2014 | 11 | 250000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | Fort Steele fire | Fort Steele fire | 250.000 | 250.000 | 82G072 | | OR | Y | Tembec | Tembec | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2014 | 11 | 250000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | Bummer's Flat | Bummer's Flat | 170.000 | 170.000 | 82G072 | | OR | Y | Tembec | Tembec | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2014 | 11 | 170000 | | HCTF | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Luke- Meadow | Luke Meadow TU A | 613.000 | 11.400 | 82G061 | 55 | OF | yes ripar | Winterlog | Galloway | Thin | sell pulp | 2014 | 12 | 10260 | | Interface | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Luke- Meadow | Luke Meadow TUB | 613.000 | 54.500 | 82G061 | 55 | OR | yes ripar | Winterlog | Galloway | Thin | sell pulp | 2014 | 12 | 49050 | | Interface | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Luke- Meadow | Luke Meadow TU D | 613.000 | 67.100 | 82G061 | 55 | OR | yes ripar | Winterlog | Galloway | Thin | sell pulp | 2014 | 12 | 60390 | | Interface | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Luke- Meadow | Luke Meadow TU G | 613.000 | 72.100 | 82G061 | 55 | OR | yes ripar | Winterlog | Galloway | Thin | sell pulp | 2014 | 12 | 64890 | | Interface | | | | |
| Sheep Creek North | Springbrook South | Springbrook South | 526.000 | 316.000 | 82G092 | 82 | OF | | | Tembec | Thin | sell pulp | 2014 | 12 | 316000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| | | | | 3696 | | | | | | | | | | | 2634540 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Newgate | Rocks | Rocks | 688.000 | 688.000 | 82G004 | 37 | OF | Yes | snowpack/ | BCTS | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2015 | 11 | 412800 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Sheep Mtn | Sheep Mtn AB | 327.000 | 327.000 | 82G025 | | OR | Yes | No, need | Tembec | Thin | pile/burn | 2015 | 11 | 327000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| | | | | 1015 | | | | | | | | | | | 739800 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lewis - Wolf Creek | C. T. P. | CTP1A | 745.000 | 250.000 | 82G072 | 88 | OF | Yes | Yes | BCTS | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2016 | 11 | 150000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Lewis - Wolf Creek | C. T. P. | CTP1B | 745.000 | 250.000 | 82G072 | 88 | OF | Yes | Yes | BCTS | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2016 | 11 | 150000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Lewis - Wolf Creek | C. T. P. | CTP1C | 745.000 | 250.000 | 82G072 | 88 | OR | Yes | Yes | BCTS | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2016 | 11 | 150000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Newgate | Burlotts | Burlotts | 539.000 | 220.000 | 82G004 | 38 | OF | Yes | snowpack/ | BCTS | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2016 | 11 | 447000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Sheep Creek North | Dry Gulch | Dry Gulch | 834.000 | 170.000 | 82G092 | 101 | OF | | | | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2016 | 12 | 150000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| | | | | 1140 | | | | | | | | | | | 1047000 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot North | Hot Foot TU 2 | 658.300 | 33.400 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | yes ripar | Winterlog | BCTS | Thin | sell pulp | 2017 | 11 | 30060 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot North | Hot Foot TU 9 | 658.300 | 16.000 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | yes ripar | Winterlog | BCTS | Thin | sell pulp | 2017 | 11 | 14400 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Miller Road | Miller Road C | 200.000 | 70.000 | 82G072 | 9 (31) | OR | Snowpack- | | Galloway | Thin | sell pulp | 2017 | 11 | 70000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| | | | | 119 | | | | | | | | | | | 114460 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lewis - Wolf Creek | Big Burn | Big Burn1A | 422.000 | 0.000 | 82G082 | 144 | OR | | | BCTS | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2018 | 11 | 253200 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Lewis - Wolf Creek | Big Burn | Big Burn1B | 422.000 | 0.000 | 82G082 | 144 | OR | | | BCTS | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2018 | 11 | 253200 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Lewis - Wolf Creek | Big Burn | Big Burn1C | 422.000 | 0.000 | 82G082 | 144 | OR | | | BCTS | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2018 | 11 | 253200 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Lewis - Wolf Creek | Big Burn | Big Burn1D | 422.000 | 0.000 | 82G082 | 144 | OF | | | BCTS | Thin | Sell Pulp | 2018 | 11 | 253200 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | Dune B | Dune B | 212.000 | 212.000 | 82G082 | 149 | OR | | | Tembec | thin | sell pulp | 2018 | 12 | 14700 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | Dune C | Dune C | 260.000 | 260.000 | 82G082 | 150 | OF | | | Tembec | thin | sell pulp | 2018 | 12 | 182000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| | | | | 472 | | | | | | | | | | | 1209500 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sheep Creek North | Canal | Canal Non NRFL | 522.000 | 337.000 | 82G092 | | OF | | | Tembec | Thin | Sell pulp | 2020 | 9 | 252750 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Highway North | Highway North | 704.000 | 704.000 | 82G071 | 123 | OF | Y-riparia | | BCTS | Thin | sell pulp | 2020 | 12 | 422400 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Highway South | Highway South | 176.000 | 176.000 | 82G071 | 122 | OF | N | | BCTS | Thin | sell pulp | 2020 | 12 | 105600 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| | | | | 1217 | | | | | | | | | | | 780750 | | | | | | |

| RESTORATIO | LOGICAL_BU | TOTAL_AREA | NET_AREA_F | MAPSHEET | OPENING | FOREST TYP | PRIORITY | TIMBER_LIC | SLASH_TYPI | SLASH_TRE/ | SLASH_CAL | SLASH_MOI | SLASH_ESTI | SLASH_ACT | SLASH_FUN | SLASH_CONT | SLASH_CO_1 | SLASH_LOCA | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Wigwam | Wigwam Flats - West | 632.0 | 272.0 | 82G025 | 58 | OR | | Tembec | Slash | pile burn | 2003 | 0 | 51033 | | HCTF | | | | |
| Wigwam | Wigwam Road | 106.0 | 106.0 | 82G025 | 58 | OR | | Tembec | Slash | pile burn | 2003 | 10 | 0 | | HCTF | | | | |
| | | | 378.0 | | | | | | | | | | | 0.0 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Waldo | Fusee East | 356.1 | 33.5 | 82G025 | 68 | OF | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2005 | 2 | 0 | | HCTF | STDRM05-01 | Scott Wills | | |
| Waldo | Fusee East | 356.1 | 19.5 | 82G025 | 68 | OR | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2005 | 2 | 0 | | HCTF | STDRM05-01 | Scott Wills | | |
| Waldo | Fusee East | 356.1 | 29.4 | 82G025 | 68 | OF | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2005 | 2 | 0 | | HCTF | STDRM05-01 | Scott Wills | | |
| Waldo | Fusee East | 356.1 | 141.6 | 82G025 | 68 | OF | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2005 | 2 | 0 | 25000 | HCTF | STDRM05-01 | Scott Wills | | |
| | | | 224.0 | | | | | | | | | | | 25000.0 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wigwam | Rocky Ridge End | 145.0 | 145.0 | 82G025 | 58 | OF | | Tembec | Slash | pile burn | 2006 | 8 | 0 | | HCTF | | | | |
| Wigwam | Rocky Ridge North | 140.0 | 140.0 | 82G025 | 67 | OR | | Tembec | Slash | pile burn | 2006 | 8 | 0 | | HCTF | | | | |
| Wigwam | Rocky Ridge South | 111.0 | 111.0 | 82G025 | 67 | OR | | Tembec | Slash | pile burn | 2006 | 8 | 0 | | HCTF | | | | |
| | | | 396.0 | | | | | | | | | | | 0.0 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Waldo | Fusee East | 356.1 | 76.1 | 82G025 | 68 | OR | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2007 | 11 | 0 | 12850.45 | FIA | ER08SML027 | Mike Dola | Y | |
| Waldo North Pilot | Munson Slough | 294.0 | 57.0 | 82G034 | 178 | OR | 103 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2007 | 11 | 25740 | 11154 | FIA | EER06SML- | Charley W | Y | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | 295.0 | 213.0 | 82G034 | 177 | OF | 103 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2007 | 4 | 53250 | 33046 | FIA | FSDRM-07SM011 | Purcell R | Y | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | 231.4 | 180.7 | 82G034 | 180 | OF | 103 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2007 | 4 | 53250 | 33046 | FIA | FSDRM-07SM011 | Purcell R | Y | |
| Cranbrook Fort Steele | Eager Hill | 96.1 | 77.3 | 82G052 | 41 | OF | | BCTS | Slash | Pile | 2007 | 4 | 0 | 50573 | FIA | DRM07SMM013 | SCOTT willls | Y | |
| Cranbrook Fort Steele | Eager Hill | 96.1 | 7.7 | 82G052 | 41 | OF | | BCTS | Slash | Pile | 2007 | 4 | 0 | 5305 | FIA | DRM07SMM013 | SCOTT willls | Y | |
| Cranbrook Fort Steele | Eager Hill | 96.1 | 11.1 | 82G052 | 41 | OF | | BCTS | Slash | Pile | 2007 | 4 | 0 | 4400 | FIA | DRM07SMM013 | SCOTT willls | Y | |
| East Columbia Lake | 5A | 58.0 | 58.0 | 82J021 | 35 | OR | 116 | Tembec | Slash | Piles | 2007 | 4 | 4500 | 25000 | HCTF | FSDRM06SM | K'tunaxa | Y | |
| Cranbrook Fort Steele | Highway Overpass | 336.4 | 40.0 | 82G052 | 40 | OR | | BCTS | Slash | Scatter | 2007 | 4 | 0 | 14134 | FIA | DRM07SMM013 | SCOTT wills | Y | |
| Cranbrook Fort Steele | Highway Overpass | 336.4 | 18.0 | 82G052 | 40 | OF | | BCTS | Slash | Pile | 2007 | 4 | 0 | 15720 | FIA | DRM07SMM013 | SCOTT wills | Y | |
| Cranbrook Fort Steele | Highway Overpass | 336.4 | 18.0 | 82G052 | 40 | OF | | BCTS | Slash | Pile | 2007 | 4 | 0 | 15720 | FIA | DRM07SMM013 | SCOTT wills | Y | |
| Waldo | Burnt Bottom | 362.0 | 158.0 | 82G015 | 104 | OF | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2007 | 4 | 0 | 32372.17 | FIA | FSDRM-07S | Purcell R | Y | |
| Windermere-Sinclair | Juniper Heights | 110.0 | 110.0 | 82K060 | 163 | OR | 98 | Canfor | Slash | pile | 2007 | 10 | 0 | 80770 | CBFWCP | FSDRM06SM005 | New Fores | Y | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | Lakit Lake | 409.0 | 4.5 | 82G072 | 89 | OF | 68 | Tembec | slash | scatter | 2007 | 11 | 2430 | 12445.42 | MOFR-ERP | EER06SML30- | Ktunaxa K | Y | |
| | | | 1029.4 | | | | | | | | | | | 256439.5 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | 231.4 | 7.2 | 82G034 | 180 | OF | 103 | Galloway | Slash | Pile burn | 2008 | 12 | 3500 | 8755 | JOP | Galloway 2 | | Y | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | 231.4 | 7.5 | 82G034 | 180 | OR | 103 | Galloway | Slash | sell pulp | 2008 | 12 | 148200 | 0 | FIA | FSDRM-07S | Purcell R | Y | |
| Cranbrook Fort Steele | Highway Overpass | 336.4 | 24.0 | 82G052 | 40 | OR | | BCTS | slasH | Scatter | 2008 | 12 | 23800 | 5308.8 | FIA | ER09SMJ-008 | Charley W | Y | |
| Premier Ridge | Wolf | 39.0 | 30.6 | 82G082 | 145 | OF | 101 | BCTS | Slash | Pile burn | 2008 | 4 | 0 | 10000 | CBFWCP | | | | |
| Premier Ridge | Wolf | 39.0 | 8.6 | 82G082 | 145 | OF | | BCTS | Slash | Pile burn | 2008 | 4 | 0 | 10000 | CBFWCP | | | | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | Lakit Lake | 409.0 | 14.9 | 82G072 | 89 | OF | 68 | Tembec | slash | Pile | 2008 | 4 | 2430 | 14826 | MOFR-ERP | EER06SML042 | Scott Wil | Y | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | Lakit Lake | 409.0 | 15.6 | 82G072 | 89 | OF | 68 | Tembec | slash | scatter | 2008 | 4 | 2430 | 10124 | MOFR-ERP | EER06SML042 | Scott Wil | Y | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | Lakit Lake | 409.0 | 8.0 | 82G072 | 89 | OF | 68 | Tembec | slash | scatter | 2008 | 4 | 17190 | 5192 | MOFR-ERP | EER06SML042 | Scott Wil | Y | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | Lakit Lake | 409.0 | 6.4 | 82G072 | 89 | OF | 68 | Tembec | slash | scatter | 2008 | 4 | 2430 | 4154 | MOFR-ERP | EER06SML042 | Scott Wil | Y | |
| Grasmere | Dump | 900.0 | 99.0 | 82G015 | 1300 | OR | NR | BCTS | Slash | Scatter | 2008 | 10 | 34615 | 7857 | FIA | ER08SML02 | jesse Ram | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Old Airport | 707.6 | 35.2 | 82G072 | 91 | OR | 106 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2008 | 10 | | 5000 | JOP | Galloway 1 | | | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | 231.4 | 5.6 | 82G034 | 180 | OF | 103 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2008 | 10 | 4200 | 6810 | JOP | Galloway 2 | | Y | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | 231.4 | 1.3 | 82G034 | 180 | OF | 103 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2008 | 10 | 938 | 1581 | JOP | Galloway 2 | | Y | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Bare Mtn | 231.1 | 75.0 | 82G014 | 48 | OF | 95 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2008 | 11 | | 43880 | JOP | Galloway 2 | | Y | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Bare Mtn | 231.1 | 32.7 | 82G014 | 48 | OR | 95 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2008 | 11 | | 19131 | JOP | Galloway 2 | | Y | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Bare Mtn | 231.1 | 6.4 | 82G014 | 48 | OR | 95 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2008 | 11 | | 3744 | JOP | Galloway 2 | | Y | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Bare Mtn | 231.1 | 11.7 | 82G014 | 48 | OF | 95 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2008 | 11 | | 6845 | JOP | Galloway 2 | | Y | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Bare Mtn | 255.9 | 135.8 | 82G014 | 48 | OF | 95 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2008 | 11 | 62250 | 67710 | JOP | Galloway 2 | | Y | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Bare Mtn | 255.9 | 7.6 | 82G014 | 48 | OF | 95 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2008 | 11 | | 7058 | JOP | Galloway 2 | | Y | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Bare Mtn | 255.9 | 58.6 | 82G014 | 48 | OF | 95 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2008 | 11 | | 41102 | JOP | Galloway 2 | | Y | |
| Waldo | Cutts Road | 629.0 | 7.2 | 82G025 | 34 | OF | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Sctter | 2008 | 11 | 0 | 2093.9 | FIA | ER09SMJ08 | Charley W | y | |
| Waldo | Cutts Road | 629.0 | 6.2 | 82G025 | 34 | OF | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Sctter | 2008 | 11 | 25000 | 1749 | FIA | ER09SMJ08 | Charley W | y | |
| East Columbia Lake | 5B | 79.0 | 79.0 | 82J021 | 38 | OR | 116 | Tembec | Slash | Piles | 2008 | 11 | 12500 | 12500 | HCTF | | Nupqu | | |
| | | | 684.1 | | | | | | | | | | | 16342.9 | | | | | |

| RESTORATIO | LOGICAL_BU | TOTAL_AREA | NET_AREA_F | MAPSHEET | OPENING | FOREST TYP | PRIORITY | TIMBER_LIC | SLASH_TYPE | SLASH_TRE/ | SLASH_CAL | SLASH_MOI | SLASH_ESTI | SLASH_ACT | SLASH_FUN | SLASH_CONT | SLASH_CO_1 | SLASH_LOCA | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Waldo | East Kootenay-Eimer | -2.0 | 556.0 | 82G034 | 178 | OF | 103 | Galloway | Slash | Pile | 2009 | 7 | 0 | 201489 | JOP | Galloway 1 | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Beacon West | 762.2 | 239.0 | 82G071 | 121 | OR | 106 | BCTS | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | 59775 | 83650 | jop | TEMBEC 2 | | Y | |
| Waldo North Pilot | Pipeline | 358.0 | 358.0 | 82G034 | 178 | OR | 103 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | 876000 | | jop | Trench 1 | trench Society | | |
| Waldo North Pilot | North, South Lake | 250.0 | 250.0 | 82G034 | 178 | OF | 103 | BCTS | Slash | Pile | 2009 | 4 | 25000 | 206450 | jop | Trench 1 | Trench Society | | |
| Grasmere | Dump | 900.0 | 0.0 | 82G015 | | OF | NR | BCTS | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 10 | 2500 | | JOP | | | | |
| Waldo North Pilot | Colvali-Waldo | 376.0 | 376.0 | 82G034 | 178 | OF | 103 | Galloway | Slash | Pile | 2009 | 4 | 25000 | 202494 | jop | Galloway 1 | | Y | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | 295.0 | 14.7 | 82G034 | 177 | OF | 103 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 4 | 3425 | 17875 | JOP | Galloway 2 | | Y | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | 295.0 | 1.3 | 82G034 | 177 | OF | 103 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 4 | 315 | 1581 | JOP | Galloway 2 | | Y | |
| Windermere-Sinclair | Redstreak | 350.0 | 80.0 | 82K070 | 81 | OR | 98 | Canfor | Slash | Fireguard | 2009 | 6 | 2500 | 3500 | National | | Rick Kubi | Y | |
| Findlay Basin | Stinky | 550.0 | 251.4 | 82J011 | 143 | OF | 110 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 6 | 0 | 45000 | JOP | Trench 2 | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Bare Mtn | 231.1 | 32.2 | 82G014 | 36 | OF | 95 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 7 | 23500 | 29911 | JOP | Galloway 2 | | Y | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Bare Mtn | 231.1 | 7.8 | 82G014 | 36 | OF | 95 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 7 | 23500 | 7245 | JOP | Galloway 2 | | Y | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Bare Mtn | 255.9 | 15.5 | 82G014 | 48 | OR | 95 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 7 | | -9010 | JOP | Galloway 2 | | Y | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North South | 219.9 | 19.9 | 82G061 | 57 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Pile Burn | 2009 | 8 | 6965 | | JOP | S D Hunt | SD Hunt | Y | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North South | 219.9 | 9.9 | 82G061 | 57 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Pile Burn | 2009 | 8 | 3465 | | JOP | S D Hunt | SD Hunt | Y | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North South | 219.9 | 22.4 | 82G061 | 57 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Pile Burn | 2009 | 8 | 7840 | | JOP | S D Hunt | SD Hunt | Y | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North South | 219.9 | 40.6 | 82G061 | 57 | OR | 108 | Galloway | Slash | scatter | 2009 | 8 | 14210 | | JOP | S D Hunt | SD Hunt | Y | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North-South | 319.5 | 17.0 | 82G061 | 16 | OR | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Pile-Burn | 2009 | 11 | 136500 | 278000 | JOP | S D Hunt | SD Hunt | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North-South | 319.5 | 49.2 | 82G061 | 16 | OR | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Pile-Burn | 2009 | 11 | | | JOP | Tembec 2 | SD Hunt | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North-South | 319.5 | 9.5 | 82G061 | 16 | OR | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Pile-Burn | 2009 | 11 | | | JOP | Tembec 2 | SD Hunt | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North-South | 319.5 | 27.5 | 82G061 | 16 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | | | JOP | Tembec 2 | SD Hunt | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North-South | 319.5 | 9.8 | 82G061 | 16 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | | | JOP | Tembec 2 | SD Hunt | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North-South | 319.5 | 4.7 | 82G061 | 16 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | | | JOP | Tembec 2 | SD Hunt | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North-South | 319.5 | 2.6 | 82G061 | 16 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | | | JOP | Tembec 2 | SD Hunt | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North-South | 319.5 | 1.7 | 82G061 | 16 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | | | JOP | Tembec 2 | SD Hunt | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North-South | 319.5 | 1.2 | 82G061 | 16 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | | | JOP | Tembec 2 | SD Hunt | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North-South | 319.5 | 90.6 | 82G061 | 16 | OR | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | | | JOP | Tembec 2 | SD Hunt | | |
| St Mary-Wycliffe | Pine Butte | 60.0 | 60.0 | 82G061 | 62 | OR | 108 | NA | Slash | Pile burn | 2009 | 9 | 24000 | | JOP | Trench 1 | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Thunder Bob | 523.2 | 135.6 | 82J011 | 142 | OF | 110 | Tembec | Slash | pile burn | 2009 | 9 | 45000 | 35000 | JOP | trench 2 | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Thunder Bob | 523.2 | 22.2 | 82J011 | 142 | OR | 110 | Tembec | Slash | pile burn | 2009 | 9 | | 10000 | JOP | trench 2 | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Thunder Bob | 523.2 | 49.2 | 82J011 | 142 | OR | 110 | Tembec | Slash | pile burn | 2009 | 9 | | 5000 | JOP | trench 2 | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Thunder Bob | 523.2 | 71.3 | 82J011 | 142 | OF | 110 | Tembec | Slash | pile burn | 2009 | 9 | | 2500 | JOP | trench 2 | | | |
| Waldo | Cemetery Hills | 582.0 | 8.9 | 82G024 | 131 | OR | 103 | Tembec | Slash | scatter | 2009 | 10 | 60000 | 33200 | JOP-FIA | Galloway 2 | | | |
| Cranbrook Fort Steele | Highway Overpass | 336.4 | 76.0 | 82G052 | 40 | OF | | BCTS | Slash | Pile-Burn | 2009 | 10 | 75500 | | JOP | Tembec 2 | SD Hunt | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Thunder Phil | 709.4 | 43.0 | 82J011 | 144 | OF | 110 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | 15050 | | JOP | Trench 2 | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Thunder Phil | 709.4 | 51.6 | 82J011 | 144 | OF | 110 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | 18060 | | JOP | Trench 2 | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Thunder Phil | 709.4 | 13.2 | 82J011 | 144 | OF | 110 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | 4620 | | JOP | Trench 2 | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Thunder Phil | 709.4 | 4.6 | 82J011 | 144 | OF | 110 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | 1610 | | JOP | Trench 2 | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Thunder Phil | 709.4 | 11.9 | 82J011 | 144 | OF | 110 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | 4165 | | JOP | Trench 2 | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Thunder Phil | 709.4 | 15.0 | 82J011 | 144 | OF | 110 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | 5250 | | JOP | Trench 2 | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Thunder Phil | 709.4 | 7.2 | 82J011 | 144 | OF | 110 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | 2520 | | JOP | Trench 2 | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Thunder Phil | 709.4 | 18.8 | 82J011 | 144 | OF | 110 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | 6580 | | JOP | Trench 2 | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Sun Lakes | 317.3 | 41.8 | 82J011 | 145 | OF | 110 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | 14630 | | JOP | Trench 2 | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Sun Lakes | 317.3 | 46.2 | 82J011 | 145 | OF | 110 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | 16170 | | JOP | Trench 2 | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Sun Lakes | 317.3 | 37.7 | 82J011 | 145 | OF | 110 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | 13195 | | JOP | Trench 2 | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | 4 Amigos | 795.5 | 30.4 | 82J021 | 36 | OF | 110 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | 10640 | | JOP | Trench 3 | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | 4 Amigos | 795.5 | 6.6 | 82J021 | 36 | OF | 110 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | 2310 | | JOP | Trench 3 | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | 4 Amigos | 795.5 | 11.0 | 82J021 | 36 | OR | 110 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | 3850 | | JOP | Trench 3 | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | 4 Amigos | 795.5 | 64.1 | 82J021 | 36 | OF | 110 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | 22435 | | JOP | Trench 3 | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | 4 Amigos | 795.5 | 29.3 | 82J021 | 36 | OF | 110 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | 10255 | | JOP | Trench 3 | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | 4 Amigos | 795.5 | 58.8 | 82J021 | 36 | OF | 110 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2009 | 11 | 20580 | | JOP | Trench 3 | | | |
| Waldo | Elko-Airport East | 215.4 | 162.8 | 82G025 | 20 | OR | 103 | Tembec | Slash | pile burn | 2009 | 11 | 60000 | 31526 | JOP | Galloway 2 | | | |
| Waldo | Elko-Airport East | 215.4 | 52.8 | 82G025 | 20 | OF | 103 | Tembec | Slash | pile burn | 2009 | 11 | 90000 | | JOP | Purcell Resources | | | |
| Sheep Creek North | Johnson Lake | 250.0 | 250.0 | 82G092 | 87 | OF | 93 | Tembec | Slash | scatter | 2009 | 11 | 87500 | | JOP | Trench 2 | | | |

| RESTORATIO | LOGICAL_BU | TOTAL_AREA | NET_AREA_F | MAPSHEET | OPENING | FOREST TYP | PRIORITY | TIMBER_LIC | SLASH_TYPI | SLASH_TRE/ | SLASH_CAL | SLASH_MOI | SLASH_ESTI | SLASH_ACT | SLASH_FUN | SLASH_CONT | SLASH_CO_1 | SLASH_LOCA | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lewis - Wolf Creek | C. T. P. | 90.0 | 71.0 | 82G082 | 159 | OR | 62 | BCTS | Slash | pile burn | 2009 | 11 | 42300 | | CBFWC | | | | |
| Cranbrook Fort Steele | Highway Overpass | 336.4 | 113.0 | 82G052 | 40 | OF | | BCTS | Slash | Pile-Burn | 2009 | 11 | 113300 | 25000 | JOP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Rouse | 365.3 | 73.1 | 82G062 | 41 | OR | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Pile-Burn | 2009 | 12 | 270000 | | JOP | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot South | 658.3 | 28.4 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | 92 | BCTS | Slash | Pile-Burn | 2009 | 8 | 0 | 10000 | JOP | Tembec 2 | | Y | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot South | 658.3 | 7.2 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | 92 | BCTS | Slash | Pile-Burn | 2009 | 8 | 0 | 10000 | JOP | Tembec 2 | | Y | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot North | 658.3 | 33.9 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | 92 | BCTS | Slash | Pile-Burn | 2009 | 8 | 0 | 10000 | JOP | Tembec 2 | | Y | |
| | | | 41.1 | | | | | | | | | | | 20000.0 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Indian North-South | 424.0 | 424.0 | 82G061 | 60 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2010 | 10 | 106000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Rouse | 365.3 | 18.7 | 82G062 | 41 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2010 | 12 | 3740 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Rouse | 365.3 | 46.5 | 82G062 | 41 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2010 | 12 | 9300 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Rouse | 365.3 | 13.3 | 82G062 | 41 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2010 | 12 | 2660 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Rouse | 365.3 | 13.6 | 82G062 | 41 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2010 | 12 | 2720 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Rouse | 365.3 | 58.0 | 82G062 | 41 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2010 | 12 | 11600 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Cranbrook Fort Steele | Highway Overpass | 336.4 | 76.0 | 82G052 | 40 | OF | | BCTS | Slash | Pile-Burn | 2010 | 2 | 75500 | | JOP | | | | |
| Sheep Creek North | Springbrook North | 526.0 | 210.0 | 82G092 | 82 | OF | 93 | Tembec | Slash | pile burn | 2010 | 2 | 2000 | | JOP | | | | |
| Waldo | Rabbit Mtn | 330.0 | 45.0 | 82G025 | 73 | OR | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Pile burn | 2010 | 3 | 25000 | | jop | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Deep Springs | 563.2 | 40.5 | 82G061 | 20 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | scatter | 2010 | 4 | 14175 | | jop | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Deep Springs | 563.2 | 55.0 | 82G061 | 20 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | scatter | 2010 | 4 | 19250 | | jop | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Deep Springs | 563.2 | 45.7 | 82G061 | 20 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2010 | 4 | 15995 | | jop | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Deep Springs | 563.2 | 1.1 | 82G061 | 20 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Pile burn | 2010 | 4 | 385 | | jop | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Deep Springs | 563.2 | 1.3 | 82G061 | 20 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Pile burn | 2010 | 4 | 455 | | jop | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Deep Springs | 563.2 | 7.3 | 82G061 | 20 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Pile burn | 2010 | 4 | 2555 | | jop | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Deep Springs | 563.2 | 175.9 | 82G061 | 20 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2010 | 4 | 61565 | | jop | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Deep Springs | 563.2 | 15.9 | 82G061 | 20 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2010 | 4 | 5565 | | jop | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Deep Springs | 563.2 | 1.5 | 82G061 | 20 | OR | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Pile burn | 2010 | 4 | 525 | | jop | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Artesian-Dry | 387.9 | 5.4 | 82G061 | 63 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2010 | 4 | 1890 | | jop | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Artesian-Dry | 387.9 | 18.9 | 82G061 | 63 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2010 | 4 | 6615 | | jop | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Artesian-Dry | 387.9 | 51.4 | 82G061 | 63 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2010 | 4 | 17990 | | jop | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Artesian-Dry | 387.9 | 21.4 | 82G061 | 63 | OR | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2010 | 4 | 7490 | | jop | | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Spur Flat | 556.3 | 15.7 | 82J021 | 34 | OF | 110 | Tembec | Slash | scatter | 2010 | 4 | 144000 | | JOP | Trench 3 | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Spur Hill | 556.3 | 203.1 | 82J021 | 34 | OF | 110 | Tembec | Slash | scatter | 2010 | 4 | 144000 | | JOP | Trench 3 | | | |
| Wigwam | Wigwam Flats - East | 0.0 | 66.0 | 82G025 | 58 | OF | | Tembec | Slash | pile burn | 2010 | 5 | 5000 | | BCWF | | Kent Petr | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Dry Lake-Artesian | 274.0 | 83.7 | 82G061 | 58 | OR | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2010 | 12 | 29295 | | jop | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Dry Lake-Artesian | 274.0 | 42.1 | 82G061 | 58 | OR | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2010 | 12 | 14735 | | jop | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Dry Lake-Artesian | 274.0 | 20.5 | 82G061 | 58 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Pile/ burn | 2010 | 12 | 7175 | | jop | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Dry Lake-Artesian | 274.0 | 5.5 | 82G061 | 58 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Pile/ burn | 2010 | 12 | 1925 | | jop | | | | |
| Waldo | Cemetery Hills | 582.0 | 127.7 | 82G024 | 131 | OR | 103 | Tembec | Slash | scatter | 2010 | 12 | 60000 | | JOP | | | | |
| Waldo | Cemetery Hills | 582.0 | 26.6 | 82G024 | 131 | OF | 103 | Tembec | Slash | scatter | 2010 | 12 | 60000 | | JOP | | | | |
| Waldo | Cemetery Hills | 582.0 | 102.9 | 82G024 | 131 | OR | 103 | Tembec | Slash | scatter | 2010 | 12 | 75000 | | JOP | | | | |
| Findlay Basin | Stinky | 150.0 | 150.0 | 82J011 | | OF | 110 | Tembec | Slash | Pile-Burn | 2010 | 11 | 33300 | | JOP | | | | |
| Toby Benches | Enid2 | 70.0 | 70.0 | 82K060 | 1301 | OF | | BCTS | Slash | pile | 2010 | 8 | 31500 | | jop | | | | |
| Toby Benches | Enid3 | 200.0 | 200.0 | 82K060 | 1302 | OF | | BCTS | Slash | pile | 2010 | 8 | 90000 | | jop | | | | |
| East Columbia Lake | Columbia Lake East A6 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 82J021 | | OR | 116 | Tembec | Slash | Piles | 2010 | 11 | 18000 | | HCTF | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Wycliffe Corridor | 150.0 | 150.0 | 82G062 | | OR | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Pile-Burn | 2010 | 11 | 54000 | | HCTF | | | | |
| Lewis - Wolf Creek | Bradford Connector | 10.0 | 10.0 | 82G082 | | OR | 62 | BCTS | Slash | pile burn | 2010 | 11 | 10000 | | CBFWCP | | | | |
| Lewis - Wolf Creek | Lazy Lake Connector | 62.0 | 62.0 | 82G082 | | OR | 62 | BCTS | Slash | pile burn | 2010 | 11 | 62000 | | CBFWCP | | | | |
| Lewis - Wolf Creek | Lazy Lake North | 31.0 | 31.0 | 82G082 | | OR | 62 | BCTS | Slash | pile burn | 2010 | 11 | 11160 | | CBFWCP | | | | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | Brewery Ridge | 188.6 | 188.6 | 82G063 | 64 | OR | 68 | Tembec | Slash | Pile | 2010 | 12 | 23400 | | CBFWCP | | | | |
| Waldo | Rabbit Mtn | 330.0 | 120.0 | 82G025 | 73 | OR | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Pile burn | 2010 | 11 | 25000 | | jop | | | | |
| | | | 3071.8 | | | | | | | | | | 1292465.0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | 42 A | 305.0 | 78.0 | 82G082 | 151 | OF | 119 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2011 | 12 | 213500 | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Lost Spring | 500.0 | 323.0 | 82G072 | 93 | OF | 106 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2011 | 3 | 84175 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | Foster | 308.0 | 308.0 | 82G082 | 141 | OF | 119 | Tembec | Slash | sell pulp | 2011 | 12 | 215600 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |

| RESTORATIO | LOGICAL_BU | TOTAL_AREA | NET_AREA_F | MAPSHEET | OPENING | FOREST TYP | PRIORITY | TIMBER_LIC | SLASH_TYPE | SLASH_TRE/ | SLASH_CAL | SLASH_MOI | SLASH_ESTI | SLASH_ACT | SLASH_FUN | SLASH_CONT | SLASH_CO_1 | SLASH_LOCA | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | Plot | 503.7 | 60.8 | 82G082 | 99 | OF | 119 | Tembec | slash | scatter | 2011 | 12 | 20000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Sheep Creek North | Kootenay Ranch East | 120.0 | 120.0 | 82J002 | | OF | 93 | Tembec | Slash | scatter | 2011 | 9 | 2400 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Lost Spring | 500.0 | 45.0 | 82G072 | 93 (85,65) | OF | 106 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2011 | 9 | 37590 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Cemetery Hills | 582.0 | 26.0 | 82G024 | 131 | OR | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2011 | 12 | -58500 | | JOP | | | | |
| Lewis - Wolf Creek | Lazy Lake East | 52.0 | 52.0 | 82G082 | | OR | 62 | BCTS | Slash | pile burn | 2011 | 11 | 18720 | | CBFWCP | | | | |
| | | | 1012.8 | | | | | | | | | | 533485.0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Gold Creek Canyon | 146.0 | 146.0 | 82G014 | 65 | OF | 95 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2012 | 9 | 36500 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Gold Creek Canyon | 217.0 | 217.0 | 82G014 | 63 | OF | 95 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2012 | 9 | 54250 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Newgate | Butt's | 95.0 | 95.0 | 82G004 | | OF | 114 | BCTS | Slash | pile/burn | 2012 | 11 | 57000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Fusee West | 323.7 | 323.7 | 82G024 | 71 | OF | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2012 | 11 | 15000 | | JOP | | | | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | Estella Connector | | 73.0 | 82G082 | | OR | 68 | Tembec | Slash | pile burn | 2012 | 11 | 26280 | | CBFWCP | | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | River | 126.0 | 126.0 | 82G082 | 148 | OR | 119 | Tembec | Slash | bpile bur | 2012 | 12 | 88200 | | jop | | | | |
| Frances Creek | Height of Land | 250.0 | 80.0 | | | OF | | Canfor | Slash | Scatter | 2012 | 9 | 28000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| | | | 1060.7 | | | | | | | | | | 305230.0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Steer | 252.0 | 252.0 | 82G062 | 59 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2013 | 10 | 63000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | Echo | 707.0 | 657.0 | 82G082 | 147 | OF | 119 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2013 | 12 | 459900 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | Pulpmill | 393.0 | 285.2 | 82G082 | 153 | OR | 119 | Tembec | Slash | scatter | 2013 | 12 | 275100 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Premier Ridge | 3 Sons Property | 200.0 | 200.0 | 82G082 | | OF | 101 | BCTS | Slash | scatter | 2013 | 3 | 72000 | | HCTF | | | | |
| Torrent | Middle-Sheep | 234.0 | 234.0 | 82J001 | 109 | OR | | Tembec | Slash | shrubs | 2013 | 7 | 117000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Toby Benches | Eileen | 200.0 | 200.0 | 82K060 | | 0 | | BCTS | Slash | pile | 2013 | 8 | 90000 | | Interface | | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Wakefield-Gorrie | 224.0 | 224.0 | 82G004 | 147 | OR | 95 | Tembec | Slash | Pile | 2013 | 9 | 56000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | Estella North (blk 10a) | 40.0 | 40.0 | 82G082 | | OR | 68 | Tembec | Slash | pile burn | 2013 | 11 | 14400 | | CBFWCP | | | | |
| Waldo | Baynes Lake | 93.5 | 93.5 | 82G015 | 1 | OF | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2013 | 11 | 0 | | MOFR ERP | | | | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | Estella Northwest | 73.0 | 73.0 | 82G082 | | OR | | Tembec | Slash | pile burn | 2013 | 11 | 26280 | | CBFWCP | | | | |
| | | | 2258.7 | | | | | | | | | | 1173680.0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Waldo | Cemetery Hills | 582.0 | 67.4 | 82G024 | 131 | OF | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2014 | 4 | 37500 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Cemetery Hills | 582.0 | 168.2 | 82G024 | 131 | OF | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2014 | 4 | 23000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Cemetery Hills | 582.0 | 30.4 | 82G024 | 131 | OF | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2014 | 4 | 37500 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Buck West | 350.0 | 350.0 | 82G024 | | OF | 95 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2014 | 9 | 87500 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Fusee West | 339.0 | 30.0 | 82G024 | 75 | OF | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2014 | 11 | 7500 | | JOP | | | | |
| Waldo | Fusee West | 339.0 | 40.0 | 82G024 | 75 | OF | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2014 | 11 | 10000 | | JOP | | | | |
| Waldo | Fusee West | 339.0 | 60.0 | 82G024 | 75 | OF | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2014 | 11 | 15000 | | JOP | | | | |
| Lewis - Wolf Creek | Leask | 379.0 | 379.0 | 82G072 | 157 | OR | 62 | BCTS | Slash | Sell Pulp | 2014 | 11 | 227400 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Pickering Hills | Jurik Pasture | 620.0 | 620.0 | 82G053 | | OR | 88 | Galloway | Slash | scatter | 2014 | 11 | 60000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Pickering Hills | Eimer Pasture | 120.0 | 120.0 | 82G053 | | OF | 88 | Galloway | Slash | scatter | 2014 | 11 | 43500 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| | | | 1865.0 | | | | | | | | | | 548900.0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | China North South | 491.0 | 491.0 | 82G062 | | OF | 106 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2015 | 12 | 171850 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Garbutt Norbury | 390.0 | 390.0 | 82G053 | 66 | OF | 92 | BCTS | Slash | Scatter | 2015 | 9 | 97500 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Garbutt Norbury | 536.0 | 536.0 | 82G053 | | OF | 92 | BCTS | Slash | Scatter | 2015 | 9 | 134000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Sheep Camp | 353.3 | 38.0 | 82G061 | 64 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2015 | 9 | 13300 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Sheep Camp | 353.3 | 25.2 | 82G061 | 64 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2015 | 9 | 8820 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Sheep Camp | 353.3 | 66.1 | 82G061 | 64 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2015 | 9 | 23135 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Sheep Camp | 353.3 | 34.1 | 82G061 | 64 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2015 | 9 | 11935 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Sheep Camp | 353.3 | 17.2 | 82G061 | 64 | OF | 108 | Galloway | Slash | Scatter | 2015 | 9 | 6020 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | Reed A | 316.0 | 316.0 | 82G081 | 146 | OR | 119 | Tembec | Slash | scatter | 2015 | 12 | 221200 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | Reed B | 303.0 | 303.0 | 82G082 | 154 | OF | 119 | Tembec | Slash | scatter | 2015 | 12 | 212100 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | Reed C | 250.0 | 250.0 | 82G082 | 155 | OR | 119 | Tembec | Slash | scatter | 2015 | 12 | 175000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Sheep Mtn | 400.0 | 400.0 | 82G025 | | OR | 103 | Tembec | Slash | pile/burn | 2015 | 11 | 42000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| | | | 2866.6 | | | | | | | | | | 1116860.0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| RESTORATIO | LOGICAL_BU | TOTAL_AREA | NET_AREA_F | MAPSHEET | OPENING | FOREST TYP | PRIORITY | TIMBER_LIC | SLASH_TYPI | SLASH_TRE/ | SLASH_CAL | SLASH_MOI | SLASH_ESTI | SLASH_ACT | SLASH_FUN | SLASH_CONT | SLASH_CO_1 | SLASH_LOCA | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Waldo | Baynes Lake North | 269.0 | 269.0 | 82G025 | 70 | OF | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2016 | 10 | 67250 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Fusee North | 360.0 | 140.0 | 82G025 | 74 | OF | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2016 | 11 | 35000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Duck A | 506.1 | 180.0 | 82G025 | 76 | OF | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2016 | 10 | 18750 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Duck B | 506.0 | 180.0 | 82G025 | 76 | OF | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2016 | 10 | 20000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Duck C | 506.0 | 138.0 | 82G025 | 76 | OR | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2016 | 10 | 30000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Alkaline purvis | 491.0 | 412.0 | 82G053 | 20 | OF | 92 | BCTS | Slash | Scatter | 2016 | 11 | 267800 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Alkaline purvis | 238.0 | 238.0 | 82G053 | | OF | 92 | BCTS | Slash | Scatter | 2016 | 11 | 154700 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Grasmere | Bagley's | 1030.0 | 1030.0 | 82G005 | 17 | OF | NR | BCTS | Slash | Scatter | 2016 | 10 | 25000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Fusee North | 360.0 | 30.0 | 82G025 | 74 | OR | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2016 | 11 | 2500 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Fusee North | 360.0 | 10.0 | 82G025 | 74 | OF | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2016 | 11 | 2500 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Fusee North | 360.0 | 10.0 | 82G025 | 74 | OF | 103 | Tembec | Slash | Scatter | 2016 | 11 | 2500 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| | | | 2637.0 | | | | | | | | | | 626000.0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grasmere | Flagstone | 1285.0 | 250.0 | 82G015 | | OR | NR | BCTS | Slash | Scatter | 2017 | 10 | 25000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Grasmere | Flagstone | 1285.0 | 150.0 | 82G015 | | OR | NR | BCTS | Slash | Scatter | 2017 | 10 | 25000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| | | | 400.0 | | | | | | | | | | 50000.0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Beacon West | 762.6 | 523.0 | 82G071 | 121 | OF | 106 | BCTS | Slash | Scatter | 2018 | 10 | 9000 | | mofr-erp | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot North | 658.3 | 45.0 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | 92 | BCTS | Slash | Scatter | 2018 | 9 | 13500 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot North | 658.3 | 25.2 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | 92 | BCTS | Slash | Scatter | 2018 | 9 | 7560 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| | | | 593.2 | | | | | | | | | | 30060.0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Rock Lake | 616.0 | 616.0 | 82G072 | 93 (85-6 | OF | 106 | BCTS | Slash | Scatter | 2019 | 3 | 154000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Rampart - Mayook | Whiskey Creek North | 173.0 | 173.0 | 82G053 | 65 | OF | 86 | BCTS | Slash | scatter | 2019 | 9 | 60550 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| | | | 789.0 | | | | | | | | | | 214550.0 | | | | | | |

| RESTORATIO | LOGICAL_BU | TREATMENT_ | TOTAL_AREA | NET_AREA_ | MAPSHEET | OPENING | FOREST TYP | PRIORITY | BURN_TYPE | BURN_TREA | BURN_CALE | BURN_MON | BURN_ESTI | BURN_ACTU | BURNFUND | BURN_CONTR | BURN_CON | BURN_LOCAL | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Waldo | North Kikkomun | Bob's Burn | 187.0 | 187.0 | 82G024 | 65, 26 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2007 | 4.00 | 20000.00 | 24798.04 | MOFR-ERP | | Bob Couperus | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Waldo | Fusee East | Fusee East TU 2 | 356.1 | 33.5 | 82G025 | 68 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2008 | 4 | 20000 | 33240.00 | FIA | | Mark LaForest | | |
| Waldo | Fusee East | Fusee East TU 3 | 356.1 | 19.5 | 82G025 | 68 | OR | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2008 | 4 | 0 | | FIA | | Mark LaForest | | |
| Waldo | Fusee East | Fusee East TU 4 | 356.1 | 29.4 | 82G025 | 68 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2008 | 4 | 0 | | FIA | | Mark LaForest | | |
| Waldo | Fusee East | Fusee East TU 5 | 356.1 | 76.1 | 82G025 | 68 | OR | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2008 | 4 | 0 | | FIA | | Mark LaForest | | |
| Premier Ridge | Gina | Gina TU 6 | 342.0 | 17.8 | 82G082 | 111 | OR | 101 | Burn | Broadcast | 2008 | 4.00 | 25000.00 | 26419.91 | FIA | Purcell | Bob Couperus | | |
| Kimberley Nature Park | Sunflower Hill | Sunflower Hill | 56.0 | 56.0 | 82G061 | 54 | OR | | Burn | Broadcast | 2008 | 4 | 15000 | 4164.00 | MOFR-ERP | | Mike Daigle | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Miller Road | Miller Road A | 200.0 | 15.0 | 82G072 | 9 (86) | OR | 106 | Burn | Broadcast | 2008 | 4 | | 11474.00 | MOFR-ERP | | Mike Daigle | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Miller Road | Miller Road C | 200.0 | 70.0 | 82G072 | 9 (31) | OR | 106 | Burn | Broadcast | 2008 | 4 | | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | Mike Daigle | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Miller Road | Miller Road B | 200.0 | 75.0 | 82G072 | 9 | OF | 106 | Burn | Broadcast | 2008 | 4 | | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | Mike Daigle | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Miller Road | Miller Road E | 200.0 | 10.0 | 82G072 | 9 (75) | OF | 106 | Burn | Broadcast | 2008 | 4 | | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | Mike Daigle | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Miller Road | Miller Road D | 200.0 | 35.0 | 82G072 | 9 (87) | OF | 106 | Burn | Broadcast | 2008 | 4 | | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | Mike Daigle | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | Plot | Plot 2A | 503.7 | 5.0 | 82G082 | 99 | OF | 119 | Burn | piles | 2008 | 2 | | 1453.5 | HCTF | ER08SML040 | purcell r | Y | |
| | | | | 442.3 | | | | | | | | | | 75297.9 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | Clear Lake 180A | 231.4 | 7.2 | 82G034 | 180 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2009 | 4 | 25000.00 | 35870.46 | MOFR-ERP | | Bob Couperous | | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | Clear Lake 180B | 231.4 | 5.6 | 82G034 | 180 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2009 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | Bob Couperous | | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | Clear Lake 180C | 231.4 | 1.3 | 82G034 | 180 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2009 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | Bob Couperous | | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | Clear Lake 180D | 231.4 | 10.7 | 82G034 | 180 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2009 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | Bob Couperous | | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | Clear Lake 180F | 231.4 | 180.7 | 82G034 | 180 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2009 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | Bob Couperous | | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | Clear Lake 180TU1 | 231.4 | 7.5 | 82G034 | 180 | OR | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2009 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | Bob Couperous | | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | Lakit Lake | Lakit Lake TU 1 | 409.0 | 272.3 | 82G072 | 89 | OF | 68 | Burn | Broadcast | 2009 | 4 | 25000 | 19972.29 | MOFR-ERP | | Mike Daigle | | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | Lakit Lake | Lakit Lake TU 2 | 409.0 | 14.9 | 82G072 | 89 | OF | 68 | Burn | Broadcast | 2009 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | Mike Daigle | | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | Lakit Lake | Lakit Lake TU 3 | 409.0 | 15.6 | 82G072 | 89 | OF | 68 | Burn | Broadcast | 2009 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | Mike Daigle | | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | Lakit Lake | Lakit Lake TU 4A | 409.0 | 4.5 | 82G072 | 89 | OF | 68 | Burn | Broadcast | 2009 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | Mike Daigle | | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | Lakit Lake | Lakit Lake TU 4B | 409.0 | 8.0 | 82G072 | 89 | OF | 68 | Burn | Broadcast | 2009 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | Mike Daigle | | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | Lakit Lake | Lakit Lake TU 5 | 409.0 | 65.2 | 82G072 | 89 | OR | 68 | Burn | Broadcast | 2009 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | Mike Daigle | | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | Lakit Lake | Lakit Lake TU 6 | 409.0 | 6.4 | 82G072 | 89 | OF | 68 | Burn | Broadcast | 2009 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | Mike Daigle | | |
| East Columbia Lake | East Columbia 5B | East Columbia 5B | 79.0 | 79.0 | 82J021 | 38 | OR | 116 | Burn | Piles | 2009 | 10.00 | 4500 | | HCTF | | Nupqu | | |
| Cranbrook Fort Steele | Eager Hill | Eager Hill TU A | 96.1 | 77.3 | 82G052 | 41 | OF | | Burn | Piles | 2009 | 3 | 5000 | 10300.00 | JOP | Trench 1 and Gallway 1, 2 | | Y | |
| Cranbrook Fort Steele | Eager Hill | Eager Hill TU B | 96.1 | 7.7 | 82G052 | 41 | OF | | Burn | Piles | 2009 | 3 | 5000 | 2000.00 | FIA | Trench 1 and Gallway 1, 2 | | Y | |
| East Columbia Lake | 5A | East side Columbia 5A | 58.0 | 58.0 | 82J021 | 35 | OR | 116 | Burn | Piles | 2009 | 11 | 4500 | 10000.00 | HCTF | ER09SML01 | K'tunaxa | Y | |
| Premier Ridge | Wolf | Wolf Bench A | 39.0 | 30.6 | 82G082 | 145 | OF | 101 | Burn | piles | 2009 | 4 | 5000.00 | 5000.00 | HCTF | | | | |
| Premier Ridge | Wolf | Wolf Bench B | 39.0 | 8.6 | 82G082 | 145 | OF | | Burn | piles | 2009 | 4 | 5000 | 5000.00 | HCTF | | | | |
| | | | | 861.1 | | | | | | | | | | 88142.8 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | Clear Lake177B | 295.0 | 8.2 | 82G034 | 177 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2010 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | Bob Couperus | | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | Clear Lake177C | 295.0 | 5.4 | 82G034 | 177 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2010 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | Bob Couperus | | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | Clear Lake177D | 295.0 | 0.9 | 82G034 | 177 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2010 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | Bob Couperus | | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | Clear Lake177E | 295.0 | 5.1 | 82G034 | 177 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2010 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | Bob Couperus | | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | Clear Lake177F | 295.0 | 6.3 | 82G034 | 177 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2010 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | Bob Couperus | | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | Clear Lake177H | 295.0 | 14.7 | 82G034 | 177 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2010 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | Bob Couperus | | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | Clear Lake177I | 295.0 | 1.3 | 82G034 | 177 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2010 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | Bob Couperus | | |
| Waldo | Clear Lake | Clear Lake177TU1 | 295.0 | 213.0 | 82G034 | 177 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2010 | 4 | 30000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | Bob Couperus | | |
| Premier Ridge | Gina | Gina TU 1 | 300.0 | 31.2 | 82G082 | 111 | OF | 101 | Burn | Broadcast | 2010 | 4 | 35000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | Mike Daigle | | |
| Premier Ridge | Gina | Gina TU 2 | 300.0 | 8.4 | 82G082 | 111 | OF | 101 | Burn | Broadcast | 2010 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | Mike Daigle | | |
| Premier Ridge | Gina | Gina TU 3 | 300.0 | 44.9 | 82G082 | 111 | OF | 101 | Burn | Broadcast | 2010 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | Mike Daigle | | |
| Premier Ridge | Gina | Gina TU 5a | 342.0 | 12.0 | 82G082 | 111 | OR | 101 | Burn | Broadcast | 2010 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | Mike Daigle | | |
| Premier Ridge | Gina | Gina TU 5b | 342.0 | 5.0 | 82G082 | 111 | OR | 101 | Burn | Broadcast | 2010 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | Mike Daigle | | |
| Premier Ridge | Gina | Gina TU 5c | 342.0 | 63.5 | 82G082 | 111 | OR | 101 | Burn | Broadcast | 2010 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | Mike Daigle | | |
| Premier Ridge | Gina | Gina TU 5d | 342.0 | 3.0 | 82G082 | 111 | OR | 101 | Burn | Broadcast | 2010 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | Mike Daigle | | |
| Premier Ridge | Gina | Gina TU 7 | 342.0 | 10.8 | 82G082 | 111 | OR | 101 | Burn | Broadcast | 2010 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | Mike Daigle | | |
| Premier Ridge | Gina | Gina TU 7a | 342.0 | 2.0 | 82G082 | 111 | OR | 101 | Burn | Broadcast | 2010 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | Mike Daigle | | |
| Premier Ridge | Gina | New Gina TU 4 | 342.0 | 120.7 | 82G082 | 158 | OF | 101 | Burn | Broadcast | 2010 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | Mike Daigle | | |
| Windermere-Sinclair | Redstreak | Redstreak Province | 350.0 | 80.0 | 82K070 | 81 | OR | 98 | Burn | Broadcast | 2010 | 5 | 25000.00 | 0.00 | National Parks | | Rick Kubian | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Bare Mtn | Bare Mtn - Block 4 TU2 | 255.9 | 7.6 | 82G014 | 48 | OF | 95 | Burn | Piles | 2010 | 11.00 | 50000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |

| RESTORATIO | LOGICAL_BU | TREATMENT_ | TOTAL_AREA | NET_AREA_ | MAPSHEET | OPENING | FOREST TYP | PRIORITY | BURN_TYPE | BURN_TREA | BURN_CALE | BURN_MON | BURN_ESTI | BURN_ACTU | BURNFUND | BURN_CONTR | BURN_CON | BURN_LOCAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Sun Lakes | Sun Lakes TU B1 | 317.3 | 41.8 | 82J011 | 145 | OF | 110 | Burn | Piles | 2010 | 4 | 5000.00 | | JOP | Trench 2 | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Sun Lakes | Sun Lakes TU B2 | 317.3 | 46.2 | 82J011 | 145 | OF | 110 | Burn | Piles | 2010 | 4 | 5000.00 | | JOP | Trench 2 | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Sun Lakes | Sun Lakes TU B4 | 317.3 | 37.7 | 82J011 | 145 | OF | 110 | Burn | Piles | 2010 | 4 | 5000.00 | | JOP | Trench 2 | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | 4 Amigos | 4 Amigos A | 795.5 | 30.4 | 82J021 | 36 | OF | 110 | Burn | Piles | 2010 | 4 | 15000.00 | | JOP | Trench 2 | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | 4 Amigos | 4 Amigos B2 | 795.5 | 6.6 | 82J021 | 36 | OF | 110 | Burn | Piles | 2010 | 4 | 15000.00 | | JOP | Trench 2 | | |
| Toby Benches | Enid2 | Enid2 | 55.0 | 55.0 | 82K060 | 1301 | OF | | Burn | Piles | 2010 | 3.00 | 4000.00 | | JOP | Trench 3 | | |
| Toby Benches | Enid3 | Enid3 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 82K060 | 1302 | OF | | Burn | Piles | 2010 | 4.00 | 10000 | | JOP | Trench 3 | | |
| Windermere-Sinclair | Juniper Heights | Juniper Heights | 110.0 | 110.0 | 82K060 | 163 | OR | 98 | Burn | Piles | 2010 | 4 | 10000.00 | | JOP | Trench 3 | | |
| Premier Ridge | Wasa Cr North | Wasa Cr North | 158.0 | 158.0 | 82G082 | | OR | 101 | Burn | Broadcast | 2010 | 4 | 10000.00 | | CBFWCP | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Thunder Phil | Thunder Phil A5 | 709.4 | 43.0 | 82J011 | 144 | OF | 110 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2010 | 9.00 | 15000.00 | | MOFR ERP | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Thunder Phil | Thunder Phil B9 | 709.4 | 90.0 | 82J011 | 144 | OF | 110 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2010 | 9.00 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Findlay Basin | Stinky | Stinky TU 2 | 550.0 | 251.4 | 82J011 | 143 | OF | 110 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2010 | 9.00 | 20000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| | | | | 1539.1 | | | | | | | | | 244000.0 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cranbrook Fort Steele | Highway Overpass | Overpass | 336.4 | 24.0 | 82G052 | 40 | OF | | Burn | Broadcast | 2011 | 4 | | 0 | Interface | | | |
| Cranbrook Fort Steele | Highway Overpass | Overpass-tu3 | 336.4 | 40.0 | 82G052 | 40 | OR | | Burn | Broadcast | 2011 | 4 | 35000.00 | 0 | Interface | | | |
| Cranbrook Fort Steele | Highway Overpass | Overpass-tu8 | 336.4 | 76.0 | 82G052 | 40 | OF | | Burn | Broadcast | 2011 | 4 | 0 | 0 | Interface | | | |
| Cranbrook Fort Steele | Highway Overpass | Overpass-tu8 | 336.4 | 76.0 | 82G052 | 40 | OF | | Burn | Broadcast | 2011 | 4 | 0 | 0 | Interface | | | |
| Cranbrook Fort Steele | Highway Overpass | Overpass-tu10 | 336.4 | 24.0 | 82G052 | 40 | OR | | Burn | Broadcast | 2011 | 4 | 0 | 0 | Interface | | | |
| Cranbrook Fort Steele | Highway Overpass | Overpass-tu6 | 336.4 | 113.0 | 82G052 | 40 | OF | | Burn | Broadcast | 2011 | 4 | 0 | 0 | Interface | | | |
| Cranbrook Fort Steele | Highway Overpass | Overpass-tu9 | 336.4 | 6.0 | 82G052 | 40 | OR | | Burn | Broadcast | 2011 | 4 | 0 | 0 | Interface | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Old Airport | Old Airport A81787-CP1 | 707.6 | 35.2 | 82G072 | 91 | OR | 106 | Burn | Broadcast | 2011 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Old Airport | Old Airport NSR TU 1 | 707.6 | 16.2 | 82G072 | 91 | OR | 106 | Burn | Broadcast | 2011 | 4 | 35000.00 | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Old Airport | Old Airport Select Log TU | 707.6 | 68.2 | 82G072 | 91 | OR | 106 | Burn | Broadcast | 2011 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Old Airport | Old Airport OGMA TU 3 | 707.6 | 63.0 | 82G072 | 91 | OF | 106 | Burn | Broadcast | 2011 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Old Airport | Old OGMA A19042-CP14 | 707.6 | 345.2 | 82G072 | 91 | OF | 106 | Burn | Broadcast | 2011 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Old Airport | Old Airport A81787-CP1 | 707.6 | 66.1 | 82G072 | 91 | OR | 106 | Burn | Broadcast | 2011 | 4 | | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Old Airport | Old Airport TU7 | 707.6 | 33.8 | 82G072 | 91 | OF | 106 | Burn | Broadcast | 2011 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Thunder Bob | Thunder Bob A | 523.2 | 220.9 | 82J011 | 142 | OR | 110 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2011 | 4 | 35000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Thunder Bob | Thunder Bob B | 523.2 | 135.6 | 82J011 | 142 | OF | 110 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2011 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Thunder Bob | Thunder Bob C | 523.2 | 22.2 | 82J011 | 142 | OR | 110 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2011 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| | | | | 1365.4 | | | | | | | | | 105000.0 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North-South | North Cherry TU 1A | 319.5 | 17.0 | 82G061 | 16 | OR | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2012 | 4 | 35000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North-South | North Cherry TU 1B | 319.5 | 49.2 | 82G061 | 16 | OR | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2012 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North-South | North Cherry TU 1C | 319.5 | 9.5 | 82G061 | 16 | OR | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2012 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North-South | North Cherry TU 2A | 319.5 | 27.5 | 82G061 | 16 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2012 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North-South | North Cherry TU 2B | 319.5 | 9.8 | 82G061 | 16 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2012 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North-South | North Cherry TU 2C | 319.5 | 4.7 | 82G061 | 16 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2012 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North-South | North Cherry TU 2D | 319.5 | 2.6 | 82G061 | 16 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2012 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North-South | North Cherry TU 2E | 319.5 | 1.7 | 82G061 | 16 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2012 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North-South | North Cherry TU 2G | 319.5 | 1.2 | 82G061 | 16 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2012 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North-South | North Cherry TU 3A | 319.5 | 90.6 | 82G061 | 16 | OR | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2012 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North-South | North Cherry TU 4A | 319.5 | 19.9 | 82G061 | 16 | OR | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2012 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North-South | North Cherry TU 5A | 319.5 | 25.2 | 82G061 | 16 | OR | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2012 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North-South | North Cherry TU 5B | 319.5 | 16.1 | 82G061 | 16 | OR | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2012 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North South | Cherry-South TU 1D | 219.9 | 19.9 | 82G061 | 57 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2012 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North South | Cherry-South TU 1E | 219.9 | 9.9 | 82G061 | 57 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2012 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North South | Cherry-South TU 2F | 219.9 | 22.4 | 82G061 | 57 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2012 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North South | Cherry-South TU 3B | 219.9 | 40.6 | 82G061 | 57 | OR | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2012 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North South | Cherry-South TU 4B | 219.9 | 62.0 | 82G061 | 57 | OR | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2012 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Cherry North South | Cherry-South TU 4C | 219.9 | 7.7 | 82G061 | 57 | OR | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2012 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Lewis - Wolf Creek | Lazy Lake North | Lazy Lake North | | 62.0 | 82G082 | | OR | 62 | Burn | Broadcast | 2012 | 4 | 6000.00 | | CBFWCP | | | |
| East Columbia Lake | Columbia Lake East A6 | Columbia Lake East A6 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 82J021 | | OR | 116 | Burn | Piles | 2012 | 10.00 | 4500.00 | | HCTF | | | |
| Premier Ridge | Wasa Mtn South (block 16a) | Wasa Mtn South (block | 141.0 | 141.0 | 82G082 | | OR | 101 | Burn | Broadcast | 2012 | 4 | 10000.00 | | CBFWCP | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | 4 Amigos | 4 Amigos E | 795.5 | 11.0 | 82J021 | 36 | OR | 110 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2012 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | 4 Amigos | 4 Amigos F | 795.5 | 64.1 | 82J021 | 36 | OF | 110 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2012 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | 4 Amigos | 4 AmigosNCC2 | 795.5 | 58.8 | 82J021 | 36 | OF | 110 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2012 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |

| RESTORATIO | LOGICAL_BU | TREATMENT_ | TOTAL_AREA | NET_AREA_ | MAPSHEET | OPENING | FOREST TYP | PRIORITY | BURN_TYPE | BURN_TREA | BURN_CALE | BURN_MON | BURN_ESTI | BURN_ACTU | BURNFUND | BURN_CONTR | BURN_CON | BURN_LOCAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 824.4 | | | | | | | | | 105500.0 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Indian North-South | Indian North-South | 424.0 | 424.0 | 82G061 | 60 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2013 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Rouse | Rouse TU 1 | 365.3 | 33.6 | 82G062 | 41 | OR | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2013 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Rouse | Rouse TU 2 | 365.3 | 73.1 | 82G062 | 41 | OR | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2013 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Rouse | Rouse TU 3 | 365.3 | 58.2 | 82G062 | 41 | OR | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2013 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Rouse | Rouse TU 4 | 365.3 | 18.7 | 82G062 | 41 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2013 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Rouse | Rouse TU 5 | 365.3 | 46.5 | 82G062 | 41 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2013 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Rouse | Rouse TU 6 | 365.3 | 13.3 | 82G062 | 41 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2013 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Rouse | Rouse TU 7 | 365.3 | 13.6 | 82G062 | 41 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2013 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Rouse | Rouse TU 8 | 365.3 | 58.0 | 82G062 | 41 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2013 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Rouse | Rouse TU 9 | 365.3 | 38.9 | 82G062 | 41 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2013 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Lost Spring | Lost Spring A | 500.0 | 70.0 | 82G072 | 93 (86) | OR | 106 | Burn | Broadcast | 2013 | 4 | | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Lost Spring | Lost Spring G | 500.0 | 2.0 | 82G072 | 93 | OR | 106 | Burn | Broadcast | 2013 | 4 | | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Lost Spring | Lost Spring B | 500.0 | 30.0 | 82G072 | 93 (87) | OF | 106 | Burn | Broadcast | 2013 | 4 | | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Lost Spring | Lost Spring D | 500.0 | 10.0 | 82G072 | 93 (68) | OF | 106 | Burn | Broadcast | 2013 | 4 | | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Lost Spring | Lost Spring E | 500.0 | 20.0 | 82G072 | 93 (56) | OR | 106 | Burn | Broadcast | 2013 | 4 | | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Lost Spring | Lost Spring F | 500.0 | 323.0 | 82G072 | 93 | OF | 106 | Burn | Broadcast | 2013 | 4 | | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Lost Spring | Lost Spring C | 500.0 | 45.0 | 82G072 | 93 (85,65) | OF | 106 | Burn | Broadcast | 2013 | 4 | 30000.00 | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Premier Ridge | Quartz | CTP 165 | 161.0 | 161.0 | 82G082 | New | OR | 101 | Burn | Broadcast | 2013 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Newgate | Butt's | Butts | 95.0 | 95.0 | 82G004 | | OF | 114 | Burn | Piles | 2013 | 11.00 | 6000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Toby Benches | Eileen | Eileen | 200.0 | 200.0 | 82K060 | | 0 | | Burn | Piles | 2013 | 11 | 7000.00 | | Interface | | | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | Brewery Ridge | Brewery Ridge SU1-TU1 | 188.6 | 188.6 | 82G063 | 64 | OR | 68 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2013 | 4 | 25000.00 | | CBFWCP | | | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Spur Flat | Spur TU 1 | 556.3 | 262.2 | 82J021 | 34 | OR | 110 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2013 | 9 | 15000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | Grant Neville | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Spur Flat | Spur TU 2 | 556.3 | 15.7 | 82J021 | 34 | OF | 110 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2013 | 9 | | | MOFR-ERP | | Grant Neville | |
| Dutch-Findlay Creek | Spur Hill | Spur TU 3 | 556.3 | 203.1 | 82J021 | 34 | OF | 110 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2013 | 9 | 15000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | Grant Neville | |
| Waldo | Burnt Bottom | Slashed | 362.0 | 158.0 | 82G015 | 104 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2013 | 4 | 15000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Waldo | Burnt Bottom | Not slashed | 362.0 | 204.0 | 82G015 | 104 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2013 | 4 | 15000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| | | | | 2765.5 | | | | | | | | | 203000.0 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | China North South | China North South | 491.0 | 491.0 | 82G062 | | OF | 106 | Burn | Broadcast | 2014 | 4 | 25000.00 | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Newgate | Demar-Sharptail | Demar | 307.0 | 307.0 | 82G004 | 34 | OF | 114 | Burn | Broadcast | 2014 | 4 | 20000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Sheep Creek North | Kootenay Ranch Addendum | Dragons Tail | 703.0 | 400.0 | 82J002 | | OF | 93 | Burn | Broadcast | 2014 | 4 | 15000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Sheep Creek North | Kootenay Ranch East | Kootenay Ranch East | 120.0 | 120.0 | 82J002 | | OF | 93 | Burn | Broadcast | 2014 | 4 | 15000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Gold Creek Canyon | CP157-330 | 146.0 | 146.0 | 82G014 | 65 | OF | 95 | Burn | Broadcast | 2014 | 4 | 35000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Gold Creek Canyon | CP157-328 | 217.0 | 217.0 | 82G014 | 63 | OF | 95 | Burn | Broadcast | 2014 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Gold Creek Canyon | CP157-332 | 208.0 | 208.0 | 82G014 | 67 | OR | 95 | Burn | Broadcast | 2014 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | Estella Connector | Estella Connector | | 29.0 | 82G082 | | OR | 68 | Burn | Broadcast | 2014 | 4 | 20000.00 | | CBFWCP | | | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | Estella Northwest | Estella Northwest | | 73.0 | 82G082 | | OR | 68 | Burn | Broadcast | 2014 | 4 | 20000.00 | | CBFWCP | | | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | Estella North (blk 10a) | Estella North (blk 10a) | | 40.0 | 82G082 | | OR | 68 | Burn | Broadcast | 2014 | 4 | 0 | | CBFWCP | | | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | Estella South (blk 10b) | Estella South (blk 10b) | | 82.0 | 82G082 | | OR | 68 | Burn | Broadcast | 2014 | 4 | 0 | | CBFWCP | | | |
| Sheep Creek North | Johnson Lake | Johnson Lake | 250.0 | 250.0 | 82G092 | 87 | OF | 93 | Burn | Broadcast | 2014 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Newgate | Demar-Sharptail | Sharptail | 407.0 | 407.0 | 82G004 | 34 | OF | 114 | Burn | Broadcast | 2014 | 4 | 20000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Pickering Hills | Bronze Lake | Bronze Lake | 687.0 | 687.0 | 82G043 | 1 | OR | 88 | Burn | Broadcast | 2014 | 4 | 25000 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| | | | | 3457.0 | | | | | | | | | 195000.0 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grasmere | Dump | TSLA45087 | 900.0 | 99.0 | 82G015 | 1300 | OR | NR | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | 35000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Grasmere | Dump | TSLA81351 | 900.0 | 143.0 | 82G015 | 1301 | OR | NR | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Grasmere | Dump | DumpA | 900.0 | 0.0 | 82G015 | | OF | NR | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Waldo | Cemetery Hills | Cemetary Hills TU B | 582.0 | 127.7 | 82G024 | 131 | OR | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | 35000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Waldo | Cemetery Hills | Cemetary Hills TU G | 582.0 | 8.9 | 82G024 | 131 | OR | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Waldo | Cemetery Hills | Cemetary Hills TU2 | 582.0 | 26.6 | 82G024 | 131 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Waldo | Cemetery Hills | Cemetary Hills TU E | 582.0 | 102.9 | 82G024 | 131 | OR | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Waldo | Cemetery Hills | Cemetary Hills TU F | 582.0 | 26.0 | 82G024 | 131 | OR | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Waldo | Cemetery Hills | Cemetary Hills TU A CP2 | 582.0 | 67.4 | 82G024 | 131 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Waldo | Cemetery Hills | Cemetary Hills TU C | 582.0 | 168.2 | 82G024 | 131 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Waldo | Cemetery Hills | Cemetary Hills TU D1 | 582.0 | 24.4 | 82G024 | 131 | MF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |

| RESTORATIO | LOGICAL_BU | TREATMENT_ | TOTAL_AREA | NET_AREA_ | MAPSHEET | OPENING | FOREST TYP | PRIORITY | BURN_TYPE | BURN_TREA | BURN_CALE | BURN_MON | BURN_ESTI | BURN_ACTU | BURNFUND | BURN_CONTR | BURN_CON | BURN_LOCAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Waldo | Cemetery Hills | Cemetary Hills U D2 | 582.0 | 30.4 | 82G024 | 131 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot South | Hot Foot TU 3 | 658.3 | 69.6 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | 92 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | 35000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot South | Hot Foot TU 4 | 658.3 | 15.9 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | 92 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot South | Hot Foot TU 5 | 658.3 | 28.4 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | 92 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot South | Hot Foot TU 6 | 658.3 | 7.2 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | 92 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot South | Hot Foot TU 7 | 658.3 | 14.0 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | 92 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot North | Hot Foot TU 8 | 658.3 | 33.9 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | 92 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot North | Hot Foot TU 9 | 658.3 | 16.0 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | 92 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot South | Hot Foot TU 10b | 658.3 | 8.0 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | 92 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot South | Hot Foot TU 10c | 658.3 | 25.0 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | 92 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot South | Hot Foot TU 10d | 658.3 | 8.4 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | 92 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot South | Hot Foot TU 12 | 658.3 | 18.1 | 82G053 | 5 | OR | 92 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot South | Hot Foot TU 13 | 658.3 | 18.1 | 82G053 | 5 | OR | 92 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Torrent | Middle-Sheep | Saskatoon Heaven | 234.0 | 234.0 | 82J001 | 109 | OR | | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | 15000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Cranbrook Fort Steele | Highway Overpass | Overpass-tu7 | 336.4 | 80.0 | 82G052 | 40 | OF | | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | 25000.00 | 0 | Interface | | | |
| Cranbrook Fort Steele | Highway Overpass | Overpass-tu4 | 336.4 | 18.0 | 82G052 | 40 | OF | | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | 0 | 0 | Interface | | | |
| Cranbrook Fort Steele | Highway Overpass | Overpass-tu4 | 336.4 | 18.0 | 82G052 | 40 | OF | | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | 0 | 0 | Interface | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | Pulpmill | Pulpmill | 393.0 | 285.2 | 82G082 | 153 | OR | 119 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Findlay Basin | Stinky | Fir Mtn | 150.0 | 150.0 | 82J011 | | OF | 110 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Premier Ridge | 3 Sons Property | 3 Sons Property | 200.0 | 200.0 | 82G082 | | OF | 101 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | 2000.00 | | HCTF | | | |
| Newgate | Earl Ranch | Earl Ranch | 250.0 | 250.0 | 82G004 | | OF | 114 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | 20000.00 | | HCTF | | | |
| PowerPlant | Bull River Property | Bull River Property | 100.0 | 100.0 | 82G053 | | OF | 116 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | 20000.00 | | HCTF | | | |
| Waldo North Pilot | Munson Slough | Munson Slough | 294.0 | 57.0 | 82G034 | 178 | OR | 103 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2015 | 9 | 10000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Waldo | East Kootenay-Eimer | East Kootenay-Eimer | -2.0 | 556.0 | 82G034 | 178 | OF | 103 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2015 | 9 | 15000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | South Lakit Ridge | South Lakit Ridge SU1 | 132.0 | 132.0 | 82G063 | 64 | OR | 68 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2015 | 9 | 20000.00 | | CBFWCP | | | |
| Premier Ridge | Alkali North | Alkali South | 366.0 | 366.0 | 82G082 | 156 | OF | 101 | Burn | Broadcast | 2015 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| | | | | 3533.3 | | | | | | | | | 307000.0 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rampart - Mayook | City | City | 188.0 | 188.0 | 82G052 | 9 | OR | 86 | Burn | Broadcast | 2016 | 4 | 15000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | Glenn Gib | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Buck West | Dilts-Cut | 350.0 | 350.0 | 82G024 | | OF | 95 | Burn | Broadcast | 2016 | 4 | 2000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Waldo | Elko-Airport East | Elko-Airport East TU 1 | 215.4 | 162.8 | 82G025 | 20 | OR | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2016 | 4 | 15000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Waldo | Elko-Airport East | Elko-Airport East TU 2 | 215.4 | 52.8 | 82G025 | 20 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2016 | 4 | 15000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Waldo | Elko-Airport west | Elko-Airport west | 250.0 | 250.0 | 82G025 | | OR | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2016 | 4 | 15000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | Foster | Foster | 308.0 | 308.0 | 82G082 | 141 | OF | 119 | Burn | Broadcast | 2016 | 4.00 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Frances Creek | Height of Land | Height Of Land TU B | 250.0 | 170.0 | | | OF | | Burn | Broadcast | 2016 | 4 | 20000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Frances Creek | Height of Land | Height Of Land TU A | 250.0 | 80.0 | | | OF | | Burn | Broadcast | 2016 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Waldo | Labb | A | 73.0 | 73.0 | 82G024 | | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2016 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Lewis - Wolf Creek | Leask | North Wasa Interfac | 379.0 | 379.0 | 82G072 | 157 | OR | 62 | Burn | Broadcast | 2016 | 4 | 20000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Luke- Meadow | Luke Meadow TU A | 613.0 | 11.4 | 82G061 | 55 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2016 | 4 | 25000.00 | | Interface | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Luke- Meadow | Luke Meadow TUB | 613.0 | 54.5 | 82G061 | 55 | OR | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2016 | 4 | | | Interface | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Luke- Meadow | Luke Meadow TU C | 613.0 | 34.0 | 82G061 | 55 | OR | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2016 | 4 | | | Interface | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Luke- Meadow | Luke Meadow TU D | 613.0 | 67.1 | 82G061 | 55 | OR | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2016 | 4 | | | Interface | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Luke- Meadow | Luke Meadow TU G | 613.0 | 72.1 | 82G061 | 55 | OR | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2016 | 4 | | | Interface | | | |
| Newgate | Newgate-Alkali | Newgate-Alkali | 153.0 | 153.0 | 82G004 | | OR | 114 | Burn | Broadcast | 2016 | 4 | 15000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Steer | Steer | 252.0 | 252.0 | 82G062 | 59 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2016 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Pickering Hills | Pickering Pasture | Pickering Pasture | 577.0 | 577.0 | 82G043 | | OR | 88 | Burn | Broadcast | 2016 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Deep Springs | Deep Springs TU 12 | 563.2 | 40.5 | 82G061 | 20 | OF | 108 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2016 | 9 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Deep Springs | Deep Springs TU 3 | 563.2 | 55.0 | 82G061 | 20 | OF | 108 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2016 | 9 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Deep Springs | Deep Springs TU 5 | 563.2 | 45.7 | 82G061 | 20 | OF | 108 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2016 | 9 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Deep Springs | Deep Springs TU 6 | 563.2 | 1.1 | 82G061 | 20 | OF | 108 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2016 | 9 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Deep Springs | Deep Springs TU 7 | 563.2 | 1.3 | 82G061 | 20 | OF | 108 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2016 | 9 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Deep Springs | Deep Springs TU 10 | 563.2 | 7.3 | 82G061 | 20 | OF | 108 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2016 | 9 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Deep Springs | Deep Springs TU 11 | 563.2 | 175.9 | 82G061 | 20 | OF | 108 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2016 | 9 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Deep Springs | Deep Springs TU 2 | 563.2 | 15.9 | 82G061 | 20 | OF | 108 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2016 | 9 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Deep Springs | Deep Springs TU 8 | 563.2 | 74.0 | 82G061 | 20 | OR | 108 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2016 | 9 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Deep Springs | Deep Springs TU 9 | 563.2 | 1.5 | 82G061 | 20 | OR | 108 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2016 | 9 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | Echo | Echo | 707.0 | 657.0 | 82G082 | 147 | OF | 119 | Burn | Broadcast | 2016 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Wakefield-Gorrie | Gorrie | 224.0 | 224.0 | 82G004 | 147 | OR | 95 | Burn | Broadcast | 2016 | 4 | 15000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | |

| RESTORATIO | LOGICAL_BU | TREATMENT_ | TOTAL_AREA | NET_AREA_ | MAPSHEET | OPENING | FOREST TYP | PRIORITY | BURN_TYPE | BURN_TREA | BURN_CALE | BURN_MON | BURN_ESTI | BURN_ACTU | BURNFUND | BURN_CONTR | BURN_CON | BURN_LOCAL | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gold - Plumbob | Wakefield-Gorrie | Wakefield | 274.0 | 274.0 | 82G004 | 147 | OR | 95 | Burn | Broadcast | 2016 | 4 | 2000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| | | | | 4807.9 | | | | | | | | | 309000.0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Waldo | Baynes Lake | Baynes Lake A | 93.5 | 93.5 | 82G015 | 1 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2017 | 4 | 15000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Baynes Lake North | Baynes Lake North | 269.0 | 269.0 | 82G025 | 70 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2017 | 4 | 10000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Premier Ridge | Alkali North | CTP126 | 150.0 | 150.0 | 82G082 | 156 | 0 | 101 | Burn | Broadcast | 2017 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Dry Lake-Artesian | Dry Lake TU 1 | 274.0 | 57.3 | 82G061 | 58 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2017 | 4 | 15000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Dry Lake-Artesian | Dry Lake TU 2 | 274.0 | 83.7 | 82G061 | 58 | OR | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2017 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Dry Lake-Artesian | Dry Lake TU 3 | 274.0 | 42.1 | 82G061 | 58 | OR | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2017 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Dry Lake-Artesian | Dry Lake TU 5 | 274.0 | 20.5 | 82G061 | 58 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2017 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Dry Lake-Artesian | Dry Lake TU 6 | 274.0 | 5.5 | 82G061 | 58 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2017 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Fusee West | Fusee West Alpha TU 1 | 339.0 | 30.0 | 82G024 | 75 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2017 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Fusee West | Fusee West Alpha TU 2 | 339.0 | 40.0 | 82G024 | 75 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2017 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Fusee West | Fusee West Alpha TU 3 | 339.0 | 60.0 | 82G024 | 75 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2017 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Fusee West | Fusee West Beta | 323.7 | 323.7 | 82G024 | 71 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2017 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Garbutt Norbury | Garbutts | 390.0 | 390.0 | 82G053 | 66 | OF | 92 | Burn | Broadcast | 2017 | 4 | 35000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Garbutt Norbury | Norbury | 536.0 | 536.0 | 82G053 | | OF | 92 | Burn | Broadcast | 2017 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | Reed A | Reed A | 316.0 | 316.0 | 82G081 | 146 | OR | 119 | Burn | Broadcast | 2017 | 4 | 10000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | Reed B | Reed B | 303.0 | 303.0 | 82G082 | 154 | OF | 119 | Burn | Broadcast | 2017 | 4 | 10000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | Reed C | Reed C | 250.0 | 250.0 | 82G082 | 155 | OR | 119 | Burn | Broadcast | 2017 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Sheep Mtn | Sheep Mtn AB | 327.0 | 327.0 | 82G025 | | OR | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2017 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Sheep Mtn | Sheep Mtn CD | 400.0 | 400.0 | 82G025 | | OR | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2017 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Artesian-Dry | Artesian TU 1 | 387.9 | 5.4 | 82G061 | 63 | OF | 108 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2017 | 9 | 20000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Artesian-Dry | Artesian TU 2 | 387.9 | 18.9 | 82G061 | 63 | OF | 108 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2017 | 9 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Artesian-Dry | Artesian TU 3 | 387.9 | 51.4 | 82G061 | 63 | OF | 108 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2017 | 9 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Artesian-Dry | Artesian TU 4 | 387.9 | 21.4 | 82G061 | 63 | OR | 108 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2017 | 9 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Artesian-Dry | Artesian TU 5 | 387.9 | 290.8 | 82G061 | 63 | OR | 108 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2017 | 9 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo North Pilot | Colvali-Waldo | Colvali-Waldo | 376.0 | 376.0 | 82G034 | 178 | OF | 103 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2017 | 9 | 20000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| | | | | 4461.2 | | | | | | | | | 260000.0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Alkaline purvis | Peckham Ikaline | 491.0 | 412.0 | 82G053 | 20 | OF | 92 | Burn | Broadcast | 2018 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Pickering Hills | Jurik Pasture | Jurik Pasture | 620.0 | 620.0 | 82G053 | | OR | 88 | Burn | Broadcast | 2018 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Lewis - Wolf Creek | C. T. P. | CTP1A | 745.0 | 745.0 | 82G072 | 88 | OF | 62 | Burn | Broadcast | 2018 | 4 | 35000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Lewis - Wolf Creek | C. T. P. | CTP1B | 745.0 | 745.0 | 82G072 | 88 | OF | 62 | Burn | Broadcast | 2018 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Lewis - Wolf Creek | C. T. P. | CTP1C | 745.0 | 745.0 | 82G072 | 88 | OR | 62 | Burn | Broadcast | 2018 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Sheep Camp | Sheep Camp TU1 | 353.3 | 38.0 | 82G061 | 64 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2018 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Sheep Camp | Sheep Camp TU2 | 353.3 | 25.2 | 82G061 | 64 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2018 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Sheep Camp | Sheep Camp TU3 | 353.3 | 66.1 | 82G061 | 64 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2018 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Sheep Camp | Sheep Camp TU4 | 353.3 | 44.1 | 82G061 | 64 | OR | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2018 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Sheep Camp | Sheep Camp TU6 | 353.3 | 64.1 | 82G061 | 64 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2018 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Sheep Camp | Sheep Camp TU7 | 353.3 | 95.8 | 82G061 | 64 | OR | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2018 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Sheep Camp | Sheep Camp TU8 | 353.3 | 34.1 | 82G061 | 64 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2018 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| St. Mary's Prairie | Sheep Camp | Sheep Camp TU9 | 353.3 | 17.2 | 82G061 | 64 | OF | 108 | Burn | Broadcast | 2018 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Sheep Creek North | Dry Gulch | Dry Gulch | 834.0 | 834.0 | 82G092 | 101 | OF | | Burn | Broadcast | 2018 | 4 | 35000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Duck A | Duck A | 506.1 | 180.0 | 82G025 | 76 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2018 | 4 | 35000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Duck B | Duck B | 506.0 | 180.0 | 82G025 | 76 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2018 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Duck C | Duck C | 506.0 | 138.0 | 82G025 | 76 | OR | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2018 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Fusee North | Fusee North A | 360.0 | 140.0 | 82G025 | 74 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2018 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Fusee North | Fusee North B | 360.0 | 30.0 | 82G025 | 74 | OR | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2018 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Fusee North | Fusee North C | 360.0 | 10.0 | 82G025 | 74 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2018 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo | Fusee North | Fusee North D | 360.0 | 10.0 | 82G025 | 74 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2018 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Grasmere | A.I. | A.I. | 827.0 | 827.0 | 82G005 | 1 | OF | NR | Burn | Broadcast | 2018 | 4 | 30000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Newgate | Burlotts | Burlotts | 539.0 | 539.0 | 82G004 | 38 | OF | 114 | Burn | Broadcast | 2018 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Alkaline purvis | Purvis | 238.0 | 238.0 | 82G053 | | OF | 92 | Burn | Broadcast | 2018 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| | | | | 6777.6 | | | | | | | | | 285000.0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Waldo North Pilot | North, South Lake | North, South Lake | 250.0 | 250.0 | 82G034 | 178 | OF | 103 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2019 | 9 | 15000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Waldo North Pilot | Pipeline | Pipeline | 358.0 | 358.0 | 82G034 | 178 | OR | 103 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2019 | 9 | 15000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |

| RESTORATIO | LOGICAL_BU | TREATMENT_ | TOTAL_AREA | NET_AREA_ | MAPSHEET | OPENING | FOREST TYP | PRIORITY | BURN_TYPE | BURN_TREA | BURN_CALE | BURN_MON | BURN_ESTI | BURN_ACTU | BURNFUND | BURN_CONTR | BURN_CON | BURN_LOCAL | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 608.0 | | | | | | | | | 30000.0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Bare Mtn | Bare Mtn - Block 1TU1 | 231.1 | 32.2 | 82G014 | 36 | OF | 95 | Burn | Broadcast | 2020 | 9.00 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Bare Mtn | Bare Mtn - Block 1 TU 2 | 231.1 | 7.8 | 82G014 | 36 | OF | 95 | Burn | Broadcast | 2020 | 9.00 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Bare Mtn | Bare Mtn - Block 1 TU3 | 231.1 | 11.5 | 82G014 | 36 | OF | 95 | Burn | Broadcast | 2020 | 9.00 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Bare Mtn | Bare Mtn - Block 1TU 4 | 231.1 | 14.7 | 82G014 | 36 | OR | 95 | Burn | Broadcast | 2020 | 9.00 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Bare Mtn | Bare Mtn - Block 1 Tu5 | 231.1 | 31.5 | 82G014 | 36 | OF | 95 | Burn | Broadcast | 2020 | 9.00 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Bare Mtn | Bare Mtn - Block 2 TU1 | 231.1 | 75.0 | 82G014 | 48 | OF | 95 | Burn | Broadcast | 2020 | 9.00 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Bare Mtn | Bare Mtn - Block 2 TU2 | 231.1 | 32.7 | 82G014 | 48 | OR | 95 | Burn | Broadcast | 2020 | 9.00 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Bare Mtn | Bare Mtn - Block 2 TU 3 | 231.1 | 6.4 | 82G014 | 48 | OR | 95 | Burn | Broadcast | 2020 | 9.00 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Bare Mtn | Bare Mtn - Block 2 Tu4 | 231.1 | 11.7 | 82G014 | 48 | OF | 95 | Burn | Broadcast | 2020 | 9.00 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Bare Mtn | Bare Mtn - Block 3 TU1 | 255.9 | 135.8 | 82G014 | 48 | OF | 95 | Burn | Broadcast | 2020 | 9.00 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Bare Mtn | Bare Mtn - Block 5 TU 1 | 255.9 | 58.6 | 82G014 | 48 | OF | 95 | Burn | Broadcast | 2020 | 9.00 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Gold - Plumbob | Bare Mtn | Bare Mtn - Block 5 TU2 | 255.9 | 15.5 | 82G014 | 48 | OR | 95 | Burn | Broadcast | 2020 | 9.00 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Pickering Hills | Eimer Pasture | Eimer Pasture | 120.0 | 120.0 | 82G053 | | OF | 88 | Burn | Broadcast | 2020 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Beacon West | NRFL | 762.2 | 239.0 | 82G071 | 121 | OR | 106 | Burn | Broadcast | 2020 | 4 | | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Beacon West | Non-NRFL | 762.6 | 523.0 | 82G071 | 121 | OF | 106 | Burn | Broadcast | 2020 | 4 | 25000.00 | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | Dune B | Dune B | 212.0 | 212.0 | 82G082 | 149 | OR | 119 | Burn | Broadcast | 2020 | 4 | 12500.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Ta Ta-Skookumchuck | Dune C | Dune C | 260.0 | 260.0 | 82G082 | 150 | OF | 119 | Burn | Broadcast | 2020 | 4 | 12500.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot North | Hot Foot TU 1a | 658.3 | 45.0 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | 92 | Burn | Broadcast | 2020 | 4 | 35000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot North | Hot Foot TU 1b | 658.3 | 25.2 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | 92 | Burn | Broadcast | 2020 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot North | Hot Foot TU 2 | 658.3 | 33.4 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | 92 | Burn | Broadcast | 2020 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot North | Hot Foot TU 10a | 658.3 | 10.0 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | 92 | Burn | Broadcast | 2020 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Peckham's Lake | Hotfoot North | Hot Foot TU 11 | 658.3 | 120.5 | 82G053 | 5 | OF | 92 | Burn | Broadcast | 2020 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Grasmere | Flagstone | A | 1285.0 | 250.0 | 82G015 | | OR | NR | Burn | Broadcast | 2020 | 4 | 20000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Grasmere | Flagstone | A | 1285.0 | 150.0 | 82G015 | | OR | NR | Burn | Broadcast | 2020 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Grasmere | Bagley's | A | 1030.0 | 1030.0 | 82G005 | 17 | OF | NR | Burn | Broadcast | 2020 | 4 | 0 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| | | | | 3451.5 | | | | | | | | | 180000.0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lewis - Wolf Creek | Big Burn | Big Burn1A | 422.0 | 0.0 | 82G082 | 144 | OR | 62 | Burn | Broadcast | 2021 | 4 | 20000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Lewis - Wolf Creek | Big Burn | Big Burn1B | 422.0 | 0.0 | 82G082 | 144 | OR | 62 | Burn | Broadcast | 2021 | 4 | 20000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Lewis - Wolf Creek | Big Burn | Big Burn1C | 422.0 | 0.0 | 82G082 | 144 | OR | 62 | Burn | Broadcast | 2021 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Lewis - Wolf Creek | Big Burn | Big Burn1D | 422.0 | 0.0 | 82G082 | 144 | OF | 62 | Burn | Broadcast | 2021 | 4 | | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Highway North | Highway North | 704.0 | 704.0 | 82G071 | 123 | OF | 106 | Burn | Broadcast | 2021 | 4 | 25000.00 | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Highway South | Highway South | 176.0 | 176.0 | 82G071 | 122 | OF | 106 | Burn | Broadcast | 2021 | 4 | | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Cherry - Ta Ta | Rock Lake | Rock Lake | 616.0 | 616.0 | 82G072 | 93 (85-6 | OF | 106 | Burn | Broadcast | 2021 | 4 | | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Rampart - Mayook | Whiskey Creek North | Whiskey Creek North | 173.0 | 173.0 | 82G053 | 65 | OF | 86 | Burn | Broadcast | 2021 | 4 | 20000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Newgate | Rocks | Rocks | 688.0 | 688.0 | 82G004 | 37 | OF | 114 | Burn | Broadcast | 2021 | 4 | 20000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| | | | | 2357.0 | | | | | | | | | 105000.0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sheep Creek North | Canal | Canal Non NRFL | 522.0 | 337.0 | 82G092 | | OF | 93 | Burn | Broadcast | 2022 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Colvalli North | Frenchman's pasture | Frenchman's pasture | 250.0 | 250.0 | 82G034 | | OF | 78 | Burn | Broadcast | 2023 | 4 | 25000.00 | 19972.29 | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | Fort Steele fire | Fort Steele fire | 250.0 | 250.0 | 82G072 | | OR | 68 | Burn | Broadcast | 2023 | 4 | 25000.00 | 19972.29 | MOFR-ERP | | Mike Daigle | | |
| Sheep Creek North | Springbrook North | Springbrook North | 526.0 | 210.0 | 82G092 | 82 | OF | 93 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2023 | 9 | 15000.00 | 2500 | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| Sheep Creek North | Springbrook South | Springbrook South | 526.0 | 316.0 | 82G092 | 82 | OF | 93 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2023 | 9 | 15000.00 | 0 | MOFR-ERP | | | Y | |
| | | | | 1026.0 | | | | | | | | | 80000.0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Waldo | Fusee East | Fusee East TU 1 | 356.1 | 141.6 | 82G025 | 68 | OF | 103 | Burn | Broadcast | 2028 | 4 | 30000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | Mark LaFo | | |
| Premier Ridge | Premier Sheep | TU 6 | 205.0 | 20.0 | 82G082 | 111 | OR | 101 | Burn | Broadcast | 2028 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | Y | |
| | | | | 161.6 | | | | | | | | | 55000.0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wildhorse Lewis | Bummer's Flat | Bummer's Flat | 170.0 | 170.0 | 82G072 | | OR | 68 | Burn | Broadcast | 2030 | 4 | 25000.00 | | HCTF | | | | |
| Newgate | Ash Fire | Ash | 279.0 | 279.0 | 82G004 | 17 | OR | 114 | Burn main | Broadcast | 2030 | 4 | 25000.00 | | MOFR-ERP | | | | |
| | | | | 449.0 | | | | | | | | | 50000.0 | | | | | | |

Appendix II Summary of Referral Comments Received
Actual copies of comments are on file 22000-20/ERP 2010

**Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of Five Year Plan**
**Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan**
**May 2010**

<table>
<tr><th>Document Number</th><th>Person</th><th>Organisation</th><th>Date</th><th>Pasture (Range Unit)</th><th>Comment</th><th>Result</th></tr>
<tr><td>General-burns-01</td><td>Shawna Larade</td><td>Ministry Forests and Range-Agrologist</td><td>April 22, 2009</td><td>All<br>Premier Ridge/ Gina<br>Waldo/ Clear Lake<br>Dutch Findlay/ Stinky</td><td>List of co-operation from Range licensees:<ul><li>No grazing year before and year after Spring</li><li>Fall graze spring year of burn</li><li>Fall graze in fall year after burn</li><li>List of three burns for 2010</li></ul></td><td>Agree with comments, ER program needs confirmation of acceptance by licensee</td></tr>
<tr><td>General-burns-02</td><td>Leanne Colombo</td><td>Ministry Forests and Range-Agrologist</td><td>April 22, 2009</td><td>All</td><td>Agreed but pointed out need to confirm burns will be undertaken. Wild ungulate increases are again a confounding fator</td><td>No Action</td></tr>
<tr><td>General-Seed-03</td><td>Leanne Colombo</td><td>Ministry Forests and Range-Agrologist</td><td>April 6, 2009</td><td>All<br>Grasmere/ Dump</td><td>Proposing new Seed Mix for use on this pasture, slender Wheat grass replacing chewing fescue<br>Here is the blend discussed,<br>Gleeson Logging Blend<table><tr><th>Species</th><th>% by Weight</th><th>% by Species</th></tr><tr><td>Slender Wheatgrass</td><td>35%</td><td>21%</td></tr><tr><td>Perennial Ryegrass</td><td>25%</td><td>23%</td></tr><tr><td>Annual Ryegrass</td><td>20%</td><td>16%</td></tr><tr><td>Rocky mountain Fescue</td><td>10%</td><td>19%</td></tr><tr><td>Hard Fescue</td><td>10%</td><td>21%</td></tr></table></td><td>Original seed mix from winter 2009 still being used; as of May 2010 no consensus n a new seed Mix</td></tr>
<tr><td>General 04</td><td>Brian Morrison</td><td>Ministry Forests and Range-Webmaster</td><td>October 30, 2009</td><td>All</td><td>Confirmation that Draft 5 year plan text and maps were on district website</td><td>Note</td></tr>
<tr><td>General Open House 05</td><td>Ken Streloff</td><td>Tembec, Planner</td><td>October 19, 2010</td><td>All</td><td>Confirmation of schedule of 3 Open Houses; Cranbrook November 24, Jaffray November 25th and Invermere November 27th</td><td>Open Houses held, attended by Dean Draper and Liz Goyette for ER program</td></tr>
<tr><td>General Open House 06</td><td>Dean Draper</td><td>Ministry of Forests and Range, Stewardship FOS</td><td>December 11th, 2009</td><td>All</td><td>List of attendees from 3 Open Houses</td><td>No Action</td></tr>
<tr><td>General Open House 07</td><td>Dean Draper</td><td>Ministry of Forests and Range, Stewardship FOS</td><td>December 11th, 2009</td><td>All</td><td>Copy of handout distributed at Open Houses</td><td>No Action</td></tr>
<tr><td>General Open House 08</td><td>Dean Draper</td><td>Ministry of Forests and Range, Stewardship FOS</td><td>December 11th, 2009</td><td>All</td><td>Comment from un-named individual who wanted TNT and NCC conservation properties coulred separate from each other</td><td>Unable to comply, the maps are o cluttered to accept more data before they become unreadable</td></tr>
<tr><td>General Open House 09</td><td>Norman Hendricks</td><td>President, Lake Windemere Rod and Gun Club</td><td>December 10th 2009</td><td>All</td><td>Concern that not enough prescribed burns were occurring; wanted a more aggressive approach, more MOFR trained staff, use retired staff. They want to help where they can</td><td>Met with Lake Windemere Rod and Gun club On March 18th, 2010, explained that staff shortages and short window issues, beyond control of ER program</td></tr>
<tr><td>General Open House 09</td><td>Daryl Carter</td><td></td><td>November 2009</td><td>All</td><td>Well thought out process needs consistent funding</td><td>Agree, No Action</td></tr>
</table>

**Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of Five Year Plan**
**Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan**
**May 2010**

| Document Number | Person | Organisation | Date | Pasture (Range Unit) | Comment | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| General-11 | Bill DuBois | Representative, Southern Guide Outfitters | April 9, 2009 | All | Wanted a list of JOP projects in north half of district | List forwarded |
| General-RDEK-12 | Rob Gay | East Kootenay Regional District director Area C | April 12, 2009 | All | Several issues raised, effort to set up a meeting with Rob | No Action |
| General-RDEK-13 | Rob Gay | East Kootenay Regional District director Area C | May 1st, 2009 | All | Some comments<br>1. I am very pleased that the Ministry of Forests is taking the lead on planning and operations on crown land. In the past my view is that the responsibility and accountability was not clear to the public.<br>2. The number of players has certainly increased over time and I expect that the complexities of layout, field operations, worker safety, and burning are far greater. My concern is with the amount of burning for month 4. I personally feel we must expand this time frame to meet the targets. I would support controlled burning in May and late august in most years.<br>3. As mentioned I would like to see some greater evaluation of the cost effectiveness of machine clear and burning.<br>4. Thinning with low impact fire treatment is of great concern. I know of many areas (i.e. lower bull river) that were spaced and treated with a low intensity fire which has resulted in a regime hostile to cattle, ungulates and humans. I do note in some areas of your plan a need for secondary treatment which is good.<br>I would like to see some fire guards/restoration activities of our of rural communities incorporated into plan amendments | 1) The Ministry of Forests and Range is taking the lead on coordinating the ER program, with over 20 partners and increased complexity of planning this is very necessary.<br><br>2) I agree we should expand the time frames for our burn windows as we are now down to 2 to 4 days each spring for burn windows. We may have to extend into March as soon as we can get snow free; May is now greening up so soon it is difficult to get a burn away past the third week of April. We will try to get a burn in September of this year. This will double our burn season, but we do need a wet September for it to work.<br><br>3) Machine clearing is expensive and we do use it sparingly. Our preference is for a logging pass with a follow up slashing treatment; a cheaper cleaner option that removes trees in a well controlled fashion. When we use machine clearing it is for dense, larger diameter stands where piling could damage the soil and where forest licensees indicate that they cannot economically harvest the stand.<br><br>4) I am not sure of the examples that you speak of but we do remove a lot more stems now than previously. The low intensity burns are designed to clear off logging and slashing debris, kill in growing seedling under 1 metre tall but still have only a light impact on the grass and shrubs. The impact is assessed post burn using data cards and databases derived from experiments, monitoring data and methodologies used by the United States Forest Service. It does take up to 10 years for a pine grass understory to convert o a high value Bluebunch wheatgrass and fescue grassland.<br><br>5) I will send a separate note on co-coordinating our operations with fire proofing communities. Peter Hisch, Dan Murphy and I have some ideas |
| General-RDEK- | Rob Gay | East Kootenay | May 26th, 2009 | All | More discussion on using Union of BC Minicipality funding for interface and ER | Details were to be discussed by RDEK directors, no word |

**Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of Five Year Plan**
**Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan**
**May 2010**

| Document Number | Person | Organisation | Date | Pasture (Range Unit) | Comment | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | Peter Hisch | Regional District director Area C<br><br>Ministry of Forests and Range Fuel Management Technician | | | projects.<br><br>To be funded ER projects have to be within 2 kilometre PSTA polygon and be shown to reduce hazard.<br>ER projects can be used to leverage UBCM funding.<br>Projects from previous years can be amalgamated<br>Local government must apply for money, a local contractor or partner can facilitate. | received on progress |
| General-RDEK-15 | Carol Lind | Emergency Preparedness Co-ordinator RDEK | March 23, 2010 | All | Proposal meeting;<br>ER program offered to facilitate the application for Union of BC Municipalty funding to carry out Interface/ ER projects in RDELK area<br>ER program offered to put up all previous work for leverage (4.5 million dollars).<br>RDEK does not have capacity this year, fully booked in their delivery plan<br>RDEK concerned over liabilities of wood left over or of poor performance by contractors<br>RDEK will hire a contractor to review priorities in 2010 | ACTION POINT: Barb Bridger will discuss the Community Forest project with Wayne Price the Cranbrook Fire Chief to see if Cranbrook will sponsor a fuel treatment in the area. The directors at RDEK feel that this strip of forest is a Cranbrook issue not a small community issue<br><br>ACTION POINT After the meeting Cranbrook Fire zone made a decision to carry out a few small demonstration fuel management projects in the Cranbrook Community Forest<br><br>ACTION POINT Aware of the points raised by Carol during this meeting the Trench Society will forward a proposal to the RDEK board to treat the Fort Steele Fire. The directors may or may not back a proposal to treat the area, and using the process outlined this may or may not affect the delivery plan of the existing RDEK budget |
| General-BCTS-16 | Gerry Grady | Practices Forester, BCTS, Cranbrook | January 29th, 2010 | All | BCTS wants to set up commercial sawlog and pulp sales in ER areas and are targeting 40% Py stands<br><br>several possible ER projects may be covered by First Nation treaty land tenures or CPR timber reservations. | ER program has handed off three projects in City pasture, Newgate-Sharptail and Hotfoot pasture for BCTS development<br>ER program has revised ER prescription flow sheet to include a clearance for these issues |
| General-17 | Kevin Podrasky | Tech Cominco | March 31st | Grasmere, Waldo, Pickering Hills, Burton, Colvalli North, Rosen Lake/ All | Request for information on ER projects east of Lake Koocanusa | Data from 5 year plan and next two years proposed projects forwarded |
| Map Meeting 18 | Randy Harris | Team Leader Ecosystem Restoration, Ministry of Forests and Range | October 26th 2009 | All | Agenda for Interagency map meeting to be held in February 2010<br>1) Dutch Findlay, progress to date, future actions, where do we develop new WT's, who does the surveys, prescribed burn schedule, develop a budget to submit for LEWO (Lewis' Woodpecker) funding. This is a first meeting, we will have a later meeting to detail out the WT subjects with Ted Antifeau at MOE, this is a heavy to tree removal topics.<br>2) Premier ridge, integrate Premier park and 3 Sons projects to Gina, Quartz, | Meeting held February 3rd, 2010 |

**Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of Five Year Plan**
**Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan**
**May 2010**

| Document Number | Person | Organisation | Date | Pasture (Range Unit) | Comment | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Alkali and Burnt car proposals. The Wasa Mtn burns by Fish Wildlife Compensation Program. Funding for Vacant Crown Land projects<br>3) Newgate, rework of Burlott's, harvest of Sharptail and Demers by BCTS, Rework Rocks pasture? Integrate with Earl's Ranch? Manage for LEWO and FLOW<br>4) Gold Plumbob, harvest of Strauss road by Tembec, follow up slashing of Hansen, East West, Wakefield Gorrie; time area and schedule to create grass so as to avoid fuel and forage shortages. Includes small TNT property. Manage for LEWO (need budget submission)<br>5) Sheep Mtn, harvest time frame by Tembec of North aspect, slashing if summit. Integrate projects with TNT property (Cutt's Ranch) and old Ingham farm (MOE Map notation reserve) Again area for LEWO and bighorn sheep management.<br>6) Pickering Hills where to start? Should we change the Managed Forest, Open Forest Areas<br>7) Kootenay Ranch; schedule of treatments, Tembec has logged east crown land portion to Open Forest standards. NCC and crown land.<br>8) St Mary's Prairie NCC, TLC, MOE conservation properties we have Lewis' Woodpecker and Wiliamson's Sapsucker issues. Wjere are we with tree removal and WT production; another goos area to follow up with Ted.<br>9) Kikkoumun Park and Labb pasture, treat as one unit<br>10) Harvest of CP 293 Cemetery, Fusee North and South, tie into slashing and fuel management projects | |
| Map Meeting 18 | Randy Harris<br>Dean Draper<br>Ken Wahlberger<br>Rae Haddow<br>Gary Dolynchuk<br>Peter Hisch<br>Peter Von Wittgenstein<br><br>Sue Crowley<br>Mike Gall<br><br>Rob Neil<br><br>Gerry Grady<br><br>Larry Ingham<br><br>Hillary Page | Ministry of Forests and Range, Cranbrook<br><br>Ministry of Environment<br><br>The Nature Trust<br><br>BCTS<br><br>FWCP<br><br>The Nature | February 3rd 2010 | All | 1. Dutch Findlay, Develop Snag subcommittee, add MOE to MOU.<br><br>2. Premier ridge, BCTS to check interest in Lazy Lake and premier Lake no interest in Alkali and Wolf pastures<br><br>3. Newgate, BCTs interested in Sharptail next -3 years, joint field trip to Rocks Mike, Randy Larry<br><br>4. Gold Plumbob, No appetite for pulp at this time, can't log for hog<br><br>5. Sheep Mtn, Sue Crowley Rob Neil to come up with joint management of conservation properties<br><br>6. Pickering Hills Field trip to Pickering Hills, Hatchery Ridge and Power Plat areas needed<br><br>7. Kootenay Ranch; schedule of treatments, Tembec has logged east crown land portion to Open Forest standards. NCC and crown land. | 1 Committee met March field trip in May 12,<br>1 MOU to be signed June 010<br><br>2 Wolf and Alkali south developed as Forestry License o Cut blocks.<br><br>3 Randy to arrange field trip<br><br>6 Pickering Hills field trip to be arranged, Gay T, Galloway, MOE, Range and ER to attend<br><br>6 Field trip to Hatchery Ridge held in February<br><br>7 Randy to complete prescriptions on crown land portions |

**Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of Five Year Plan**
**Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan**
**May 2010**

| Document Number | Person | Organisation | Date | Pasture (Range Unit) | Comment | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Jeff Allen<br><br>Steve Temple<br>Brian Dureski<br><br>Randy Byford | Conservancy of Canada<br><br>Tembec<br><br>Galloway | | | 8. St Mary's Prairie Randy to review NRFL SP, MOE developing Wycliffe prescription TNT operates on TLC land, move JOP to pine Butte<br><br>9. Kikkoumun Park and Labb pasture, treat as one unit<br>10. Priority to complete Cemetery CP 293<br><br>11. Lakit Ridge Tembec to review possible CP extension into ER project | |
| Second Intake 20 | Randy Harris | Team Leader Ecosystem Restoration, Ministry of Forests and Range | February24th, 2010 | East Columbia<br>Findlay Basin/ Saddle<br>Watson/ Home<br>Rampart Mayook<br>Cranbrook Fort Steele<br>Grasmere/ Bagley, A.I., Adolph, Loon Lake<br>Alkali Lakes<br>Wycliffe<br>Premier ridge | Rationale to add 17 new blocks to project in mid stream<br>• Chris Paget/ Greg Dubois carrying out Community Wildlife Plan for Canal Flats and Invermere, affects projects in East Columbia, Findlay Basin and Watson Range Units<br>• Nupqu Development Corporations using FIA funds to develop prescriptions for Rampart Mayook (Butte, Isadore, Created Wheat pastures) Cranbrook fort Steele (North and west of Highway 95) and t Mary's Steer pasture<br>• Tobacco Plans and was rumoured to have interest in work in crown land in Grasmere A.I, Bagley's, Adolph and loon Lake<br>• Interface blocks in Alkali Range Unit<br>• Two MOE conservation properties in Wycliffe and Premier Ridge | In terms of referral the process now is:<br>1. Send consultation letters to all First Nation groups<br>2. Send letters to water licensees affected by entire plan (a group overlooked in November)<br>3. Discuss new proposals by telephone with affected ranch licensees<br>4. Forest Licensees were apprised of changes on February 3rd during a map meting along with MOE, Nature Trust and Nature Conservancy of Canada<br>5. No further letters will be sent to Guide outfitters and trappers as we have not had any comments from them in two years; it is a low risk to not include them in these front country issues. |
| Second Intake 21 | Brian Morrison | Ministry Forests and Range-Webmaster | February 19, 2010 | All | Confirmation that Draft 5 year plan maps showing second intake were on district website | No Action |
| Second Intake 22 | Brian Morrison | Ministry Forests and Range-Webmaster | March 8, 2010 | All | Confirmation that Draft 5 year plan text and maps showing second intake were on district website | No Action |
| Second Intake 23 | Randy Harris | Team Leader Ecosystem Restoration, Ministry of Forests and Range | February 24th, 2010 | East Columbia<br>Findlay Basin/ Saddle<br>Watson/ Home<br>Rampart Mayook<br>Cranbrook Fort Steele<br>Grasmere/ Bagley, A.I., Adolph, Loon Lake<br>Alkali Lakes<br>Wycliffe<br>Premier ridge | Notes from telephone conversations with ranchers regarding second intake | Documentation is clarified in this document below |
| Telephone call | Jordy Thibeault | Range Licensee | March 5th, 2010 | Alkali Lake | Discussed possible new Interface funded blocks near Cranbrook reservoir and Mt Baker Road. JT likes removal of trees but a lot of ATV traffic on sites already and swimming in spillway. Mr Thibeault owns land controlling access to east side | Plan for ORV control when developing prescription, discuss further with Range Licensee |

**Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of Five Year Plan**
**Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan**
**May 2010**

| Document Number | Person | Organisation | Date | Pasture (Range Unit) | Comment | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Joseph Creek near reservoir | |
| Telephone call | Joe Masi | Range Licensee | March 5th 2010 | Cranbrook Fort Steele- MM20, Lake, Gravel pit pastures | Nupqu development corporation is interested in developing interface-Ecosystem restoration prescriptions in this area; fuel management near ST Mary's band housing-Mission Hill-Standard Hill. Range staff advise these pastures have little forage, only three weeks use. With difficulty of excessive Off Road vehicle use and open gates, the pastures are now vacant, no Range licensee use. | Range licensee not contacted about this unit; ER would have no effect on his operations. Plan for Off Road Vehicle pressure in prescription.<br><br>Note that BCTS is interested in pulpwood logging gravel pit pasture near Highway 93/95 |
| Personal Communication | Brain McKersie | Range Licensee | February 20th, 2010 | Findlay Basin- Saddle pasture | During annual general meeting of Kootenay Livestock Association discussed possible UBCM funded project to thin Saddle pasture. Licensee is happy with work to date will co-operate with thinning this pasture. | Add Saddle pasture actions to Dutch Findlay Memorandum of Understanding. Keep Range licensee informed of operations. Chris Paget and Greg DuBois take lead on prescription. |
| Telephone call | Cam MacDonald | Range Licensee | March 9th, 2010 | Grasmere- Loon Lake, Adolph, Bagley pastures | Informed range licensee that Tobacco plains Band may be applying for funding to thin and treat these areas. Intent is interface areas and manage for Spaulding's Campion. Cam wants to discuss this with Rae Haddow, waterholes are losing water (possible ingrowth) east central Adolph's pasture has good commercial volume as does Flagstone; some slashing possible in Loon lake. He has invitation to prescriber for a field trip. | Manage three pastures for interface and Spaulding's Campion (check against map provided by Michael Keefer)<br><br>Strongly suggest prescriber arrange field trip with range licensee, lot of past ER work on site; emphasis should be on tree removal not just burning. |
| Telephone call | Glenn Proudfoot | Range Licensee | March 5th, 2010 | Grasmer- A.I. | Telephone call Informed range licensee that Tobacco plains Band may be applying for funding to thin and treat these areas. Intent is interface areas and manage for Spaulding's Campion. Licensee strongly in favour of burn feels tree removal was incomplete in South east corner | Strongly suggest prescriber arrange field trip with range licensee, lot of past ER work on site; emphasis should be on tree removal not just burning. |
| Telephone call | Jesse Mallard | Range Licensee | March 8th, 2010 | Peckham's Lake- Wallcam | Telephone call. Informed range licensee that Nupqu development may be applying for funding to thin and treat these areas. Intent is interface fuel reduction. Licensee has no issue with logging, Wallcam is crown land, locks on fence are to keep traffic off private land to south; no lease involved. | Get Range licensee to open gates to facilitate operations |
| Telephone call | Ben Hawke | Range Licensee | March 8th, 2010 | Peckham's Lake/ Kiek, Big Hill | Telephone call. Informed range licensee that Nupqu development may be applying for funding to thin and treat these areas. Intent is interface fuel reduction and bighorn sheep. Works area with Lonnie Jones | Licensee has no issue with ER treatment in these sites; has recommended Kiek for slashing projects in previous years |
| Telephone call | Ben Hawke | Range Licensee | March 8th, 2010 | Power Plant/ little Bull, Big Bull | Telephone call. Informed range licensee that Nupqu development may be applying for funding to thin and treat these areas. Intent is interface fuel reduction. Work this range unit with Herb and Val Bower. There is merchantable timber on site prefers it be used. | Tree removal to be considered for sale at conclusion of operations. Develop in conjunction with The Nature Trust and MOE properties. |
| Personal Communication | Don Lancaster | Range Licensee | March 5th, 2010 | Rampart-Mayook/ Isadore, Butte, Whiskey South and Crested Wheat Grass Seeding pastures | Range staff have talked to group of range licensees here; Anna Fontana, Don Lancaster, Colin Morison, Rod Savage. All are in favour of Ecosystem Restoration. Nupqu development may be applying for funding to thin and treat these areas. Intent is interface fuel reduction and Ecosystem Restoration. | Proceed with Ecosystem restoration. |
| Telephone call | Alfred Joseph | Manager J-2 Ranch | March 9th, 2010 | Watson/ Home, Mud pastures | Telephone call. Informed range licensee that Chris Paget and Greg Dubois may be applying for funding to thin and treat these areas. Intent is interface fuel reduction and Ecosystem Restoration. Licensee not active in Home pasture due to high level of ingrowth. Two units in Home and Mud pasture are proposed as | Exclude agriculture lease from Ecosystem Restoration projects. |

**Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of Five Year Plan**
**Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan**
**May 2010**

| Document Number | Person | Organisation | Date | Pasture (Range Unit) | Comment | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | agriculture leases; 8 year process but they due to be cleared, stumped and irrigated to get cattle use off Kootenay River flood plain | |
| Water Licensee 24 | Sandra Loewen | Water Licensee | March 8th, 2010 | Wildhorse/ Lower Brewery<br><br>St Mary's Prairie/ North Cherry | Just a file note dealing with a Ecosystem Restoration Five year referral letter that I sent out on February 22nd 2010 asking for input from water licensees. Luke Creek POD 1380 was mapped as being in Wildhorse drainage close to two projects in Brewery Creek and owned by Sandra Loewen. Sandra called back that is her water license but her POD and home is 4 kilometres north of Kimberley upstream of the St Mary' Prairie projects. She was curious about Ecosystem Restoration so we discussed in general terms the St Mary's Meadowbrook fuel management projects. No input or requests and her actual address is 8512 Highway 95A Kimberley, BC V1A 3M1 | No Action needed, Point of Diversion mis-mapped, ER operations should not affect water |
| Water Licensee 25 | Gary Nimiken | Water Licensee | March 3rd, 2010 | Waldo/ Cutts | I returned a telephone call from Gary Nimiken (250-359-7815) Gary runs a restaurant in South Slocan in the West Kootenays and has a water license on Purdy spring. The water license database listed this spring as being in Cutts Road pasture in Waldo Range unit; his spring is actually in the West Kootenays. I apologised as there is an obvious error in the water licensee database. So far we have received 7 of 48 letters; returned with no forwarding address. | No Action needed, Point of Diversion mis-mapped, ER operations should not affect water |
| Water Licensee 26 | Nancy Corrin | water licensee for Ross creek | March 10, 2010 | Peckham's Range Unit / Norbury pasture | I received a telephone call from Nancy Corrin the water licensee for Ross creek which the Water Branch mapping showed as being in Peckham's Range Unit near Norbury pasture. Nancy does have the licensee for Ross Creek but her Ross creek is near her home Queens town's Bay town site on the south arm of Kootenay Lake. | No Action needed, Point of Diversion mis-mapped, ER operations should not affect water |
| Water Licensee 27 | Brenda Buerge | water licensee for Samual Spring | March 18, 2010 | Wild horse Lewis/ Lakit Mtn | Thank you for your letter of February 22, 2010.<br>My family has been the holder of the water license on Samual Springs for a considerable number of years. In your letter you state that "project areas that occur upstream of your water licenses point of diversion on Samual Spring" are involved in this project. Please tell me what you are talking about as the spring comes out of the base of a mountain and I am unaware of where is originates from or where the point of diversion would be. This spring is on private property owned by School District No. 10 (Arrow Lakes), who I work for and, upon talking to the Maint/Facility Supervisor, seem to be unaware of what the letter talks about.<br><br>So, I just need clarification on where the activity will be taking place in relation to the private property and the spring. Maybe if you sent a map of the area concerning this activity then I would be able to understand and I will also discuss with the private property owners on all sides, including the school district.<br><br>Once again, thank you for the letter. | I called Brenda back, her spring is near Nakusp in the West Kootenay. Obviously no issue with work in the Wildhorse Lewis Creek area |
| Water Licensee 28 | Heather Smith | Water Licensee Heather Creek | March 31st 2010 | Wildhorse Lewis/ CTP | Concern that ER operations would affect her West Kootenay water supply near Kaslo | No Action needed, Point of Diversion mis-mapped, ER operations should not affect water |
| BC Hydro 29 | Darcy Johnson | Transmission Maintenance | April 23, 2009 | All | Field notes from April 2str field trip covering Eager hill, St Mary's Prairie, Dutch Findlay areas for operations near Power lines | Note became basis of a Public Utility Standard Operating Procedure used for all operations near highways, pipelines |

**Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of Five Year Plan**
**Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan**
**May 2010**

| Document Number | Person | Organisation | Date | Pasture (Range Unit) | Comment | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Technologist BC Hydro | | | | and powerlines |
| BC Hydro 30 | Darcy Johnson | Transmission Maintenance Technologist BC Hydro | May 1st, 2009 | All | Feed back on previous email of Field notes from April 2str field trip covering Eager hill, St Mary's Prairie, Dutch Findlay areas for operations near Power lines | This feedback was incorporated into a Public Utility Standard Operating Procedure used for all operations near highways, pipelines and powerlines |
| BC Hydro 31 | Darcy Johnson | Transmission Maintenance Technologist BC Hydro | May 5th, 2009 | All | Further feed back with notes from Ian Kozicky and Bill Lafflin on previous email of Field notes from April 2str field trip covering Eager hill, St Mary's Prairie, Dutch Findlay areas for operations near Power lines | This feedback was incorporated into a Public Utility Standard Operating Procedure used for all operations near highways, pipelines and powerlines |
| BC Hydro 32 | Darcy Johnson | Transmission Maintenance Technologist BC Hydro | June 8th, 2009 | All | Final submission of final standard operating procedures for ER projects near BC Hydro powerlines | No further comments made |
| BC Hydro 33 | Bill Lafflin | Vegetation Maintenance Co-ordinator, East Kootenay BC Hydro | March 29, 2010 | All | New contact information for Bill Lafflin, Ian Kozicky, Darcy Johnson | Contact data sheets updated |
| Trans Canada Pipelines 34 | Darren Mitchell | Trans Canada Pipelines | May 1st 2009 | All | Referred draft of Standard operating Procedure to be used in all ER projects near all Public Utilises | Minor changes incorporated into final SOP |
| CTP 36 | Tom Quirk | CT Permitee | December 5th 2009 | Toby Benches | Concerns raised over ER program slashing down potential Christmas Trees<br>Request made to not slash Lake Eileen block until a meeting is held<br>Four other Christmas Tree Permits are to be held in abeyance until situation is resolved.<br>General concern that Ministry of Forests and Range is not doing all it could to strengthen Christmas Tree industry | Lake Eileen block put on hold for JOP slashing until meeting held<br>Meeting held February 18, 2010 |
| CTP 37 | Grant Neville | Tenures Forester, Ministry of Forests and Range | February 11th, 2010 | All | Set up Christmas Tree Permitee meeting for February 18, 2010 | Meeting held |
| CTP 38 | Randy Harris<br>Grant Neville<br>Paul White<br><br>Tom Quirk<br>Charlie Willis<br>Mark Serediuk | Ministry of Forests and Range, Rocky Mtn District<br>Christmas Tree Permitees/ Christmas tree Association | February 18th, 2010 | All | Christmas Tree Association is concerned industry is in decline, retired permits not being reoffered, less area in production, needle cast in south, expensive logging<br>Permitees would like to work northern area, better trees or Montane spruce areas for Balsam, better trees<br>Permitees would like letters of support fro MOFR when applying for thinning crews like JOP<br>Well managed CPS could do some work as fuel management around communities<br>Christmas Tree association would like to join ER Operations Team<br>10 hectares of Lake Eilieen block, south of access road to be ribboned off by Tom Quirk, JOP crew will slash rest of block | Grant Neville to do response letter for broad concerns by Christmas Tree Association<br>Randy to forward request to join ER operations committee at next Committee meeting<br>North half of Lake Eileen block slashed by JOP in March |

**Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of Five Year Plan**
**Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan**
**May 2010**

| Document Number | Person | Organisation | Date | Pasture (Range Unit) | Comment | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CTP 39 | Randy Harris | Team Leader Ecosystem Restoration, MOFR | February 18th, 2010 | All | Forwarding a note after a discussion with tom Quirk when Tom insisted that ER prescriptions identify, evaluate and collect data n possible Christmas Tree values on an ER project. | ER Team Leader holds that this is extra work; if good values are found information will be forwarded to Tenures staff for a cash sale. |
| CTP 40 | Tom Quirk | CT Permitee | February 24th 2010 | All | Mr Quirk reiterated points in previous letter pointing that his desire is that ER program gather more data on Christmas trees inside ER projects. | ER Team Leader holds that this is extra work; if good values are found information will be forwarded to Tenures staff for a cash sale. |
| CTP 41 | Tom Quirk | CT Permitee | February 24, 2010 | All | Thank you note for meeting of February 18th | No Action necessary |
| CTP 42 | Mark Serediuk | Director Kootenay Christmas Tree Association | March 30th 2010 | All | Kootenay Christmas Tree Association would like to sit on Ecosystem Restoration Operations Committee. Randy Harris sent response | Discussed at April 22nd 2010 ER Operations Team Meeting. Kootenay Christmas Tree Association will be invited to sit on the September 2010 meeting |
| FN- Red Canyon 43 | Brent Lucas | Aboriginal Liaison MOFR, Cranbrook | April 28, 2009 | Grasmere/ Dalton Range | Tobacco Plains Band interested in turning Red canyon area east of Highway 95 into a Range Opportunity using ER operations. | Needs buy in from BCTS, site overall looks to be NDT3, needs ER Steering Committee approval |
| FN 44 | Brent Lucas | Aboriginal Liaison MOFR, Cranbrook | February 4th, 2010 | Grasmere | Tobacco Plains Band requires letter of support for a JOP application | Work turned out to be all on federal reserve land no letter arrived. |
| FN-Shuswap 45 | Bob Jamieson | Consulting Biologist, Tata Creek | November 10, 2009 | Cherry Tata Frances Creek | Suggestion that Er program work with shuswap Band on projects off reserve | |
| FN Shuswap 46 | Brent Lucas | Aboriginal Liaison MOFR, Cranbrook | February 4th, 2010 | Windemere Fairmont | Shuswap Band requires letter of support for a JOP application | Work turned out to be in stream, work was referred to Ministry of Environment. |
| FN Shuswap 47 | Brent Lucas | Aboriginal Liaison MOFR, Cranbrook | February 8th, 2010 | Windemere Fairmont | Request for more information from Shuswap Band before a letter of support for a JOP application | Work turned out to be in stream, work was referred to Ministry of Environment. |
| FN Shuswap 48 | Sue Crowley | Ministry of Environment, Invermere | March 16, 2010 | Windemere Fairmont/ Stoddart Creek | Direction from MOE given on JOP in stream work proposed for Stoddart Creek | Issue closed for ER program, No further Action taken on letter |
| FN Shuswap 49 | Greg Anderson | Provincial ER Manager, MOFR, Invermere | February 22, 2010 | Windemere Fairmont/ Stoddart Creek | Press clippings from Invermere newspapers discussing the smoke issues arising from pile burning operations on Shuswap reserve | Er program elected to tour Shuswap operations and add helpful suggestions to Band operations; Smoke management is cross jurisdictional. |
| FN Shuswap 50 | Randy Harris | Team Leader Ecosystem Restoration, MOFR | March 15, 2010 | Windemere Fairmont/ Stoddart Creek | Field trip set up to discuss burning operations, possible contracting issues | Field trip held April 28th 2010, information shared |
| FN Shuswap 51 | Brad Munroe | Wildllands Eco-Forestry and Wildfire Prevention | May 4th 2010 | Windemere Fairmont | Details on work completed on reserve in last fiscal given and a interest shown in using the Shuswap crew in off reserve projects | Further meeting to tighten up proposals scheduled for May 27th, 2010 |

**Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of Five Year Plan**
**Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan**
**May 2010**

| Document Number | Person | Organisation | Date | Pasture (Range Unit) | Comment | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FN Shuswap 52 | Rory Hromadnik | Planner, District of Invermere | May 5th 2010 | Windemere Fairmont | District of Invermere has some UBCM funding for planning and would like a JOP crew to carry out works. They wish to partner with ER program, Shuswap band in order to meet goals. | Further meeting to tighten up proposals scheduled for May 27th, 2010, Invermere, Wildlife management Branch nd Steve Schmidt of FNESSE invited |
| FN 53 | Brent Lucas | Aboriginal Liaison MOFR, Cranbrook | February 17th, 2010 | All | Questions of clarity for inclusion in First Nation Consultation letters | Clarity added |
| FN 54 | Brent Lucas | Aboriginal Liaison MOFR, Cranbrook | February 19th, 2010 | All | Request to review draft of consultation letter | Review completed, minor changes made |
| FN 55 | Brent Lucas | Aboriginal Liaison MOFR, Cranbrook | February 23rd, 2010 | All | Consultation letters mailed out to K'tnuaxa and Secwempec nations, St Mary's, Lake Windemere, Tobacco Plains and Shuswap Bands | No further Action needed |
| FN 56 | Brent Lucas | Aboriginal Liaison MOFR, Cranbrook | April 27, 2010 | All | Consultation summary of all discussions with First Nations | Approval recommended |
| Brisco 57 | Bill DuBois | Representative, Southern Guide Outfitters | September 20, 2009 | Sunny Bench Fish Lakes | Request from Bill to carry out thinning on Peter Feldman (Bugaboo Ranch) property near Brisco. Area is overgrown could be treated by JOP crew | Team Leader suggested no, good growing site, not an ER site may be possibility for a bushing treatment with a silviculture JOP crew. Request forwarded to Clay Tindall in 2009 |
| Frances Creek 58 | Frans Feldman | Rancher, Frances Creek, Horsethief Range units | January 19, 2010 | Frances Creek | Frans would like a higher priority put on slashing and treating Height of land pasture, good for cattle good for wildlife. He followed with a telephone call in February to Team Leader Ecosystem Restoration | Area of Height of Land is proposed for treatment but the higher priorities in the Dutch Findlay crowded this small project out. Maybe hop in 2011, but this budget driven. |
| JH 59 | Rose Walker | President, Juniper Heights Residents Association | October 6, 2009 | Juniper Heights | Requested information on the slashing and pile project t be carried out on Juniper Heights | JOP crews were hired and slashed proceeded in mid October, 50% of pile burning completed in March 2020 |
| JH 60 | Randy Harris | Team Leader Ecosystem Restoration, MOFR | November 6, 2008 | Juniper Heights | List of Juniper Heights Residents | Bob Couperus contacted residents prior to burn light up |
| JH 61 | Dean Draper | Stewardship FOS, MOFR Cranbrook | March 9, 2010 | Juniper Heights | Response to public complaint from Seona Helmer resident complained of piles being burnt next to trees, piles still smouldering, grass burnt between piles | Dean explained intent was to damage some trees for wildlife use, if poor venting persists operations stop, crew patrols and limits fire spread. |
| JH 62 | Seona Helmer | Resident Juniper Heights | March 9, 2010 | Juniper Heights | Thank you note for satisfactory explanation, offer made to finance improved road closure sign. | No Action from ER program required, offer to buy new sign forwarded to Ministry of Environment, who apparently did not take her up on the offer |
| JH 63 | Randy Harris | Team Leader Ecosystem Restoration, MOFR | March 23d, 2010 | Juniper Heights | Long file note detailing conversation with Tony Helmer and operations on Juniper Heights. Tony is a Juniper Heights resident and is unhappy that we were burning piles in hat was listed as poor venting conditions. He felt he was not listened to and that MOFR did not follow open burning regulations. Team leader denied allegation but Mr. Hekmer complained to Ministry of Environment. | Lawrence Umsonst CO in Invermere investigated and dismissed charges, he accepted that MOFR followed open burning regulation with spot forecasts and test bun piles. |
| JH 64 | Rose Walker | President, Juniper Heights | April 28, 2010 | Juniper Heights | The Juniper Heights Community Association wants confirmation that ER program will complete the pile burning project. | Confirmation was given, residents love the wok done to date. |

**Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of Five Year Plan**
**Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan**
**May 2010**

| Document Number | Person | Organisation | Date | Pasture (Range Unit) | Comment | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Residents Association | | | | |
| JH 65 | Rose Walker | President, Juniper Heights Residents Association | May 10th, 2010 | Juniper Heights | Juniper Heights community complained of slash build up in Christmas Tree Permit 101 Mitchell Jopp, concern is over Interface fire risk | Complaint forwarded with maps to Compliance and Enforcement Supervisor Lise Lvesque |
| East Columbia 66 | Dave White | President, Canal Flats Wilderness Club | February 18, 2010 | East Columbia/ Sabine Flats | Canal Flats Wilderness Club is looking to do some volunteer slashing and burning on the outskirt of Canal Flats. Good for Bighorn sheep, volunteer fire department will help as this reduces interface risks | Team Leader Ecosystem Restoration asked club to hold off until fall, Chris Paget is producing plan and prescriptions for area. Do it as part of larger picture. Club agreed. Notes to Chris |
| DF MOU 67 | Randy Harris | Team Leader Ecosystem Restoration, MOFR | August 7, 2009 | Dutch Findlay/ Spur, Sun, Dutch, Thunder Findlay Basin/ Saddle, Stinky | Referral of version 4 of Memorandum of Understanding for Dutch Findlay Area | Comments made, further revisions made as a result of February 3rd 2010 map meeting and version 5 put into review February 10th, 2010 |
| DF MOU 68 | Randy Harris | Team Leader Ecosystem Restoration, MOFR | March 9, 2010 | Dutch Findlay/ Spur, Sun, Dutch, Thunder Findlay Basin/ Saddle, Stinky | Upgrading of version 6 of Memorandum of Understanding to version 7, need a legal opinion to address liability and access issues. Concern raised that crown must limit its liability in regards to a partnership with other parties and that crown must have access to non crown land to carry out its obligations. | A legal opinion was sought by MOE and then MOFR Range Branch in Victoria. |
| DF MOU 69 | Karen Tannas | Resource, Environmental and Land Law Group, Legal services Branch Ministry of Attorney General | April 6, 2010 | Dutch Findlay/ Spur, Sun, Dutch, Thunder Findlay Basin/ Saddle, Stinky | Legal opinion was that two documents were required, the memorandum of Understanding 6 should be cleaned of unwieldy liability clauses and forwarded for approval as a stand alone document with no legal action possible as a result of its wording. The access and liability issues should addressed in a more strongly, legally worded document; access is allowed, landowners accept risk of operations and waive the right to sue the crown except in case of negligence. This document is best forged in partnership with Real Estate Operations of RTEB that th | MOU 7 prepared, RTEB to be contacted later for wording of second document. |
| DF MOU 70 | Randy Harris | Team Leader Ecosystem Restoration, MOFR | April 12th, 2010 | Dutch Findlay/ Spur, Sun, Dutch, Thunder Findlay Basin/ Saddle, Stinky | New text of Memorandum of Understanding Version 7 | Sent out for referral |
| DF MOU 71 | Randy Harris | Team Leader Ecosystem Restoration, MOFR | April 28th, 2010 | Dutch Findlay/ Spur, Sun, Dutch, Thunder Findlay Basin/ Saddle, Stinky | Minor comments received for alteration from The Nature Trust of BC | Minor changes made |
| DF WT 72 | Tanya Luszcz | Canadian Wildlife Service, Lewis Woodpecker Recovery Plan | October 13, 2009 | Dutch Findlay/ Spur, Sun, Dutch, Thunder Findlay Basin/ Saddle, Stinky | Tanya wants to include details of Dutch Findlay Lewis' Woodpecker recovery actions in an update report on the status of Lewis' Woodpecker. | Data was truncated but added. |

**Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of Five Year Plan**
**Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan**
**May 2010**

| Document Number | Person | Organisation | Date | Pasture (Range Unit) | Comment | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| DF WT 73 | Ted Antifeau | Rare and Endangered Species Biologist, Ministry of Environment, Nelson | January 27th, 2010 | Dutch Findlay/ Spur, Sun, Dutch, Thunder Findlay Basin/ Saddle, Stinky | Long email chain detailed that ER program will not broadcast burn moist of Lewis Woodpecker area, ThunderPhil, Sun Lakes to be slashed and pile burnt. Ted had gone out over fall 2009 and field located existing Lewis Woodpecker Nest trees, marked in field with yellow posting, tree tags and ribbon and GPSed into data spread sheet. He also photos of all trees | Data will be included in future surveys and stored as a mapping layer in LRDW |
| DF WT 74 | Randy Harris | Team Leader Ecosystem Restoration, MOFR | February 12th, 2010 | Dutch Findlay/ Spur, Sun, Dutch, Thunder Findlay Basin/ Saddle, Stinky | Setting up a meeting and agenda to discuss creating wildlife trees in Dutch Findlay area using examples from previous Wildlife Tree creation studies in Hofert and Pine Butte properties. | Meeting set for February 25th, 2010, meeting held. |
| DF WT 75 | Randy Harris | Team Leader Ecosystem Restoration, MOFR | February 26th, 2010 | Dutch Findlay/ Spur, Sun, Dutch, Thunder Findlay Basin/ Saddle, Stinky | WT creation meeting held, Present: Rob Neil (the Nature Trust of BC (TNT), Cary Tipper (Nature Conservancy of Canada (NCC) Sue Crowley and Ted Antifeau (Ministry of Environment (MOE)) Larry Ingham, Dave Lewis and Irene Manley (Fish Wildlife Compensation Program (FWCP)); Randy Harris (Ministry of Forests and Range (MOFR)) Absent: Hillary Page (NCC)<br>• Use existing survey methodology, surveys completed by NCC, TNT and FWCP staff<br>• 100 trees to be inoculated in Dutch Findlay,<br>• $20,000 cost split between MOE and FWCP.<br>• This template should work well in other Lewis Woodpecker areas in Gold Cree\Strauss Road\ Newgate, Sheep Mtn\Cutts Road, St May's Prairie\Wycliffe and Gina\Premier Ridge Planning areas<br>• Wildlife trees are being cut down repeatedly around district mostly for firewood. Sign posting tree is not enough, most firewood cutters do not have a firewood permit and all agencies lack enough enforcement staff for effective patrols. Tactics to be tried by partners:<br>o Continue posting wildlife trees with metal signs, consider painting stripes on trees<br>o Sign post high value areas with cut no wildlife trees/ snags signs similar to Off road vehicle use signs<br>o Wrap wildlife trees in sheet metal see District Manager MOFR for permission to nail trees as Section 55a of Forest and Range Practices prohibits tree spiking but Section 52.1 of Forest act allows agents of the crown to alter trees with conditions. | ACTION POINT Randy to inform Todd Manning of need for inoculums; Completed.<br>ACTION POINT: TNT, NCC and MOFR to select out 3 or 4 highest potential areas for Lewis Woodpecker nest trees (overlooking wetlands, shrub areas, edge of more open forest, lots of larger residual trees, Py preferred) and map them out.<br>ACTION POINT Maps to be shared with mailing list for review by mid March.<br>ACTION POINT Hold comments until Field review in week of May 7th, 10th; Randy to send out Doodle poll to mailing list to choose field trip day. Include Amy Waterhouse who is being much put upon for mapping.<br>ACTION POINT once areas finalised have a training day in early June to review methodologies with all 3 crews who will do the inventory; ensure consistency. FWCP, TNT and NCC will each inventory one TU with existing in house staff; need to find an aggregate of 100 good trees for inoculation<br>ACTION POINT; FWCP and specifically Amy Waterhouse is to be keeper of the inoculated and high value wildlife tree map layer. Share with Randy Harris, NCC and TNT so data can be referenced and used in all future planning and operations.<br>ACTION POINT: Sue Crowley to forward spreadsheet locations of Wildlife Tree protected in previous broadcast burns to Amy Waterhouse for inclusion in a WT layer. |
| DF WT 76 | Randy Harris | Team Leader Ecosystem Restoration, MOFR | February 26th, 2010 | Dutch Findlay/ Spur, Sun, Dutch, Thunder Findlay Basin/ Saddle, Stinky | 1. Areas to survey fine tuned, new survey to be remapped<br>2. Track Wildlife tree patches, High value wildlife trees/ Nest trees and manufactured trees on three separate databases. Gary Tipper to develop.<br>3. Survey areas split up between 3 partners TNT, NCC, FWCP<br>4. In future Stinky. Thundehill Ranch and Spur Lake Area should be surveyed | ACTION POINT Ted Antifeau to forward All nest tree location GPS data to Randy so Nest Tree layer and detail can be added to maps and location data forwarded to crews.<br>ACTION POINT Randy or assistant to create 1:10,000 scale maps of units to be surveyed with graticules, wildlife Tree |

**Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of Five Year Plan**
**Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan**
**May 2010**

| Document Number | Person | Organisation | Date | Pasture (Range Unit) | Comment | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 5. Suggestion forwarded that Irene Manley look at Sheep Mtn / Cutts Road area for early WT creation for Lewis Woodpecker. ER treatment of trees completed on site; no burn for 5 years; exiting nest trees are nearly rotted through with limited useful life left.<br>Present: Sue Crowley Ted Antifeau, MOE; Dave Lewis FWCP; Gary Tipper NCC, Randy Harris MOFR | patches and existing nest trees shown<br>ACTION POINT Randy to forward jpeg files of 1950 photography so crews can better choose long term trees<br>Attached. |
| DF 77 | Randy Harris | Team Leader Ecosystem Restoration, MOFR | July 20th, 2009 | Dutch Findlay/ Spur, Sun, Dutch, Thunder<br>Findlay Basin/ Saddle, Stinky | Compendium of 4 field trips<br>Field trip 1 June 29th with Grant Neville, Rob Neil (the Nature Trust) and Laura Luxton. We reviewed proposed fire guards for Spur fire and the western fireguards for 4 Amigos and Thunder Phil. TNT is good with all three locations. Details:<br>• The upper Spur fire guard will skirt the lower edges of several rock cliffs just south of Spur Lake.<br>  • JOP crews will slash and pile burn trees between this fire guard and the edge of the cliff top tree line.<br>  • Road deactivation to prevent a loop road is required.<br>  • A new road providing a fire guard and running along a wetland in the south of the Spur fire is also in a good location although it does enter The Nature Trust property.<br>  • The Nature Trust is also good with reopening a road into a landing in the south east corner of the Spur Fire block.<br>• The guards for 4 Amigos and Thunder Phil are in good location and they skirt TNT property.<br>  • 4 Amigos guard (if built) will be recontoured at two major gulley crossings to prevent a loop road.<br>  • Thunder Phil will have its first kilometre recontoured on completion of fire to prevent a loop road.<br>  • TNT approves having several hectares of understory PL on the north boundary of Thunder Phil removed so as to strengthen the fire guard.<br><br>Field trip 2 Randy Harris and Dean Draper met Brad Hill resident living near Thunder Phil burn on July 9th 2009. Brad has been concerned about burning near his property. MOFR related all information from second paragraph and gave him maps of the prescriptions. He was very relieved to hear that no broadcast burning was to occur near his property; home protection was his biggest concern. MOFR left him maps of all three burns (ThunderBob, Sun Lake, Stinky and Thunder Phil) as well as maps of known Lewis' Woodpecker nest locations. An avid nature photographer he claims to know locations of 35 Lewis' Woodpecker nests, he has promised to GPS their locations and forward them to me.<br><br>Meeting number 3 Randy Harris and Grant Neville met Jim Miller (Fairmont fire department) Stuart Moore (Canal Flats Fire department) Dave Rae (Columbia Ridge residents) Wendy Booth (RDEK area F) at Canal Flats Fire Department July 16th 2009. Details:<br>• Related the theory and science of Ecosystem Restoration and plans for Dutch Findlay area as outlined in paragraph 2.<br>• Residents are quite knowledgeable about burns and would appreciate it we hurried t up.<br>• All 4 members would appreciate keeping kept in the loop regarding these fires | Comments incorporated into plans and prescriptions. |

**Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of Five Year Plan**
**Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan**
**May 2010**

| Document Number | Person | Organisation | Date | Pasture (Range Unit) | Comment | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | as they will be the first phone call for most residents when they see the burns.<br>• Dave Rae has the intention of fire proofing 500 acres of his private land just south and east of Spur fire.<br><br>Meeting number 4 Randy Harris met Brian McKersie to bring him into the loop regarding all the changes related in paragraph 2. He had no comments or requests for changes and will agree to removing 25 hectares from the south west corner of the family Christmas Tree Permit in Sun Lake burn. Brian would like to be considered as a contractor for guard development given his interest and familiarity with the roads and land. He also pointed out where the Range Reference area was located in 4 Amigos. July 17th.<br><br>Meeting number 5 met Jeff Allan at MOFR office. We had been trading maps and emails regarding 4 Amigos burn as regarding linking up projects on crown lad and Nature Conservancy of Canada properties. Our comments:<br>• There is very little fuel on 4 Amigos to carry a prescribed burn; with very few trees there no need for burning area east of the powerline.<br>• Three small units on 4 Amigos can be pile burnt and left.<br>• A small 100 hectare prescribed burn unit is possible; it is west of the powerline and south and west of the irrigated meadow and wetland complex in NCC property. It requires understory thinning by JOP.<br>• There is small pockets of PL saw logs in this burn unit; if the burn is delayed until 2014 this gives MOFR and NCC time to set the wood up for sale. If crown land PL stands do not sell it is recommended that we burn them as is; they provide good habitat cover.<br>• Most PL stands have heavy Mtn pine beetle attack if left unthinned the trees will die by them selves; thinning these stands will fire proof the BC Hydro line.<br>• NCC will cover off some powerline edge thinning to be conducted by JOP crew as well as a north aspect logged block just east of the powerline. | |
| DF 77 | Wendy Booth | RDEK Director Area G; Fairmont Windermere | August 14th, 2009 | Dutch Findlay/ Spur, Sun, Dutch, Thunder<br>Findlay Basin/ Saddle, Stinky | Wendy wanted details of the ER schedule for the Dutch Findlay area so she could inform citizens at the August 21st Fairmont residents association meeting | Meeting was held and Wendy informed residents of projects proposed in their air shed. |
| DF Stinky Burn 78 | Shawna Larade | Agrologist, MOFR Range Branch Cranbrook | April 22, 2009 | Findlay Basin/ Stinky | Shawna outlined level of co-operation needed between rancher and prescribed burn program. List of co-operation from Range licensees:<br>• No grazing year before and year after Spring<br>• Fall graze spring year of burn<br>• Fall graze in fall year after burn<br>List of three burns for 2010 | Shawna met with Brian Dureski range licensee and grazing pattern was altered to allow more grass in Stinky pasture to facilitate a fall 2009 burn |
| DF Stinky Burn 78 | Randy Harris | Team Leader Ecosystem Restoration, MOFR | July 25th, 2009 | Findlay Basin/ Stinky | Results of field trip with Shawna Larade and Ken Walburger on Stinky pasture to examine need for prescribed burn. Site is generally overgrazed but a light burn could<br>• Reduce the piled fuels,<br>• Burn off the remaining understory | Range staff agreed with notes. |

**Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of Five Year Plan**
**Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan**
**May 2010**

| Document Number | Person | Organisation | Date | Pasture (Range Unit) | Comment | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | • Burn off the pine grass which should be invaded by the bunch grasses on site. | |
| DF Stinky Burn 78 | Shawna Larade | Agrologist, MOFR Range Branch Cranbrook | April 22, 2009 | Findlay Basin/ Stinky | Results of a final September 7th 2009 field tour with Bob Gray, Stephen Hatalcik, Grant Neville and Dean Draper and a synopsis of back and forth discussions about burning this block; it was proposed and reject three times, this time is final. Site will not be burnt as the grass on site in this September would not produce the tree killing heat needed. Burning off shrubs in an overgrazed site would lead to them vanishing from site. Unit B9 in ThunderPhil LBU is also on list to be burnt, it also is dropped. | Stinky TU 1 and 2 prescribed burn and ThunderPhil B8, B9 prescribed burn are dropped from prescribed burn treatment for foreseeable future. Need significant drop in grazing before project can continue. |
| DF 81 | Bill DuBois | Trench Society Director, Southern Guide Outfitters | September 20th, 2009 | Dutch Findlay/ Spur, Sun, Dutch, Thunder Findlay Basin/ Saddle, Stinky | Concern raised that extensive pile burning is damaging grasslands, preference stated for chipping stems on site or criss crossing them for a range burn. Response was that ER program did not have funding under JOP to hire machinery, only concentrations were to be brunt and we would grass seed fire rings post treatment. | Bill generally accepted comments. |
| DF 4 Amigos/ Spur 82 | Peter Kerchoff | Silviculture Forester Tembec Industries | March 29th, 2010 | Dutch Findlay/ Spur, Sun, Dutch | Peter was endeavouring to avoid planting two salvage blocks logged under FL A18978 CP 199 blocks 916 919 (openings 82J021-1200 and 1201). Blocks logged to Open Forest standards but regeneration did not meet 76 well spaced stems/ ha. Defied logic to plant a site so ER program could later burn the trees off. | Matter referred to Stewardship Forester Lyn Konowalyk who agreed to accept stand as is without a planting of the site |
| DF Fir Mtn 83 | George Ingstrom | Owner Lot 42 foot Fir Mtn | February 24, 2010 | Findlay Basin/ Stinky | Response to telephone call from George Ingstrom (250-349-5337) who owns lot 42 at the base of Fir Mtn straddling Emily Creek. He saw the Ecosystem Restoration ribbon hanging around his property and he wanted to know what was going . I told him that we planning to and slash and mechanically thin the area and then broadcast burn the area away from his property to Fir Mtn FSR; project was not due for a few years as we have no funds for mechanical thinning. He is in support of the project for wildlife and fuel management concerns; he is thinning pine on his own property. His concerns were that:<br>• We do not increase traffic on the hill behind his house. I said we would leave thickets near his property line, maintain the deactivation on the road above his property but we would need to thin close to the property line to safe guard his property and . I did not mention it but a field trip would e in order with George prior to operations commencing.<br>• He also wanted the "cathedral Grove' stand of large Douglas fir near a spring on mid slope of the hill protected. We both noted it was in Wildlife Tree Patch and if fire did creep into the site the large fir could withstand the light burn. | Concerns will be addressed in prescription and operations on Fir Mtn LBU |
| Premier Ridge 84 | Doug Barraclough | Range Licensee Wolf Premier (Premier Ridge) | April 23, 2009 | Wolf Premier/ Gina<br><br>Wolf Premier/ Lot 338 | Response to phone call from Doug Barraclough about his Range Unit Wolf Sheep (Premier ridge). He could not make the Open Houses and he wanted to know if any prescribed burns were called for on his Range Unit and what he could do to expedite them. I responded that there are no burns this year but Gina pasture is due to be burnt in 2010. He will amend his grazing schedule to graze Gina early in 2009, rest in fall and all 2010 to accommodate the burn.<br><br>As an aside Doug would like to burn the MOE property by the Kootenay River, Lot 338. The fuels are building up and it has been on his wish list for some time. It shows on our maps as crown land but outside Ecosystem Restoration operating | Doug did vary his range use and a prescribed burn was carried out in spring 2010 on Gina pasture.<br><br>Information has been forwarded to Ministry of Environment. It is a crown owned Conservation property and has b added to 5 Tear Plan. MOE is planning work on 3 Sons property |

**Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of Five Year Plan**
**Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan**
**May 2010**

| Document Number | Person | Organisation | Date | Pasture (Range Unit) | Comment | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | area. Next year? Moe will have to confirm land status | which may or may not be this property. |
| Premier Ridge 85 | Cheryl Bradford | Rancher Lazy Lake | March 29th 2010 | Wolf Premier/ Gina | Cheryl is asthmatic and requested an early warning call before ER program lit up Gina pasture prescribed burn. She also requested that hotel room be available if the smoke persisted in the valley and she could not return home that night. | Message was passed onto fire boss and Georgina Borho who called Cheryl the day before the prescribed burn (April 19th) A hotel room was arranged with Trench Society funded but Cheryl did not use it; smoke dissipated to north. |
| Cherry Tata 86 | Bob Jamieson | Consulting Biologist, Tata Creek | November 10, 2009 | | 1. Ta Ta Creek area. I am supportive of the continuing work there, as a local land owner and will help out with some of the neighbours as needed. I have talked with Ken Strolloff about this and have seen the plans for the area above the ranch.<br><br>2. It looks like we have plans for doing extensive work in the area between Ta Ta Creek and Wycliffe Prairie. We had sharp-tailed grouse in both areas in decades past. Jack Brown, the former owner of our ranch told me that he would see them roosting and feeding on aspen and birch buds on the ranch here into the 60's. If we can do enough area between the two units, and manage grazing effectively, we just might be able to restore that population. That would be a feather in our collective hat.<br><br>3. You might talk to the St. Mary's band folks and include their plans in the overall plan. Some work on their lands would compliment the work that you are doing just to the north and west of the reserve.<br><br>5. It might be useful to talk to Rob Neil and get their plans included in your overall planning so we all know what is going on overall. | 1) NRFL A84742 is proceeding on Lost Spring and China North pastures<br><br>2) Sharp tailed grouse reintroduction is being explored by the Fish Wildlife Compensation Program<br><br>3) St Mary's Band has proposed adding 320 hectares to side of NFRL A84743 in Indian Springs North/ South pastures. Tembec cannot accept due to pulp and markets<br><br>4) Rob Neil has joined ER program Operations Committee. The Nature Trust of BC Cherry Creek property are proposed as a joit burn unit in 2011. |
| St Mary's 87 | Hugh McLuckie<br><br>Gary Tipper | Range Licensee, Pine Butte Ranch and St Mary's Prairie<br><br>Nature Conservancy of Canada | June 18, 2009 | St Mary's Prairie/ Pine Butte | Request for input from Gary Tipper NCC and Hugh McLuckie for input on an ER Prescription covering a Pine Butte Ranch grazing Unit. Unit is crown but is cover by a grazing lease 401261 and NCC has tenure over adjacent private land.<br><br>Hugh had no input but Gary did pass on notification of two rare plants on adjacent property. | Comments were incorporated into prescription. File was checked to ensure operations were consistent with plan for grazing lease 401261. |
| St Mary's 88 | Hugh McLuckie | Range Licensee, Pine Butte Ranch and St Mary's Prairie Canada | August 30th, 2009 | St Mary's Prairie/ Deep Springs | Request for input from Hugh McLuckie for input on an ER Prescription covering a Pine Butte Ranch grazing Unit. Unit is crown but is cover by a grazing lease 401261. Hugh had no input . | No comments to incorporate into prescription. File was checked to ensure operations were consistent with plan for grazing lease 401261. |
| St Mary's 89 | Randy Harris | Team Leader Ecosystem Restoration, MOFR | September 16, 2009 | St Mary's Prairie/ Indian Springs North and South, Rouse, Sheep Camp, Deep Springs | Setting up a public meeting for October 7th 2009 of concerned residents. Purpose is to update residents about ER operations on site. Data forwarded to Tembec is a list of concerned citizens, letter from previous meeting and notes on concerns raised that committee got. Concerns centred on recreational use of the pastures especially Rouse, range being too open and possible windthrow, maintain cover between Sommerfeldt Road and the airport for visual ad sound screening. Reduce | Meeting date set. |

**Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of Five Year Plan**
**Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan**
**May 2010**

| Document Number | Person | Organisation | Date | Pasture (Range Unit) | Comment | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | invasive plants and haul trees away from residences. | |
| St Mary's 90 | Randy Harris | Team Leader Ecosystem Restoration, MOFR | September 16, 2009 | St Mary's Prairie/ Indian Springs North and South, Rouse, Sheep Camp, Deep Springs | Due to a conflicting meeting resident meeting had to be reset to Wednesday October 8th. | Meeting reset. |
| St Mary's 91 | Ken Streloff<br><br>Liz Monteith<br><br>Gary Tipper | Planner, Tembec Industries<br><br>Community Leader Sommerfeldt Road<br><br>Nature Conservancy of Canada | October 15, 2009 | St Mary's Prairie/ Indian Springs North and South, Rouse, Sheep Camp, Deep Springs | Notes from a meeting held with the residents of Sommerfeldt Road. Liz Monteith was kind enough to post a letter at the main mail box pick upo site informing residents about the meeting. Randy Harris and Bob Couperus attended for Ministry of Forests and Range, Ken Streloff for Tembec, Gary Tipper for Nature Conservancy of Canada; former range licensee Mike Rouse showed p late, current range licensee Hugh McLuckie could not make it.<br>Topics covered<br>• Randy and Bob covered off Ecosystem Restoration program actions to date.<br>o Bob ribboned out two WTPs and a proposed outside boundary for a Non Renewable Forest License (NRFL) cut block.<br>o Hiking and biking trails were traversed and placed on map; locations will be confidential but shared with Tembec<br>o Tembec has bid on the NRF License and is currently looking at block layout<br>o Only slashing proposed is<br>▪ between the main access road and the private land fence line (for reducing fuel next to the housing) and<br>▪ within 20 metres of the power lines (to protect the power lines).<br>• The trees on the hill side facing the housing and buffering the houses from the airport will be left untouched except for the slashing around the power lines.<br>• Slashing only covers trees under 15cm diameter at breast height; trees outside the NRFL cut block and over 15cm diameter will be maintained.<br>• Most trees within 10 metres of the fence lines will be cut and piled but enough over diameter trees should remain to retain privacy of the homes.<br>• Trails will be kept clear of slash and slash piles.<br>• Slashing should be started in December 2009, pile burning should be finished by April 2010<br>Ken Streloff covered the proposed Non Renewable Forest License harvesting.<br>• Tembec has won the bid for the license and is starting the planning process to include this new unit into their existing Forest Development plan.<br>• Harvest covers Rouse, Indian Springs north, Indian Springs south and possible Dry Lake and sheep Camp pastures.<br>• Residents signed up at this meeting will receive a letter in the mail to request input on the plan.<br>• Ministry of Forests and Range has forwarded notes from previous meetings with residents to Tembec and Tembec will consider these concerns and discussions in their planning and operations.<br>• Tembec will minimise impact to the mapped trails, but they will have to cross them and possibly upgrade them to haul roads.<br>• Exact route of log hauling hjas to be determined but the most likely route is | Citizens happy with response NRFL A84741 for Indian Springs developed 2010, no gravest until 2011.<br><br>ER Program slashed 17 hectares of area adjacent to houses of Siommerfeldt road in February 2010 with JOP crew. Burn fall 2010. |

**Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of Five Year Plan**
**Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan**
**May 2010**

| Document Number | Person | Organisation | Date | Pasture (Range Unit) | Comment | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | north away from Sommerfeldt road to the pulp mill at Skookumchuck.<br><br>Need to add some more to Tembec comments:<br>• Plans are to commence road building this coming winter 2009/10<br>• Harvesting to commence May, June and early July 2010 with in block processing of Chips and Hog fuel ( Chip vans to haul out fibre vs logs on logging trucks)<br>• Reason for spring harvest and chipping is that the bark from species like Ponderosa and Douglas Fir can be removed sufficiently in the Spring by the chain flails to produce acceptable wood chips for the pulpmill. Bark tightens up during the winter and summer months making in block chipping of acceptable chips not possible.<br><br>Attached is a scan of the people that signed in at the evening meeting. | |
| St Mary's 92 | Peter Woods | Landowner Lot 8109 | April 23rd, 2010 | St Mary's Prairie/ Steer | Peter is worried that harvest south of his property will open up stand and blow down trees in his yard. Disagreed with a 600 foot buffer but said prescriber would address blow down risk in his prescription | Information assed onto Neil Throndson at Nupqu development who will use this information in developing prescription. Some Mtn Pine Beetle in area. |
| Eager Hills 93 | Dave Bulford | Service Manager, East Kootenays, Telus | May 5th 2009 | Cranbrook-Fort Steele/ Tule pasture | Inquiry about operating near telephone lines proposal is<br>• Fell all trees that could touch the telephone line of either side of the line.<br>• Buck the fallen trees up and pile them 20 metres away from the line<br>• Black line, foam and otherwise protect the telephone poles and line during burning operations.<br>• At this time we have no intent to use heavy equipment near the lines other than water trucks during broadcast burn operations. The trees are o felled by a certified faller. | Proposal is acceptable to Telus, work on TU 6 and 8 are proceeding under JOP crews. |
| Eager Hills 94 | Terasen Gas | Vancouver | May 5th 2009 | Cranbrook-Fort Steele/ Tule pasture | Automated response detailing what to avoid when digging near a Tersaen line. As hand slashing only is proposed, the notes are of esoteric interest | No Action required. |
| CCF 95 | Jordy Thibeault<br><br>Ray Catherall | Range Licensee Alkali Lakes<br><br>President Cranbrook Community Forest Society | April 23, 2009 | Alkali /Alkali | Jordy wants to install new ate to allow access to Range Unit, ER program likes wider gate.<br><br>Thinning the Forest raised at annual General Meeting of the Community Forest Society, some hand pulling underway. Consensus is that it should proceed. Grant Griffin committed to help. | Based on this a draft presriptin was developed in winter 2009/ 2010, no funding available to carry out project. |
| CCF 96 | Wayne Price<br><br>Bob Gray | Fire Chief, Cranbrook<br><br>Fire Ecologist contracted to Cranbrook | July 28th, 2009 | Alkali /Alkali | Cranbrook needs the area treated, 4 to 8 fires a year this year 8 houses in Edgewood Drive almost lost.<br>MOFR agreed to develop a prescription; thin all area between access road and private lad; will need machinery.<br>Management Plan for Community Forest should be updated to allow these projects.<br>City will help with approaching Union of BC Municipalities to fund project and to help with public involvement. | A Draft prescription was developed for area, no movement on funding project or holding public meetings. |
| CCF 97 | Ray Catherall | President Cranbrook | November 24th, 2009 | Alkali /Alkali | Open House comment, the Cranbrook Community Forest Society is to be involved in any projects in the forest. | Community Forest Society will be involved. Mentioned project again at Annual General meeting April 21st, 2010. |

**Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of Five Year Plan**
**Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan**
**May 2010**

| Document Number | Person | Organisation | Date | Pasture (Range Unit) | Comment | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Community Forest Society | | | | Society wants MOFR to help organise a work bee for the forest. |
| CCF 98 | Jordie Thibeault | Range Licensee Alkali Lakes | November 24th, 2009 | Alkali /Alkali | Jordy raised concern that fuel management is over riding management on this site. He wants recreation considered as well. He would like recreation and grass creation considered as well. His intent is to graze the Community forest on his way to Isadore's canyon. | Grass Creation and recreation will be considered in the operations. There will likely be public backlash on allow grazing use of the Community forest. |
| CCF 99 | Lisa Cox | District Manager, Ministry of tourism, Culture and Arts | November 24th, 2009 | Alkali /Alkali<br><br>Lewis Wolf/ Lazy Lake | Include the stewardship zone of the Community Forest, high amount of homeless camps and parties in the area; high fire risk.<br><br>Concern that off road vehicle use of Lazy Lake North and East will result if area is opened up. | Intent is to include the stewardship zone in the ER operations, must negotiate with College of the Rockies.<br><br>Off Road Vehicle use will be considered in FWCP prescription for this site. |
| CCF 100 | Grant Griffin | Resident Park Royal, Direct of Cranbrook Community forest Society | February 24th, 2010 | Alkali /Alkali | Grant wants thinning to occur in Cranbrook Community Forest for recreation and fire a reasons. He will bring it up at Cranbrook Community Forest Society Meeting in April 21, 2010. | Mentioned project again at Annual General meeting April 21st, 2010. Society wants MOFR to help organise a work bee for the forest. |
| CCF 101 | Mike Morrow | Fuel Technician, wildlife Management Branch, MOFR Cranbrook | April 23, 2010 | Alkali /Alkali | Wildfire Management ranch is proposing to thin 2.8 hectares of area within the Cranbrook Community Forest with a Unit Crew. | Proposal will be covered by prescription for Community Forest Activity. Wildfire Management Branch will be asked to help with two fire interface work bees June 16th 2010 Civil Servants clear small area near WMB unit and June 19th when Cranbrook Community Forest Society |
| Lakit Mtn 102 | Brian Dureski | Planning Superintendant, Tembec | February 12th, 2010 | Wildhorse Lewis/ Lakit Mtn | As per discussion at February 3rd Map Meeting, Tembec looked at adding small ER volume to side of FL A19040 CP 488 block 153 on the Wild horse River road. Cost was prohibitive, though they would buy the wood if t was decked roadside | Issue dropped Er program does not have funds to thin stand mechanically. |
| Hatchery Ridge 103 | Steve Byford<br><br>Sue Crowley<br><br>Rob Neil and<br><br>Randy Harris | (BC Timber Sales)<br><br>(Ministry of Environment)<br><br>(The Nature Trust of BC)<br><br>(ER Program) MOFR | March 31st, 2010 | Peckham's Lake/ Big Hill, Kiek<br><br>PowerPlant/ Big Bull, Little Bull | These are field notes from a field trip that Steve Byford (BCTS) Sue Crowley (MOE) Rob Neil (TNT) and Randy Harris (ER Program) took to review Ecosystem Restoration options in the Hatchery Ridge area. Focus of treatment here is ungulates with Bighorn sheep being main focus. Lot of previous planning by MOE, BCTS and area is part of bighorn recovery plan by Columbia Basin Fish Wildlife Compensation program. Nupqu is also interested in prescription work ad proposing projects for funding by FIA, Union of BC Municipalities or other funding. My notes<br><br>1. Treatments at foot of hill (82G043-112);<br>a. site is overgrown with pole, small sawlog stand but has a good understory of blue-bunch wheat grass.<br>b. Soils are sandy and prone to erosion, lots of invasive plants in the areas as well as ORV use (everywhere in Trench) topography is benchy with natural OR stands on steep slope.<br>c. The site has not received a good snow pack in a decade to facilitate ground skidding.<br>d. An extremely large and complex archaeological site in this stand; | ACTION POINT: BCTS (Steve Byford or Gerry Grady) to forward existing AIA report to prescriber to drive the prescription.<br><br>ACTION POINT: Forward these comments to NUPQU for use in prescription development (done)<br><br>ACTION POINT: MOE or Fish Wildlife Compensation Program to forward Bighorn plan for Powerplant area to Randy for distribution to prescribers/ addition to ER library<br><br>ACTION POINT: Propose steep hillsides in opening 111 as a hand slashing project; currently covered by 5 year ER plan |

**Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of Five Year Plan**
**Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan**
**May 2010**

| Document Number | Person | Organisation | Date | Pasture (Range Unit) | Comment | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | contains a major village with a lot of surface material see BCTS for full AIA survey.<br>e. Treatment of opening 82G043-13 shows removing only under sawlog material still leaves too much canopy on site with some understory improvement.<br>f. Bighorn sheep movement corridor runs down a ridge just west of gypsum quarry.<br>g. Consensus from people on site remove poles small sawlog trees on benches and gentle slopes, retain canopy in draws and north aspects but skid trees out of a forwarder on frozen soil or snow pack to reduce drag on ground protect arch site and existing grass and avoid erosion on soils.<br><br>2. Top of the Hill (Big Hill pasture 82G043-111)<br>a. the flat area on top is mostly woodlot run as commercial operation by TNT<br>b. Adjacent flat crown area could be thinned or logged on snowpack or forwarder in conjunction with adjacent woodlot opportunities; access issues and small opportunity or a stand alone sale.<br>c. Steep open slopes show moss covered cap rock opening with prickly pear, locally rare species of interest<br>d. Consensus of group was that hand slash pile and burn to Open Range status on rocky south aspect open slopes would greatly enhance bighorn sheep use and avoid soil problems.<br>3. O'Reilly Property Lot 4839, part Lot 4838<br>a. TNT Conservation property Big Hill pasture between gypsum quarry and Fort Steele –Norbury Road<br>b. Current owner has life tenancy on property, TNT has management rights to majority<br>c. TNT will propose a thinning/ slashing project on benched area on north part of property to facilitate bighorn movement and visibility<br><br>4. Armstrong properties east of Fort-Steele Norbury Road<br>a. TNT has one property straddling highway (Lot 2906), area to immediate east is still owned by Armstrong family (part Lot 10278), Area east of Armstrong property (part lot 10278) is MOE owned Conservation property<br>b. MOE property is quite open does not appear to need much work, may have been treated in past<br>c. Lot 2906 and private Armstrong property has flat land but very dense pulp to pole sized stand of Douglas fir and minor components of ponderosa and Lodgepole pine. Previous loggers have looked at site | ACTION POINT: Rob Neil to approach Tembec to see if sale of pulp or hog fuel is possible then check to see if Neil Gleason or another logger can make a go of this show.<br><br>ACTION POINT If terms are favourable Rob Neil will approach Armstrong family to see if they will add their wood to the project.<br><br>ACTION POINT: Rob will keep BCTS apprised of negotiations. If favourable BCTS would look at an innovative Timber Sale License (lump sum cover cost of development) to add crown timber to mix, thin stand for future pass and create a logical burn unit (private land Armstrong excluded) for ER program. |

**Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of Five Year Plan**
**Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan**
**May 2010**

| Document Number | Person | Organisation | Date | Pasture (Range Unit) | Comment | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | and could not find a lucrative pass on site;<br>d. TNT would like their property thinned for ER biodiversity purposes bighorn sheep management as well. Armstrong family would like their remaining property logged for interface purposes.<br>e. Crown land to north (lot 2959) is in similar shape as TNT property, no stand alone timber sale is possible | |
| Colvali North 104 | Darlene Larsen | Range Licensee, Frenchman's Pasture | April 23rd, 2009 | Colvali North/ Frenchman's Pasture | Darlene at an open house; interested in getting Frenchman's pasture opened up similar to Waldo North with JOP crew. ER Team Leader said ER program would look at it but JOP crew was only capable of doing machine thinning projects. | Pasture has been reviewed by Bob Couperus; some draws can be thinned but north aspects and ridge tops are managed forest types; difficult to keep open and boundaries would be very ragged for a burn and to maintain area as a LBU. Recce area once more |
| Colvali North 105 | Jim Durham | Range Licensee, Colvali North Range Unit | March 4th 2010 | Colvali North/ All | Jim Durham wants pastures thinned; Brush East and West are especially brushed in. Team Leader mentioned draft prescription are available Frenchman's and Wapiti but so far Powerplant and Pickering Hills are higher priorities. | Brush East and west may be candidates if Fire proofing Jaffray becomes funded. |
| North Waldo 106 | Alan Edwards | Range Licensee, North Waldo | April 6th 2010 | Waldo/ Colvalli, Twin Lakes, Pipeline, Eimer | Handed out standard ER mix grass seed to Alan to grass seed skid trails and landings in North Waldo Pilot project logging | Grass Seeding complete, grass seed mix discussion is not. |
| Waldo 107 | Heath Slee,<br><br>Dave Boreen,<br><br><br>Jane Carlson, Craig Smith,<br><br>Randy Harris<br><br><br><br>Ken Streloff; | RDEK Director Area B Jaffray/ Baynes Lake Fire chief<br><br>Baynes Lake Residents<br><br>Team Leader Ecosystem Restoration, MOFR<br><br>Planner Tembec Industries | | Waldo/ All<br><br><br>Pickering Hills / Eimer | Just a file note to cover off two meetings held recently between residents of Jaffray, Baynes Lake and Elko in which Ecosystem Restoration projects around the communities were discussed.<br><br>Meeting number one was held May 13th 2009. at First Perk coffee Shop in Jaffray 9:45 to 10:30am. Attending were Heath Slee, Dave Boreen, Jane Carlson, Craig Smith, Randy Harris and Ken Streloff; Stan Doehle sent his regrets. Intent was to describe Ecosystem Restoration projects in the area and get feedback on slashing, thinning and burning activities proposed over the next 3 years. Air photos of all three communities was handed out, showing communities in 1950 and 2004; much ingrowth has occurred in all 3. Projects are:<br>• Baynes Lake<br>  • about 250 hectares of slashing by Job Opportunity Program crews will be carried out over June, July 2009.<br>  • Crew will pile accumulations of slash, piles to be burnt in fall 2009 or fall 2010 dependant on venting indices.<br>  • Intent is to broadcast burn Cemetery pasture within 3 years but about 300 hectares of merchantable forest will need to be logged by TEMBEC under 292 prior to harvest.<br>  • Two smaller units (54 and 168 hectares) will be looked at by Tembec as harvesting potential. If the blocks are not economic the Ecosystem Restoration program will pursue money to thin the stand with machinery.<br>• FitzPatrick Road<br>  • About 156 hectares slashed south of this road in 2006.<br>  • A further 184 hectares has been laid out for a mechanical thinning of the stand with an intent to sell decked wood for pulp or hog fuel.<br>  • Tembec has looked at the stand and sees no economic pass on this block. | JOP crews have slashed Airport, Rabbit Mtn, Kikkomun Park, part of Sheep Mtn. north and small piece of Cemetery pasture. Pile burning due in fall 2010<br><br>Cutts road has been slashed thinned ad pile burnt in 2010 by machine contract and JOP crew.<br><br>Clear Lake 1 and 2 have been prescribed burnt.<br><br>Field trip into Pickering Hills is due in mid June.<br><br>Notes show as accurate by Tembec cross reference |

**Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of Five Year Plan**
**Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan**
**May 2010**

| Document Number | Person | Organisation | Date | Pasture (Range Unit) | Comment | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | • Elko<br>  • Two Job Opportunity Program projects are proposed in the pastures just south of Elko. Minor hand slashing only with piling of slash accumulations. Piles should be burnt in fall 2009.<br>  • Broadcast burns due by 2012 but burn needs to be configured to safeguard residents in centre of pasture and Elko<br>• Jaffray<br>  • Regrettably no firm projects are proposed in the Jaffray area,. Randy will check hillsides south of Jaffray with Perry Rammeloo for possible projects.<br><br>Feed back received was generally positive. Dave would like some fuel work around Jaffray specifically the ridge adjacent to the road to Tie Lake; major access concern. Not listed as Ecosystem Restoration ground but it can be thinned as a fuel management treatment if Union of BC Municipality funding is available. Heath Slee is curious if the Baynes Lake and Sand Creek Cemeteries can be treated. The Baynes Lake Cemetery is on crown Land within a prescribed area; JOP can clean up and fire proof the cemetery, we will ask for direction from Community. Sand Creek Cemetery is on private land. To action it would need written permission from the land owner.<br><br>Meeting number two was an evening meeting at the Baynes Lake Hall on Thursday and May 21st. Meeting was called to discuss a new Senior's residence but Randy attended and discussed the two Baynes lake proposal while Ken Streloff presented Tembec harvest plans. The plans were well received and only questions asked were for clarification not opposition. There is interest in applying for Union of BC Municipality fire proofing funding. | |
| Waldo 108 | Steve Temple | Planner, Tembec, Elko | June 4th 2009 | Waldo/ Cemetery, Sheep Creek North and South, Cutts Road, Burnt Bottom, Duck, Fusee, West and North, Airport | 1. CP 542<br>- Randy is proposing works on Sheep Mountain in the vicinity of 542 002. I gave him a copy of our SP map and clarified where the block was located “on the ground”. He will confine their undertakings to the south and also within the old existing CP blocks adjacent to our new block.<br>- They have reviewed the area between Baynes Lake and the Dump Road and will avoid our block (542 001) (Fusee West pasture). He pointed out one area which surrounds the Cemetery which he has decided not to pursue ER works within because it contains a high predominance of sawlog. He asked if we would be interested in harvesting and I said that at this time we will be concentrating on pulp and would not be pursuing it in the near future.<br>- He asked about the area where our 542 003 (Duck Lake) is located and I pointed out that most of their proposed area overlaps our block. The one exception is the strip of non-merch along the highway. This is the reason I sent maps of our blocks so they can schedule to treat the areas that are outside our block.<br><br>2. Nature Trust and MOE properties on east side of Sheep Mountain<br>- They are looking at this area and Randy had just completed some plots to determine feasibility of work in the area but it may be a bigger challenge than | JOP crews have slashed Airport, Rabbit Mtn, Kikkomun Park, part of Sheep Mtn. north and small piece of Cemetery pasture. Pile burning due in fall 2010<br><br>Cutts road has been slashed thinned ad pile burnt in 2010 by machine contract and JOP crew.<br><br>Clear Lake 1 and 2 have been prescribed burnt. |

**Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of Five Year Plan**
**Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan**
**May 2010**

| Document Number | Person | Organisation | Date | Pasture (Range Unit) | Comment | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | they wish to undertake.<br><br>3. Airport Pasture (North of the Caven)<br>- They will be setting up a slashing program (avoiding the pruned stems apparently) between the Caven and the Elko airport. The goal is to broadcast burn this area.<br><br>4. Rabbit Mountain (and west to Highway 93)<br>- They want to treat this area for fire interface (both for Elko and the guy who lives in the middle of it) but broadcast burning it will probably be an issue so they will slash / pile and burn the piles.<br><br>5. Bare Mountain (at least that is Randy's name for it)<br>- This is actually the blocks just west of Marcer's. They are CP 277 which is called Bare Mountain. They have completed slashing on the two large blocks which are adjacent to the Newgate.<br><br>6. Fitzpatrick Road<br>- They have laid out the area I looked at and rejected for harvest. I think the plan is to go there next winter. It will be machine treated (not hand fell) and piled for possible sale as hog or pulp. | |
| Waldo 109 | Jon Blair | Home Owner, Sheep Mtn | August 10th, 2009 | Waldo/ Sheep Mtn North | Jon lives in centre of pasture in a straw bale house, he was infoed of proposed ER operations around is house and is generally happy with fuel management around his house. | Jon received a map of the project area. In February March 2010 JOP crew slashed and pile to within 300 metres north of his house. |
| Wigwam 110 | Mario Rocca,<br><br>Bob Forbes<br><br>Steve Temple<br><br>Irene Teske | Fernie Rod and Gun Club<br><br>Nature Conservancy of Canada<br><br>Tembec Industries<br><br>Ministry of Environment | April 8th 2010 | Wigwam/ All | I met the Fernie Rod and Gun club on site at the Lodgepole gate to Wigwam today, some notes just to keep us all in the know.<br><br>1) I handed over keys 7 and 8 (for the wigwam gate; MOFR will keep Key number 6) to the club along with 4 extra maps for the site and an Ecosystem Restoration sign to be posted by Elko gate so as to reduce phone calls to MOE about traffic into the area closure.<br>2) Work party will proceed Saturday April 17th about 40 people to attend, Randy Harris Bob Couperus MOFR have volunteered to attend. Club will likely work under Trench Society WCB. First Aid to be set up. Remainder of project area will be put out to contract, for about $300/ha.<br>3) MOFR has rewritten schedules A, B, D (attached). As per notes from Bob Forbs clarity over the treatment is added;<br>a. NCC property has been separated out as separate unit, will show on prescription map.<br>b. schedule B has a possible $1000 fine to be levied on excessive site disturbance. Schedule A includes remedial work clause for environmental damage, follow up by telling contractor to stay on | 1) Keys to be returned MOFR keeps one<br><br>2) MOFR to participate in work party Aparil 17th<br><br>3) MOFR is assised Fernie Rod and Gun club with contract<br><br>4) MOFR will facilitate treatment of area for Invasive plants by East Kootenay Invasive Plant Council |

**Appendix II Summary of Stakeholder Review of Five Year Plan**
**Rocky Mountain Trench Ecosystem Restoration Plan**
**May 2010**

| Document Number | Person | Organisation | Date | Pasture (Range Unit) | Comment | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | road.<br>c. Piling of slash clause is added (clause 2.09)<br>d. Province and Ministry references changed to Fernie Rod and Gun club.<br>e. For issuance the name of the contracting company needs to be added to header of all 3 schedules, areas and prices into schedule B<br>4) Club would also like area treated for invasive plants MOFR will forward map to East Kootenay Invasive Plant Council with a request to treat area for 2 days, about $2000, and forward invoice to Rod and Gun club for payment. So far treatment request is for spotted and diffuse knapweed, no treatment know for common St John's wort. Should we target other species.<br>5) The treatment site is ribboned in pink ribbon two thickets and one WTP taken out; NCC property added in as NCC1. Randy to draft a prescription for review by Bob Forbes and Ken Streloff for comment before map and prescription finalised. Hopefully tomorrow | 5) Prescription completed April 9th, 2010, comments from this field trip incorporated<br><br>6) ER Program to amend all both prescriptions for Wigwam by June for review by MOE, NCC and Fernie Rod and Gun club. Basically break large units into smaller, add in some anomalous areas and update some clauses; look for new project opportunities. August 20190 |
| Wigwam 111 | Bob Forbes | Area Manager with Nature Conservancy of Canada | April 12th, 2010 | Wigwam/ All | Prescription reviewed by NCC and Steve Temple of Tembec. Clauses held to meet management criteria for 7.9 hectares of the Mt. Broadwood Conservation property. Areato be managed as open forest, pile burning will likely be necessary. | Prescription approved work proceeded at work bee April 17th. |
| Wigwam 112 | Mario Rocca | Fernie Rod and Gun Club | April 21st 2010 | Wigwam/ All | Report of treatment completed and forwarded to Mario for comment. Work went well, good production and enthusiasm. In future projects pay more attention to safety and emergency transportation. | Project report put on Opening file 82G025-78 |
| Wigwam 113 | Mario Rocca | Fernie Rod and Gun Club | April 21st 2010 | Wigwam/ All | Contract to Purcell Resources has been let, $10,080 of BC Wildlife Federation dollars spent to slash and pile 35 hectares of land. Mario feels work is good, contract is complete and paid out. Keys and signs returned. | Keys and sign returned to Ministry of Environment.<br>Second report to be competed for end of project. |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Appendix III Maps and Documentation on Maps
Maps are under separate cover

Contents