**Questions:**

**Confirmation of salvage priority**

Based upon the cruise type summary or professional judgment, were any types identified within the cutting permit as not meeting salvage-criteria as per the biodiversity conservation strategy? If yes, how are these types being managed in order to ensure their higher biodiversity value in this period of potentially increased harvests due to salvage priorities is conserved?

Answer:

**Plants of food or cultural use value AND of higher likelihood to be negatively impacted by forest management activities.**

If the following plants are present in significant amounts, what management practices will be used to ensure their continued availability to the Tsilhqot’in people

* Labrador tea/trappers tea (i.e. harvesting on snowpack, no intensive site preparation)
* Balsam in the drier areas of the SBPS and IDF (i.e. isolation of balsam concentration in WTPs or other reserves)?

Answer:

**Moose and furbearer habitat and moose vulnerability**

(*Furbearer habitat is likely well managed if moose habitat is well managed.)*

**Management of thermal cover for moose**

Does the pre-harvest assessment indicate that after harvesting has been completed there will remain an adequate area of thermal cover (i.e. 30%[[1]](#footnote-1) in (SBPS, SBS, and MS) in the sub-landscape (i.e. the 10km2 that represents a moose home range)? If not, what measures are being taken to ensure sustainability of an adequate area of moose thermal cover?

Answer:

**Management of moose vulnerability through access control**

What access control measures are in-place or planned to reduce moose vulnerability (i.e. single crossings of significant watercourses enabling efficient access control, removal of potential or existing loop roads, etc.)??

Answer:

**Management of moose vulnerability through security cover**

Considering both the cutting permit and the adjacent area, what other measures (i.e. WTP placement; road location; regeneration protection; immature balsam and spruce retention; deciduous retention; wetland, lake, and stream buffers; consideration of sightlines onto wetlands; consideration of sightlines onto the harvested area from available roads in the area, etc.) are being taken to reduce moose vulnerability?

Answer:

Does the pre-harvest assessment indicate that after harvesting has been completed there will remain an adequate area of security cover (i.e 30%[[2]](#footnote-2) of area >2m in height in SBPS, SBS, and MS) continue to be available in the sub-landscape (i.e. the 10km2 that represents a moose home range)? If not, what measures are being taken to ensure sustainability of an adequate area of moose security cover?

Answer:

**Connectivity in general**

Considering also any adjacent recently harvested openings (i.e. <3m tall), will the minimum dash distance as recommended by the Biodiversity Guidebook maintained?

Answer:

**Trails**

Did the pre-harvest assessment identify any trails identified within or adjacent to the area to be harvested? What measures will be used to ensure trail integrity and their continuing availability? Please specify if any of the planned measures are in excess of minimum requirements.

Answer:

**Heritage (archeological) resources**

What measures have been taken to ensure heritage resources are identified if present, and then protected or conserved if identified? Please specify if any of the planned measures are in excess of minimum requirements.

Answer:

**Fisheries habitat**

Is the proposed harvesting in a location that will affect water quantity and timing of flow and/or in a position in which sediment is likely to be introduced into a fish bearing water? If yes, what measures are being undertaken to ensure no adverse effects to fish or fish habitat will occur? Please specify which, if any, of the planned measures are in excess of minimum requirements.

Answer:

Additional notes:

1. Maintaining 30% of the area as thermal cover is suggested by Keystone(2006) as a Best Management Practice for moose habitat management. <http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/cariboo/env_stewardship/ecosystems/reports/id_mgmnt_moose_winter_habitat_car_reg.pdf> page 22 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Maintaining 30% of the area in a condition to provide security cover is suggested by Keystone(2006) as a Best Management Practice for moose habitat management.

   <http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/cariboo/env_stewardship/ecosystems/reports/id_mgmnt_moose_winter_habitat_car_reg.pdf> page 22 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)