

TREE FARM LICENCE NO. 26

(Mission Municipal Forest)

**FOREST STEWARDSHIP PLAN
2007 - 2012**



Amendment #1 (submitted May 27, 2011)

- Minor housekeeping (minor)
- Revised Strategy for Stand Level Biodiversity (approval required)
- Revised Strategy for Water in Community Watersheds (approval required)
- Objectives and Strategies for Recreation Resources (approval required)

1.0 DATE OF SUBMISSION

The date of submission of the original Forest Stewardship Plan (FSP) is, for the purposes of Forest Planning and Practices Regulation (FPPR) Sections 7, 14 and 26 and Forest and Range Practices Act (FPC) Section 196(3), January 24, 2007 (the “Date of Submission”).

The date of the original submission for approval of Amendment #1 is September 27, 2011.

2.0 APPLICATION OF THIS FSP

2.1 Licensee(s) and Licence(s)

This FSP applies to all of District of Mission Tree Farm Licence 26 (TFL 26). The current allowable annual cut for TFL 26 is 43,398 cubic metres.

2.2 Cutblocks and Roads to Which the Forest Practices Code (FPC), Not This FSP Will Apply

As of the Effective Date of this FSP, all active cutting permits and road permits will continue to operate under the Forest Practices Code (FPC) and the FPC regulations, not the provisions of this FSP. All new cutting permits and road permit applications approved by the Ministry of Forests and Range after the Effective Date of this FSP will be subject to this plan.

As of the date of submission of this FSP, the active cutting permits and road permits in TFL 26 are: CP8, CP10, CP11, CP21, CP22, CP23, R05420

3.0 TERM OF THIS FSP

3.1 Length of Term

The term of this FSP is 5 years from the Effective Date.

This FSP may be:

- Terminated earlier if the District of Mission (Mission or the licensee) elects to replace it with another approved FSP; or
- Extended pursuant to FRPA or its regulations.

3.2 Effective Date and Commencement of Term

The term of this FSP commences on the Effective Date, which is April 1, 2007.

4.0 FOREST DEVELOPMENT UNITS (FDU)

4.1 Map

The FSP map (Appendix 1) shows the boundaries of TFL 26 and other relevant features at a 1:20,000 scale.

4.2 FDUs in Effect as of Date of Submission of this FSP (FPPR S. 14(1)(b))

There are no forest development units in effect on the date of submission of this FSP.

4.3 New Forest Development Units

FDUs indicate areas that will contain forest development activities and that will have a common set of objectives, results and strategies.

There is only one FDU included in this plan that covers all included areas in TFL 26.

4.4 Forest Development Plan (FDP) Roads and Cutblocks With Assessments Complete

In accordance with FRPA S. 196(1) and FPPR S. 14(1)(c), cutblocks and roads Category 'A' approved in the current 2003-2007 FDP for TFL 26 where assessments have been completed as per S. 16,17 and 37 of the Operational and Site Planning Regulation or section 5 of the Forest Road Regulation, are to retain their approvals from the FDP and are not subject to review and comments for approval of this FSP.

These cutblocks and roads are listed in Appendix 2.

5.0 STOCKING STANDARDS

Stocking standards are the stocking and free growing standards developed by Mission and approved by the MOFR. These standards apply when establishing a free growing stand and are described for each Standards Unit. The Licencee will apply FPPR 44 on all areas where a Free Growing Stand is required to be established by FRPA 29.

The stocking standards to be used in this FSP are listed in Appendix 3.

6.0 NATURAL RANGE BARRIERS

No range activities or practical opportunities exist for range within TFL 26, therefore no measures are needed to deal with effects on natural range barriers.

7.0 CUMULATIVE EFFECTS OF MULTIPLE FSPS

The following licensees hold FSPs which cover all or portions of TFL 26: British Columbia Timber Sales Program: *MTFL FDU*, Teal Cedar Products Ltd: *FDU #2 – Hatzic*, and Leq'a:mel Forestry Limited Partnership: *FDU – Hatzic*.

The licensee plans to communicate with the relevant forest licenses, as necessary, to discuss situations involving potential cumulative effects.

8.0 REVIEW AND REFERRAL

This FSP has been made available to the general public and interested parties for review and comment. This has been done through advertisements in the Abbotsford News, letters sent to known possible interested parties and placement on Mission's website.

Copies of the advertisement, copies of referral letters, comments received back and the District of Mission's responses to the comments received are included in Appendix 4.

9.0 REVISIONS

Any revisions to this FSP are or will be detailed in Appendix 5.

10.0 OBJECTIVES, STRATEGIES AND RESULTS

The FPPR Sections 5-10 identifies ten objectives that must be defined in an FSP. These are all detailed in the following sections.

The Government Actions Regulation (GAR) has several measures identified that could also be included under an FSP. As of the date of submission of this FSP, one such measure applies to TFL 26:

- The Chilliwack District Manager in a letter dated October 17, 2005, decided to continue the existing recommended Visual Quality Classes (rVQCs) into Visual Quality Objectives (VQOs) under the authority of GAR S. 17.
- This determination states that a VQC is continued as a VQO for a scenic area if the VQC has been included in the most recent TFL visual landscape

inventory approved by the Regional Manager and that the VQCs must also have been in existence when GAR came into force in December 2004.

As of the date of submission of this FSP, there are no Higher Level Plans either in effect or known to be imminent for the TFL 26 area, except for that related to Provincial Non-Spatial Old Growth (Table 1).

11.0 Higher Level Plans

Table 1	Objectives Set by Government for	Provincial Non-Spatial Old Growth
Regulation:	FPC Sec 4(1)	
Objective as set:	Pursuant to Sections 4(1) and 4(2) of the Forest Practices Code of BC Act, Provincial Non-Spatial Old Growth Objectives were established and came into effect June 30, 2004.	
Results or Strategy	The licensee's timber harvest and road construction will be in accordance with Biodiversity Management of the Old Growth Objectives as outlined in the Provincial Non-Spatial Old Growth Objectives (effective June 30, 2004). The licensee plans to communicate with other relevant forest licensees in the Hatzic and Alouette LUPs, as necessary in future, to discuss potential cumulative effects with the intent to ensuring that the overall objective is met.	
Application: All FDUs in TFL 26.		

11.1 Objectives Set by Government Under FRPA S. 149

Table 2	Objectives Set by Government for	SOILS
Regulation:	FPPR S. 5	
Objective as set:	Without unduly reducing the supply of timber from British Columbia's forests, to conserve the productivity and the hydrologic function of soils.	
Result or Strategy	Soil disturbance limits: In accordance with the opportunity provided under FPPR 12.1(1), the licensee undertakes to comply with FPPR S. 35 during the term of this FSP.	
	Permanent Access Structure Limits: In accordance with the opportunity provided under FPPR 12.1(1), the licensee undertakes to comply with FPPR S. 36 during the term of this FSP.	
Application: All FDUs in TFL 26.		

Table 3	Objectives Set by Government for	TIMBER
Regulation:	FPPR S. 6	
Objectives as set:	<p>(a) Maintain or enhance an economically valuable supply of commercial timber from British Columbia's forests,</p> <p>(b) Ensure that delivered wood costs, generally, after taking into account the effect on them of the relevant provisions of this regulation and of the Act, are competitive in relation to equivalent costs in relation to regulated primary forest activities in other jurisdictions, and</p> <p>(c) Ensure that the provisions of this regulation and of the Act that pertain to primary forest activities do not unduly constrain the ability of a holder of an agreement under the <i>Forest Act</i> to exercise the holder's rights under the agreement.</p>	
Result or Strategy	In accordance with FPPR section 12(8), "A person who is required to prepare a forest stewardship plan is exempt from the requirement to prepare results or strategies for an objective set by government for timber." Therefore, no results or strategies are included in this FSP.	
Application: N/A		

Table 4	Objectives Set by Government for	WILDLIFE
Regulation:	FPPR S. 7	
Objectives as set:	Without unduly reducing the supply of timber from British Columbia's forests, to conserve sufficient wildlife habitat in terms of amount of area, distribution of areas and attributes of those areas, for (a) The survival of species at risk, (b) The survival of regionally important wildlife, and (c) The winter survival of specified ungulate species.	
Result or Strategy (in accordance with FPPR S. 7(2))	If any detections of Pacific Water Shrew or Coastal Tailed Frog are made in TFL 26, the licensee will report this and be willing to discuss management options with the Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations.	
Application: All FDUs in TFL 26.		

Table 5	Objectives Set by Government for	WATER, FISH, WILDLIFE AND BIODIVERSITY WITHIN RIPARIAN AREAS
Regulation:	FPPR S. 8	
Objective as set:	Without unduly reducing the supply of timber from British Columbia's forests, to conserve, at the landscape level, the water quality, fish habitat, wildlife habitat and biodiversity associated with those riparian areas.	
Result or Strategy	Stream riparian classes: In accordance with the opportunity provided under FPPR 12.1(2), the licensee undertakes to comply with FPPR S. 47 during the term of this FSP.	
	Wetland riparian classes: In accordance with the opportunity provided under FPPR 12.1(2), the licensee undertakes to comply with FPPR S. 48 during the term of this FSP.	
	Lake riparian classes: In accordance with the opportunity provided under FPPR 12.1(2), the licensee undertakes to comply with FPPR S. 49 during the term of this FSP.	
	Restrictions in a riparian management area: In accordance with the opportunity provided under FPPR 12.1(2), the licensee undertakes to comply with FPPR S. 50 during the term of this FSP.	
	Restrictions in a riparian reserve zone: In accordance with the opportunity provided under FPPR 12.1(2), the licensee undertakes to comply with FPPR S. 51 during the term of this FSP.	
	Restrictions in a riparian management zone: In accordance with the opportunity provided under FPPR 12.1(2), the licensee undertakes to comply with FPPR S. 52(2) during the term of this FSP.	
	Temperature Sensitive Streams: In accordance with the opportunity provided under FPPR 12.1(2), the licensee undertakes to comply with FPPR S. 53 during the term of this FSP.	
Application: All FDUs in TFL 26.		

Table 6	Objectives Set by Government for	Retention Rates in Riparian Management Zones
Regulation:	FPPR S 12(3)	
Objective as set:	A person who prepares a forest stewardship plan must specify in it, for objectives set out in section 8, a result or strategy that address retention of trees in a riparian management zone	

Result or Strategy	<p>The licensee will undertake to retain the following levels of standing trees in the Riparian Management Zones:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Column 1 - RIPARIAN CLASS</th> <th>Column 2 - RMZ BASAL AREA RETENTION ¹</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>S1-A & S1-B</td> <td>≥ 20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>S2 & S3</td> <td>≥ 20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>S4 & S5²</td> <td>≥ 10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>S5³ & S6</td> <td>≥ 0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>W1, W2, W3, W4 & W5</td> <td>≥ 10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>L1-A & L1-B</td> <td>≥ 0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>L2, L3 & L4</td> <td>≥ 10%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>¹ Merchantable and non-merchantable conifer and deciduous trees. ² Valley or non-valley bottom stream dependent on woody debris or streamside trees to maintain channel and/or stream-bank stability ³ Non-valley bottom stream not dependent on woody debris or streamside trees to maintain channel and/or stream-bank stability</p> <p>Management Application – When forest development is planned in a riparian management zone, the licensee will use a qualified professional to conduct a field assessment and develop a prescription considering the factors relating to objectives set by government for water, fish, wildlife and biodiversity in riparian areas in FPPR Schedule 1, section 2. The licensee will conduct forest operations in accordance with the developed prescriptions. The basal area retention is to be met over each Cutting or Road Permit and not necessarily on each individual stream, wetland or lake.</p>	Column 1 - RIPARIAN CLASS	Column 2 - RMZ BASAL AREA RETENTION ¹	S1-A & S1-B	≥ 20%	S2 & S3	≥ 20%	S4 & S5 ²	≥ 10%	S5 ³ & S6	≥ 0%	W1, W2, W3, W4 & W5	≥ 10%	L1-A & L1-B	≥ 0%	L2, L3 & L4	≥ 10%
Column 1 - RIPARIAN CLASS	Column 2 - RMZ BASAL AREA RETENTION ¹																
S1-A & S1-B	≥ 20%																
S2 & S3	≥ 20%																
S4 & S5 ²	≥ 10%																
S5 ³ & S6	≥ 0%																
W1, W2, W3, W4 & W5	≥ 10%																
L1-A & L1-B	≥ 0%																
L2, L3 & L4	≥ 10%																
Application: All FDUs in TFL 26.																	

Table 7	Objectives Set by Government for	FISH HABITAT IN FISHERIES SENSITIVE WATERSHEDS
Regulation:	FPPR S. 8.1	
Objective as set:	Until December 31, 2005, to prevent to the extent described in subsection (3) the cumulative hydrological effects of primary forest activities in the fisheries sensitive watershed from resulting in a material adverse impact on the habitat of the fish species for which the fisheries sensitive watershed was established.	
Result or Strategy	This section does not apply, as there are no fisheries sensitive watersheds identified for TFL 26.	
Application: N/A		

Table 8	Objectives Set by Government for	WATER IN COMMUNITY WATERSHEDS
Regulation:	FPPR S. 8.2	
Objective as set:	For water being diverted for human consumption through a licensed waterworks in a community watershed is to prevent to the extent described in subsection (3) the cumulative hydrological effects of primary forest activities within the community watershed from resulting in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) A material adverse impact on the quantity of water or the timing of the flow of the water from the waterworks, or (b) The water from the waterworks having a material adverse impact on human health that cannot be addressed by water treatment required under: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) An enactment, or (ii) The licence pertaining to the waterworks. 	

Result or Strategy	There are two community watersheds entirely within TFL 26: Cannell Lake and Kenworthy Creek. A small portion of the Kanaka Creek community watershed is within TFL 26 on part of the western boundary. The licensee, when carrying out primary forest activities, will do so in a manner that is consistent with recommendations in a hydro-geomorphological assessment or watershed assessment as determined and prepared by a qualified professional.
Application: All FDUs in TFL 26.	

Table 9a	Objectives Set by Government for	WILDLIFE AND BIODIVERSITY – LANDSCAPE LEVEL
Regulation:	FPPR S. 9	
Objectives as set:	Without unduly reducing the supply of timber from British Columbia's forests and to the extent practicable, to design areas on which timber harvesting is to be carried out that resemble, both spatially and temporally, the patterns of natural disturbance that occur within the landscape.	
Result or Strategy	Maximum cutblock size: In accordance with the opportunity provided under FPPR 12.1(3), the licensee undertakes to comply with FPPR S. 64 during the term of this FSP.	
	Harvesting adjacent to another cutblock: In accordance with the opportunity provided under FPPR 12.1(3), the licensee undertakes to comply with FPPR S. 65 during the term of this FSP.	
Application: All FDUs in TFL 26.		

Table 9b	Objectives Set by Government for	WILDLIFE AND BIODIVERSITY – STAND LEVEL
Regulation:	FPPR S. 9.1	
Objectives as set:	Without unduly reducing the supply of timber from British Columbia's forests and to the extent practicable, to design areas on which timber harvesting is to be carried out that retain wildlife trees.	
Result or Strategy	Wildlife tree retention: The licensee has identified and spatially located a minimum of 13% of the total TFL land base under long term and rotational reserves, to be retained as required under FPPR Sec 66(3). The minimum 13% will be managed for the length of the licence. Wildlife tree retention on a cutblock basis will range from 0 – 10% of total cutblock volume.	
	Restriction on harvesting: In accordance with the opportunity provided under FPPR 12.1(4), the licensee undertakes to comply with FPPR S. 67 during the term of this FSP.	
Application: All FDUs in TFL 26.		

Table 10	Objective Set by Government for	VISUAL QUALITY
Regulation:	FPPR S. 9.2	
Objective as set:	In relation to visual quality for a scenic area, that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Was established on or before October 24, 2002, and (b) For which there is no visual quality objective is to ensure that the altered forest landscape for the scenic area (c) In visual sensitivity class 1 is in either the preservation or retention category, (d) In visual sensitivity class 2 is in either the retention or partial retention category, (e) In visual sensitivity class 3 is in either the partial retention or modification category, 	

	<p>(f) In visual sensitivity class 4 is in either the partial retention or modification category, and</p> <p>(g) In visual sensitivity class 5 is in either the modification or maximum modification category.</p>
Result or Strategy	A result or strategy is not required under FPPR S. 9.2 as Visual Quality Objectives have been established via a letter dated October 17, 2005 from the Chilliwack District Manager to continue the existing recommended Visual Quality Classes (rVQCs) into Visual Quality Objectives (VQOs) under the authority of GAR S. 17.
Application: N/A	

Table 11	Objective Under the Government Actions Regulation for	VISUAL QUALITY CLASS CONTINUED
Regulation:	GAR S. 17	
Regulation states:	<p>A visual quality class for a scenic area is continued under this regulation as visual quality objective if:</p> <p>(a) The visual quality class has been:</p> <p>(i) Set out before October 24, 2002 in a letter from the district manager to the holder of an agreement under the <i>Forest Act</i>, or</p> <p>(ii) Included in the most recent tree farm licence visual landscape inventory prepared by the holder of a tree farm licence and approved by the regional manager, and</p> <p>(b) In existence on the coming into force of this section.</p>	
Scenic Areas	FPPR 14(3)(e): All polygons that have assigned VQOs are scenic areas.	
Result or Strategy	The licensee will be consistent with Visual Quality Objectives in accordance with Appendix 6 "Visual Quality Objectives Within TFL 26". These VQOs are indicated for each Visual Sensitivity Unit in TFL 26.	
Application: All FDUs in TFL 26.		

Table 12	Objective Set by Government for	CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES
Regulation:	FPPR S. 10	
Objective as set:	<p>Is to conserve, or, if necessary, protect cultural heritage resources that are:</p> <p>(a) The focus of a traditional use by an aboriginal people that is of continuing importance to that people, and</p> <p>(b) Not regulated under the <i>Heritage Conservation Act</i>.</p>	
Result or Strategy	<p>The licensee will continue to communicate with interested First Nations to discuss upcoming forest activities before new cutting permit and road permits applications are made and request input regarding potential impacts on aboriginal interests. The licensee will update any cultural resource information received from First Nations within traditional territories applicable to the FDUs within this FSP. The licensee will consider information received by the First Nations, as well as from any archaeological assessments, prior to finalizing development activities and review this information for the potential development of a Result or Strategy to be amended to this FSP.</p> <p>The licensee will carry out forest practices that do not damage the cultural heritage resource features that have been determined to require protection or conservation by the licensee or provincial government as guided by the factors specified in FPPR Schedule 1, Part 4.</p>	

	Mission will continue to assess aboriginal archaeological potential using results of AIAs as well as input from First Nations and government agencies and, where indicated as reasonable from the assessments, conduct field recces in the indicated upcoming development areas using qualified personnel to assess cultural heritage resources potential and presence.
	Regarding short-term cedar bark supply strategies, upon request from First Nations, the licensee will identify opportunities to strip bark in areas under cutting permit in TFL 26 or supply contact information for any dry land sorts where TFL 26 logs have been sent.
	Regarding a long-term cedar supply and bark potential, the licensee will replant, where ecologically suitable, logged areas using at least the same percentage of western red cedar that grew at the time of logging. The determination of meeting this strategy will be done using average numbers for the entire TFL over five year periods.
	The licensee will not publicly disclose confidential archaeological information provided by First Nations unless agreed to by them.
Application: All FDUs in TFL 26.	

Table 13	Measures Related to	INVASIVE PLANTS
Regulation:	FPPR S. 17	
Regulation states:	For the purpose of section 47 [<i>invasive plants</i>] of the Act, a person who prepares a forest stewardship plan must specify measures in the plan to prevent the introduction or spread of species of plants that are invasive plants under the Invasive Plants Regulation, if the introduction or spread is likely to be the result of the person's forest practices.	
Measures:	<p>In context of FPPR S. 17, which specifies that a licensee has responsibilities where the introduction or spread of invasive plants is likely to be the result of the licensee's forest practices, the following measures will be used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Within six months of the Effective Date of this FSP, the licensee will provide information and education about relevant invasive plants to staff and contractors dealing with this matter. These people will be instructed to be aware of invasive plants and in the importance of not transporting invasive plant seed or live material on clothing or equipment when moving to other locations. ▪ The licensee will monitor the presence and spread of invasive plants during silviculture surveys and road inspections within cutblocks and along roads under permit or obligation by the licensee in the FDUs listed in the FSP. ▪ When invasive plants are reported within 100 metres of new road or landing construction or cutblocks, the licensee will evaluate the relative risk for spread of the invasive plant and where the risk ranking indicates, make efforts to minimize the spread of these invasive plants into the new construction or cutblocks. These efforts could include techniques such as minimizing the amount of soil disturbance during the construction of these roads and landings or to seed areas of exposed mineral soil along roadsides, landings or within the net area to reforest, as indicated by the relative risk of the known invasive plants. When the licensee carries out efforts as described above, they will be done within a reasonable time frame considering both the risk of the invasive plant as well as the biology and/or effectiveness of the specified technique(s). ▪ When seed is used for re-vegetation, the licensee will use grade Common #1 Forage Mixture, as defined in the Canada Seeds Act, or better. 	
Application: All FDUs in TFL 26.		

Table 14	Objective Set by Government for	RECREATION RESOURCES
Regulation	FRPA Section 180	
Objective as set:	<p>The following trails are designated, but not yet established through Section 56 of FRPA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 900-5501 – Hoover Lake Trail • 900-5579 – Rolley Falls Trail • 900-6239 – Stave Dam Forest Interpretive Trail • 900-6554 – Red Mountain Trail West • 900-6642 – Hayward Reservoir Trail <p>The following trails are neither designated, nor established through Section 56, but are maintained for the Crown by the District of Mission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devil's Lake Trail • Red Mt East Trail • Red Mt. Loop Trail • Mt. Crickmer Trail • Steelhead Trails • Bell Road Interpretive Trail <p>There are no objectives set for any trails within TFL 26.</p> <p>The following Interpretive Forest designation has been established in the TFL 26 sections on the west side of Stave Lake: Mission Interpretive Forest Site (REC 106116).</p> <p>Legal objectives for the Mission Interpretive Forest Site established under FRPA Section 56:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain the quality of the experience of forest recreation activities; • Maintain or enhance where practicable the forest interpretive qualities of the site. 	
Result or Strategy	<p>In the Mission Interpretive Forest Site, the licensee will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Retain forest management as the highest priority including managing for the eleven Forest and Range Practices Act (FRPA) values; timber, including forest health, soils, water, forage and associated plant communities, cultural heritage resources, recreation resources, biodiversity, resource features, fish, visual quality, and wildlife. b) Design cutblocks and roads in a manner that is consistent with the objectives of the Interpretive Forest Site, and c) Carry out the primary forest activities only if the activities are consistent with the design for the cutblocks or roads referred to in paragraph (b). 	
Application: All FDUs in TFL 26.		

12.0 SIGNATURES OF PERSONS REQUIRED TO PREPARE THE PLAN:

District of Mission
PO Box 20
Mission, BC
V2V 4L9
Phone: 604-820-3762

Fax: 604-826-8633

Authorized Licensee Signature:

Kim Allan, RPF
Director of Forest Management

Date: September 22, 2011

Preparing Forester:

_____ SEAL

Kim Allan, RPF
Director of Forest Management

Date: September 22, 2011

"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".

Appendix 1: Maps

A large scale overview map is provided with the amendment #1 as there are no changes to the map or area under the plan (Forest Development Unit).

(A 1:20,000 scale map of Mission TFL 26, titled 'Forest Stewardship Plan 2007-2012' is available (original) on request)

Appendix 2: Forest Development Plan Roads and Cutblocks With Assessments Complete

Block or Road	Type of Assessment Completed
SD2	Terrain Stability Field Assessment Outside a Community Watershed
SD2	Visual Impact Assessment
RO11	Visual Impact Assessment
RO13	Visual Impact Assessment
RO14	Visual Impact Assessment
RP3	Archaeological Impact Assessment

Appendix 3: Stocking Standards

STOCKING STANDARDS

The following stocking standards will generally apply for identified areas in the subsequent site plans. The stocking standards below are slightly different from the previous Establishment to Free Growing Guidelines – Vancouver Region, but have been put into normal practice in TFL 26 for the past several years. Mission has many areas where CWHdm is influenced by CWHvm1, therefore there are some standards where species suitability varies; for instance where western hemlock is listed as preferred or acceptable.

(a) Approved Stocking Standards

BEC Variant	Site Series	Species		Stocking * (well-spaced/ha)			Regen Delay	Free Growing	Group 1 Brush Comp % over Ht	Group 2 Brush Comp % over Ht	Other Info	
		Preferred	Accept	Target+	Min p a	Min p		Late				
CWH dm Coastal Western Hemlock – dry maritime	01	Fd Hw Cw		900	500	400	3	20	150	100		
	03	Fd Cw	Hw	800	400	400	3	20	150	100		
	04	Fd Cw	Hw	900	500	400	3	20	150	100		
	05	Cw Fd	Bg Hw	900	500	400	3	20	150	100		
	06	Cw Hw	Fd	900	500	400	6	20	150	100		
	07	Fd Cw Bg	Hw	900	500	400	3	20	150	100		
	08	Cw Bg		900	500	400	3	20	150	100		
	09	Cw ¹ Bg ¹		900	500	400	3	20	150	100		
	1 on elevated microsites +The target stocking standard is reduced by 100 stems/hectare for Douglas-fir stands Minimum Characteristics of any leave trees including form, health and vigor: Mature Layer will have various forms, health and vigor ranging from high grade and value, to low grade and marginal marketability for the primary purposes of providing for wildlife habitat, features and to meet particular visual quality objectives. Immature Layer or advanced regen acceptable trees will be based on good form, no health issues, good growth potential. * The stocking figures only relate to the immature/advanced regen layer but do not relate to the mature layer.											
	Free Growing Height Criteria (m)											
Site Series		Fd	Hw	Cw	Bg							
03		2.0	2.0	1.0	-					Minimum inter-tree distance	2.0	
01 04 06		3.0	3.0	1.5	2.5					Min-Max post spacing density (sph)	400-1,500	
05 07 08 09		4.0	4.0	2.0	3.5							

BEC Variant	Site Series	Species		Stocking * (well-spaced/ha)			Regen Delay	Free Growing	Group 1 Brush Comp % over Ht	Group 2 Brush Comp % over Ht	Other Info
		Preferred	Accept	Target+	Min p a	Min p		Late			
CWH vm1 Coastal Western Hemlock – submontane	01	Ba Cw Hw Fd	Ss ³⁵ Yc	900	500	400	6	20	150	100	
	03	Cw Hw Fd		800	400	400	6	20	150	100	
	04	Cw Hw Fd	Ba Ss ³⁵ Yc	900	500	400	3	20	150	100	
	05	Hw Ba Cw Fd	Ss ³⁵ Yc	900	500	400	3	20	150	100	
	06	Ba Cw Hw	Fd Ss ³⁵ Yc	900	500	400	6	20	150	100	
	07	Hw Ba Cw	Fd Ss ³⁵ Yc	900	500	400	3	20	150	100	
	08	Hw Ba Cw	Ss ³⁵ Yc	900	500	400	3	20	150	100	

	35 risk of weevil damage +The target stocking standard is reduced by 100 stems/hectares for Douglas-fir stands									
	Minimum Characteristics of any leave trees including form, health and vigor: Mature Layer will have various forms, health and vigor ranging from high grade and value, to low grade and marginal marketability for the primary purposes of providing for wildlife habitat, features and to meet particular visual quality objectives. Immature Layer or advanced regen acceptable trees will be based on good form, no health issues, good growth potential.									
	* The stocking figures only relate to the immature/advanced regen layer but do not relate to the mature layer.									
	Free Growing Height Criteria (m)									
	Site Series		Fd	Hw	Cw	Ba	Ss	Yc		
03		2.0	2.0	1.0	-	-	-		Min inter-tree distance	2.0
01 04 05 06		3.0	3.0	1.5	1.75	3.0	1.5		Min-Max post spacing dens.	400-1,500
07 08		4.0	4.0	2.0	2.25	4.0	2.0			

BEC Variant	Site Series	Species		Stocking * (well-spaced/ha)			Regen Delay	Free Growing	Group 1 Brush Comp % over Ht	Group 2 Brush Comp % over Ht	Other Info	
		Preferred	Accept	Target+	Min p a	Min p		Late				
CWH vm2 Coastal Western Hemlock – montane very wet maritime	01	Ba Hw Yc Fd Cw	Ss ³⁵ Hm	900	500	400	6	20	150	100		
	03	Cw Hw Fd Yc	Ba Hm	800	400	400	6	20	150	100		
	04	Cw Hw Fd Yc	Ba Ss ³⁵ Hm	900	500	400	6	20	150	100		
	05	Ba Cw Hw Yc	Ss ³⁵ Fd Hm	900	500	400	3	20	150	100		
	06	Ba Cw Hw Yc	Ss Hm	900	500	400	6	20	150	100		
	07	Ba Cw Yc Hw	Ss ³⁵ Hm	900	500	400	3	20	150	100		
	08	Ba Cw Yc Hw	Ss ³⁵ Hm	900	500	400	3	20	150	100		
	09	Cw ¹ Hw ¹ Yc ¹	Hm ¹ Ba	800	400	400	3	20	150	100		
	1 on elevated microsites 35 risk of weevil damage +The target stocking standard is reduced by 100 stems/hectares for Douglas-fir stands											
	Minimum Characteristics of any leave trees including form, health and vigor: Mature Layer will have various forms, health and vigor ranging from high grade and value, to low grade and marginal marketability for the primary purposes of providing for wildlife habitat, features and to meet particular visual quality objectives. Immature Layer or advanced regen acceptable trees will be based on good form, no health issues, good growth potential.											
* The stocking figures only relate to the immature/advanced regen layer but do not relate to the mature layer.												
Free Growing Height Criteria (m)												
Site Series		Fd	Hw	Cw	Ba	Ss	Yc	Hm				
03 04 09		1.5	1.75	1.0	1.5	2.0	1.0	0.75	Min inter-tree distance	2.0		
01 05 06		2.25	2.5	1.5	1.75	3.0	1.5	1.5	Min-Max post spacing dens.	400-1,500		
07 08		-	3.5	2.0	2.25	4.0	2.0	1.5				

BEC Variant	Site Series	Species		Stocking * (well spaced/ha)			Regen Delay	Free Growing	Group 1 Brush Comp % over Ht	Group 2 Brush Comp% over Ht	Other Info	
		Preferred	Acceptable	Target +	Min p a	Min p		Late				
MHmm1 Mountain Hemlock – leeward moist maritime	01	Ba Hm Yc	Se Hw Cw	900	500	400	7	20	125	100		
	02	Hm Yc	Ba	800	400	400	4	20	125	100		
	03	Ba Hm Yc	Se Hw Cw	900	500	400	4	20	125	100		
	04	Ba Hm Yc	Se Hw Cw	900	500	400	7	20	125	100		
	05	Ba Yc Hm	Se Hw Cw	900	500	400	4	20	125	100		
	06	Hm ¹ Yc ¹ Ba		800	400	400	7	20	125	100		
	07	Ba ¹ Yc ¹ Hm		900	500	400	4	20	125	100		
	09	Yc ¹ Hm ¹		800	400	400	4	20	125	100		
	1 on elevated microsites											
	Minimum Characteristics of any leave trees including form, health and vigor: Mature Layer will have various forms, health and vigor ranging from high grade and value, to low grade and marginal marketability for the primary purposes of providing for wildlife habitat, features and to meet particular visual quality objectives. Immature Layer or advanced regen acceptable trees will be based on good form, no health issues, good growth potential.											
* The stocking figures only relate to the immature/advanced regen layer but do not relate to the mature layer.												
Free Growing Height Criteria (m)												
Site Series		Ba	Yc	Hm	Se	Hw	Cw					
02 06 07 09		0.6	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75		Minimum inter-tree distance			2.0	
01 03 04 05		0.6	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	Min-Max post spacing density (sph)			400-1,500	

Group 1 species include: Red Alder (Dr), Bigleaf Maple (Mb), Birch (Ep) and Cottonwood (Ac)

Group 2 species include: Cherry, Willow, Cascara, and miscellaneous (as per District agreement Dec 2, 1999, and excepting site series where conifers are not 'preferred'. Where Group 2 heights are similar to immediately adjacent crop trees, acceptable crop trees must be in good health and continue to out compete those deciduous species. Crop trees under performing will not be acceptable as FTG.)

Appendix 4: Referrals

ADVERTISING – AMENDMENT #1

Advertising was completed as follows:

- Advertised in the Mission City Record – 2 weeks

REFERRALS MADE – AMENDMENT #1

Allan Johnsrude, District Manager (Chilliwack), Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations

David Bennett, Fraser Valley Regional District, Chilliwack, BC

Chief Marilyn Gabriel, Tumia Knott, Kwantlen First Nation, Fort Langley, BC

Chief Alice McKay, Matsqui First Nation, Matsqui, BC

Sonny McHalsie, Sto:lo Nation, Chilliwack, BC

Clarence Pennier, Sto:lo Tribal Council, Agassiz, BC

Chief Dalton Silver, Sumas First Nation, Abbotsford, BC

Katzie First Nation, Pitt Meadows, BC

Sharie Conroy, Hatzic/Durieu/McConnell Creek Ratepayers Association, BC

Noreen Beauvais, Stave Lake Cabin Owners Association, BC

COMMENTS RECEIVED AND RESPONSES SENT BACK – AMENDMENT #1

1. Matsqui First Nation: Cynthia Collins sent an email (attached) dated July 5, 2011 with comments, and questions.

Kelly responded via letter and set up a meeting to have Cynthia come to review in the office and then take on a site tour on August 17. Ann Peter (MOFLNRO attended). A copy of the letter is attached.

2. Kwantlen First Nation: Brenda Fernie and Mike Bonshor came to a meeting at the District of Mission office on July 12, 2011. In attendance were Kevin Chisholm and Ann Peter.

A summary of the meeting notes is attached.

3. Fraser Valley Regional District: Copy of Staff Recommendation to the Board and response to District of Mission received September 14, 2011. A copy of both are attached. District response sent September 22, 2011.
4. Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations comments received August 4, 2011 and discussed in person on August 17, 2011 with Ann Peter.
5. One public telephone call was received and discussed with Kim Allan on a 'record of discussion form'. The party was advised to put comments in writing if interested in commenting further. No comments received. Copy of the ROD attached.
6. Call made to Shari Conroy to explain FSP amendments. Response on behalf of Hatzic Ratepayers Association received September 19, 2011. No District response considered at this time.
7. Paul Tataryn, Regional Manager – Recreation Sites and Trails BC responded on September 15, 2011 that the Deputy Ministry signed the establishment order for the

Mission Interpretive Forest Site, and that Paul would be establishing the legal objectives.

ADVERTISING - ORIGINAL

Advertising was completed as follows:

- A copy of an advertisement is attached, which was placed in the July 29, 2006 and August 12, 2006 editions of the Abbotsford News which is free of charge to all households in the Abbotsford/Mission area.
- Notification of the availability of the draft FSP was placed on the District of Mission's website. A link was provided to enable direct viewing of a .pdf copy of the text of the draft FSP.

REFERRALS MADE - ORIGINAL

Copies of initial referral letters dated July 28, 2006 (attached) regarding the initial draft FSP were sent to the following:

1. Kerry Grozier, District Manager (Chilliwack), Ministry of Forests and Range
2. Fraser Valley Regional District, Chilliwack, BC
3. Tumia Knott, Kwantlen First Nation, Fort Langley, BC
4. Chief Alice McKay, Matsqui First Nation, Matsqui, BC
5. Clem Seymour, Seabird Island Indian Band, Agassiz, BC
6. Chief Maureen Chapman, Skawahlook First Nation, Agassiz, BC
7. Sonny McHalsie, Sto:lo Nation, Chilliwack, BC
8. Clarence Pennier, Sto:lo Tribal Council, Agassiz, BC

A referral letter dated August 16, 2006 (attached) regarding the draft FSP was sent to the following:

- Gerald Owen: registered trap line in Mission TFL 26

Follow-up letters dated August 17, 2006 (attached) regarding the draft FSP were sent to the following six First Nations:

9. Tumia Knott, Kwantlen First Nation, Fort Langley, BC
10. Chief Alice McKay, Matsqui First Nation, Matsqui, BC
11. Clem Seymour, Seabird Island Indian Band, Agassiz, BC
12. Chief Maureen Chapman, Skawahlook First Nation, Agassiz, BC
13. Sonny McHalsie, Sto:lo Nation, Chilliwack, BC
14. Clarence Pennier, Sto:lo Tribal Council, Agassiz, BC

Follow-up faxes dated August 31, 2006 (attached) regarding the draft FSP were sent to the following six First Nations:

15. Tumia Knott, Kwantlen First Nation, Fort Langley, BC
16. Chief Alice McKay, Matsqui First Nation, Matsqui, BC
17. Clem Seymour, Seabird Island Indian Band, Agassiz, BC
18. Chief Maureen Chapman, Skawahlook First Nation, Agassiz, BC
19. Sonny McHalsie, Sto:lo Nation, Chilliwack, BC
20. Clarence Pennier, Sto:lo Tribal Council, Agassiz, BC

COMMENTS RECEIVED AND RESPONSES SENT BACK - ORIGINAL

1. Seabird Island Band: Garry Davidson, RFT sent an email (attached) dated September 1, 2006 on behalf of the Seabird Island Band saying that they were reviewing the FSP and that they planned on providing written comments within the comment period.

Note: No response was received within the comment period or up to the date of the submission of this version of the FSP.

2. Fraser Valley Regional District: A letter (attached) dated September 28, 2006 was sent by FVRD with their comments.

The District of Mission sent a response letter to FVRD (attached) dated October 2, 2006. No changes were required to the FSP as a result of the FVRD comments or reply.

3. Ministry of Forests and Range, Chilliwack Forest District: Review comments were received by the licensee by email on December 4, 2006. These review comments were the source of many of the changes made to the December 2006 version of the FSP compared to the October 2006 version.

4. Ministry of Forests and Range, Chilliwack Forest District: Review comments were received by the licensee by email on January 19, 2007. These review comments were the source of all the changes made to this version of the FSP compared to the December 2006 version.

Appendix 5: Revisions

Revisions to Amendment #1

Table 4 – Grizzly bear and spotted owl removed. Ministry of Environment changed to Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations.

Table 8 - Results and Strategies revised to read:

The licensee, when carrying out primary forest activities, will do so in a manner that is consistent with recommendations in a hydro-geomorphological assessment or watershed assessment as determined and prepared by a qualified professional.

Table 9a – Objectives as set by Government for Wildlife and Biodiversity – Landscape Level: removed ‘and to retain wildlife trees’ and placed as the objective for Table 9b

Table 9b – Objectives as set by Government for Wildlife and Biodiversity – Stand Level: removed ‘that resemble, both spatially and temporally, the patterns of natural disturbance that occur within the landscape; and’ and replaced with ‘that retain wildlife trees.’

Table 9b – Result or Strategy: An up-to-date analysis of the total percentage of rotational and long term reserves was completed in September and determined that we were just under 14% retained across the landscape. Therefore, we determined that it would be important to change the percentage retained to 13%, as Hatzic landscape unit OGMAs are still pending, and we are currently achieving just over 13%.

Adding the intent to maintain the minimum 13% for the length of the licence, and as the licence is replaced or renewed.

Added that the total area under long term and rotation reserves is to be retained as required under section FPPR Sec 66(3).

ORIGINAL FSP REVISIONS

Revisions from the July, 2006 FSP version to the October, 2006 FSP version:

1. *Dates were changed in several places to reflect October 2, 2006 rather than the previous July, 2006 date.*
2. *‘Section 8.0 Review and Referral’ is now completed.*
3. *‘Appendix 4: Referrals’ is now completed.*
4. *‘Appendix 5: Revisions’ has had the above added.*

Revisions from the October, 2006 FSP version to this December, 2006 FSP version:

Various revisions were made as a result of Ministry of Forests and Range review comments sent to the licensee by email on December 4, 2006.

Revisions from the December, 2006 FSP version to this January, 2007 FSP version:

A few revisions were made as a result of Ministry of Forests and Range review comments sent to the licensee by email on January 19, 2007.

Appendix 6: Visual Quality Objectives in TFL 26

VISUAL QUALITY OBJECTIVES IN TFL 26

Visual Sensitivity Unit #s on FSP Map	VSU #s To Reference to Original 1999 VLI *	Visual Quality Objective **	Comments
606	1000	PR	
596	1001	PR	
580	1002	PR	
578	1003	PR	
562	1004	PR	
526	1005	PR	
n/a	1006	n/a	This unit was deleted in the VLI.
535	1007	PR	
521	1008	PR	
515	1009	PR	
507	1010	PR	
508	1011	PR	
491	1012	PR	
457	1013	PR	
434	1014	PR	
433	1015	PR	
452	1016	PR	
502	1017	PR	
402	1018	PR	
400	1019	PR	
412	1020	PR	
431	1021	PR	
440	1022	PR	
510	1023	PR	
504	1024	PR	
506	1025	PR	
467	1026	PR	
389	1027	PR	
405	1028	PR	
505	1029	PR	
531	1030	M	
530	1031	M	
529	1032	PR	
581	1033	PR	
550	1034	M	
585	1035	PR	
601	1036	PR	
605	1037	M	
612	1038	M	
588	1039	M	
495	1040	M	
427	1041	M	

Note: the source of the Visual Sensitivity Unit boundaries is from the 1999 Visual Landscape Inventory for Mission TFL 26 completed by Geoscape Environmental Planners. * These are the Visual landscape Unit #s shown in the 1999 Visual Landscape Inventory. While they have no relevance to the FSP, they can be used to reference to corresponding units identified in the original VLI. **M = Modification** **PR = Partial Retention**