

Resource Stewardship Monitoring
District Status Report
2005 to 2007



Prepared by: Queen Charlotte Islands Forest District, Stewardship Section

This summer marked the third year for the Queen Charlotte Islands Forest District's (QCIFD) participation in the Forest & Range Evaluation Program (FREP). Our field season has grown from piloting the first evaluation protocols for *Fish/Riparian* and *Stand-Level Biodiversity* (SLB) values in 2005 to monitoring more than 30 cutblocks and 15 stream reaches this past summer (2007). Riparian and SLB assessments were mandatory for all 29 districts in the Province this year and we volunteered to carry out additional protocols developed for *Water Quality* and *Soils* as they made the transition from a pilot to an implementation phase. Our Stewardship team also assisted in the development and delivery of pilot protocols for *Cultural Heritage Resource*, *Karst Resource Features* and *Windthrow*.

The following table details our current involvement with FREP through routine assessment or *extensive* monitoring. It does not, however, account for *intensive* monitoring and special projects led by FREP specialists in or contracted out by the MoFR's Forest Practices Branch. Note that by 2010, it is expected that all protocols for resource values under FRPA will be in full implementation.

Resource Value		Scale	Lead Agency	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Biodiversity	Stand Level	Cutblock	MoFR & MoE	M	M	M	M	M
	Landscape Level	Landscape Unit	MoFR & MoE			P	V	V
Riparian	Reach	Reach	MoFR & MoE	M	M	M	M	M
	Fish Passage	Structure	MoFR & MoE		P	M	M	M
Water	Quality	Structure	MoFR & MoE	P	V	V	M	M
Soils	Stand Level	Cutblock	MoFR	P	V	V	M	M
	Landscape Level	Watershed	MoFR			P	V	V
Cultural Heritage		Cutblock	MoFR	P	P	M	M	M
Range		Pasture	MoFR		P	V	V	V
Resource Features		Cutblock	MoFR	P	V	V	V	V
Wildlife		WHA	MoE		P	P	M	M
		UWR	MoE		P	P	M	M
Visual Quality		Scenic Unit	MoFR		P	V	V	V
Timber	Partial Cut	Cutblock	MoFR			P	P	V
	Forest Health	Cutblock	MoFR			P	P	V
Recreation		Rec Site	MTSA	P	P	M	M	M

P = Pilot, Protocol Testing V = Protocol Completed, Voluntary Participation M = Mandatory Implementation

Results of Fieldwork

Fish/Riparian

Priority Question:

Are riparian forestry and range practices effective in maintaining the structural integrity and functions of stream ecosystems and other aquatic resource features over both short and long terms?



Status of Protocol:

Completed. Minor edits year to year based on assessors' feedback.

District Involvement:

Mandatory. We are funded to sample 15 randomly selected stream reaches each year.

Selection Criteria:

Stream reaches in or adjacent to randomly selected cutblocks. Adjacent is defined as a stream reach within 2 RMA widths of the block boundary for a distance equal to at least 30 channel widths. Stream reaches sampled are within or adjacent to openings listed in RESULTS with SP's signed or approved after June 15, 1997. Openings must have existed for 2 or more winters.

Indicators Assessed:

channel bed & bank disturbance	aquatic invertebrate diversity
large woody debris (LWD) processes & supply	windthrow frequency
channel morphology	riparian soil disturbance
aquatic connectivity	bank microclimate (shade)
fish cover diversity	disturbance-increaser plants
moss abundance / diversity	vegetation vigour, form and structure
fine sediments	

Results:

The following table shows the functioning status of streams sampled between 2005 and 2007.

Stream Class	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	Total
Properly Functioning	1	2	5	1	4	7	20 (40%)
Properly Functioning, But At Risk			2	3		6	11 (24%)
Properly Functioning, But At High Risk				2	1	5	8 (18%)
Non-Functioning						6	6 (13%)
Total	1 (2%)	2 (4%)	7 (16%)	6 (13%)	5 (11%)	24 (53%)	45

Interpretations:

It's important to note that 2005 was a pilot year and the first 10 stream reaches were sampled after limited training. Since then, Stewardship staff have participated in more than 23 mentoring and training days.

These results do represent a good cross-section of streams associated with development activity in the QCIFD under the Forest Practices Code over the last decade. S6 streams make up more than half (53%) of our sample set and represent a wide range of functioning conditions, with almost half of these (46% of S6 streams) functioning at high risk or non-functioning. For the most part, all higher order fish-bearing streams (S1-S3) were found to be properly functioning. Most of the S4 streams sampled (83%) were functioning, but had various levels of risk associated.

Predominant disturbance factors observed in the field were windthrow in RMA's, increased sedimentation due to roadbuilding and an excess of in-stream debris accumulations impacting riparian function.

Opportunities:

The Forest & Range Evaluation Program has developed and is currently piloting a protocol that monitors the impacts of road building on fish passage. It is expected that our team will be actively monitoring for this value by the 2009 field season.

The Fish/Riparian protocol has been field tested extensively and data collected in 29 districts has been analyzed at the Provincial level. Reports on stream function and causal factors are available online via the FREP Information Management System. Our Stewardship team is comfortable completing these assessments in the field which presents a potential opportunity to begin targeted monitoring in higher risk watersheds or operating areas in the QCIFD. This will allow the DDM to make more informed determinations on future FSP submissions and it has the potential to foster progressive dialogue between prescribing and reviewing forest professionals.

Stand Level Biodiversity

Priority Question:

Is stand-level retention providing the range of habitat with the structural attributes understood as necessary for maintaining the species dependent on wildlife trees and CWD?



Status of Protocol:

Completed. Minor edits year to year based on assessors' feedback.

District Involvement:

Mandatory. We are funded to sample 15 randomly selected cutblocks each year.

Selection Criteria:

Cutblocks must be greater than 2 ha in size. Cutblocks sampled are openings listed in RESULTS with SP's signed or approved after June 15, 1997. Openings must have existed for 2 or more winters.

Indicators Assessed:

tree species / size	amount & type of coarse woody debris (CWD)
Wildlife tree class	amount of windthrow
invasive plants	harvesting constraints
ecological attributes used to anchor retention	

Results:

FREP analyzed data collected for each district in the Province that had completed greater than 20 samples in the first two field seasons. There were a total of 22 cutblocks sampled in 2005 and 2006 in the QCIFD. Approximately 107.5 ha out 493.2 ha (TAUP) (22%) was left as patch retention in these blocks. There was an average of 1.4 ecological anchors found per ha of patch retention. Windthrow in patch reserves was on average 13%.

The following table compares the average values of data for various indicators collected in district to baseline data derived from BCTS cruise compilations in similar BEC subzones.

Indicator	Cruise Mean	FREP Patch Reserve Mean	FREP Harvest Area Mean
Snags (dbh>30cm, Ht>10m)	55.17 pieces/ha	23.71 pieces/ha	
Large Trees (dbh>70cm)	60.17 trees/ha	31.76 trees/ha	
Tree Species Diversity	4 species	3 species	
Volume of CWD		518 m ³ /ha	360 m ³ /ha
Large CWD (pieces > 10m)		94 pieces/ha	20 pieces/ha

Interpretations:

Though these results are derived from a limited sample set, we can see evidence of some basic trends when comparing pre and post-harvest stand-level biodiversity indicators. Generally the diversity of leave trees and the densities of functional snags and large trees are higher in the cruise data as opposed to the data collected in patch reserves during our assessments. There

was no significant statistical difference between total volume of CWD in the patch reserves versus the harvest areas, but there was considerable difference between densities of large CWD pieces found in these areas.

Opportunities:

Analysis to date is preliminary. A more meaningful examination can take place with a higher sample size, and through comparisons with baseline information derived from local cruise data. It is anticipated that by 2008 or 2009, FREP will report out on this data and interpret how it relates to habitat for wildlife tree and CWD dependent species. As previously mentioned, the Stewardship team has three years experience in implementing this protocol, and there may be an opportunity to begin targeted monitoring of this resource value.

FREP is also currently developing a protocol that will monitor the cumulative impacts of forest development (i.e., harvesting and road building) on biodiversity at the landscape level. It is expected that our team will be actively monitoring for this value by the 2010 field season.

Water Quality

Priority Questions:

Do forest practices contribute to sedimentation or turbidity that interferes with water treatment, increases treatment costs, or damages the intake? Are forest practices effective in protecting water quality? Are forest and range practices increasing the risk of drinking water health hazards?



Status of Protocol:

Completed. Minor edits year to year based on assessors' feedback.

District Involvement:

Voluntary. We were funded to sample 10 randomly selected sample sites (cutblock and associated roads) each field season for the last two years. We anticipate the same opportunity in 2008, but recent cutblocks may be limited as logging in 2005 was impacted by the blockade.

Selection Criteria:

Sample sites are associated with randomly generated openings from FTA and must be less than 2 years old as sediment introduction to watercourses is generally more evident and abundant in the months following disturbance.

Indicators Assessed:

Turbidity is used as a proxy indicator to assess relative water quality. Turbidity is a function of the following variables that are measured in situ.

connectivity between natural and artificial drainages	proportion of fine sediment in erodible material
volume of fine sediment in mass wasting event	total surface area of erodible components

Results:

The table below outlines data collected at approximately 100 samples sites in 13 locations over the last two field seasons (2006, 2007). Sites sampled fell within one of five categories of impact based on their total fine sediment contribution.

Rating of Total Fine Sediment Contribution					
Rating	Low ($<1m^3$)	Mod (1 to $5m^3$)	High (5 to $20m^3$)	Very High ($20-50m^3$)	Extreme ($>50m^3$)
# of Sites Sampled	86 (89%)	9 (9%)		2 (2%)	

Interpretations:

The water quality results are fairly self-explanatory. Recent road building practices and in block development near riparian areas sampled has predominantly resulted in a low contribution of fine sediment to streams we observed. Mass-wasting events (small slumps) have resulted in very high contributions in only two sites out of 97 (2%).

Opportunities:

Since road building and the impacts of access construction on water quality are frequently under scrutiny during and after development, this protocol has been a useful tool in quantifying the magnitude of this impact. Some licensees in our district have shown interest in using this protocol to fit their local operating procedures as it is eligible for FIA funding.

Soils

Priority Questions:

Do access structures have the least possible impact on productive soil loss and hydrologic function of the soil?
Are forest practices resulting in levels of site disturbance detrimental to soil productivity and hydrologic function?



Status of Protocol:

Completed. Minor edits year to year based on assessors' feedback.

District Involvement:

Voluntary. We will be funded to assess 5 randomly selected sample sites (cutblock and associated roads) in the 2008 field season. Training and office prep for these samples will occur over the 2007/08 winter months. This is the first year of involvement for our district.

Selection Criteria:

Sample sites are associated with randomly generated openings from FTA and must be less than 2 years old. Stratification of these cutblocks is performed to focus on areas with higher soil sensitivity and with summer operations.

Indicators Assessed:

loss of productivity due to access construction	dispersed soil disturbance in the net area to be reforested
in-block area affected by slides, drainage diversion or significant erosion	green tree retention
in-block area affected by disturbance resulting in water accumulations	organic matter retention

Progress:

Five cutblocks were selected through the criteria outlined above and high resolution airphotos (10 cm res.) were taken of these areas during the past field season. Pictures for each cutblock were pieced together in photomosaics and these areas will be analyzed with OziExplorer throughout the winter. Training on this analysis occurred in November of 2007.

Analysis will delineate areas of permanent access, inordinate disturbance, rehabilitated structures, slides and active erosion. These polygons will be ground-truthed in the 2008 field season.

Interpretations:

Results derived through office and field assessment will be used to complete soils checklists for each cutblock. Each checklist will present a picture of how forest practices maintained soil productivity and hydrologic function in the associated cutblocks. It should be noted that all five samples selected for assessment fall within areas using high retention (single tree select) silviculture systems. It is anticipated that there will minimal soil impacts in these blocks.

Opportunities:

One of the most significant ancillary benefits of being involved in this assessment is being introduced to OziExplorer and OziExplorerCE. With recent orthophotos downloaded onto a handheld unit with a GPS receiver, we are able to navigate in-block with much greater precision than before. The implications of using this technology for all of the FREP protocols may translate into greater efficiency in data collection, increased safety and enhanced ability to perform quality assurance.

Developing Protocols

Resources Features (Karst)



Priority Question:

Are current forest practices adequately protecting and maintaining the structure, function and ecological integrity of the surface and subsurface elements of a karst system?

Status of Protocol:

In Progress. Complete version expected in January 2008. Checklists complete.

District Involvement:

Voluntary. We have been funded to assist in the development and field testing of this protocol. It is anticipated that this protocol will switch from the pilot to implementation phase by the 2008 field season. We will have funding for 5 cutblocks to be sampled. Sub-stratification of Karst Sample Units (KSU's) will occur in cutblocks without Karst Field Assessments that are intersected by karst inventory mapping

Selection Criteria:

Cutblocks must be greater than 2 ha in size. Cutblocks sampled are openings listed in FTA with SP's signed or approved after June 15, 1997. Openings must have existed for 2 or more winters.

Indicators Assessed:

removal of forest cover	post-harvest windthrow
reduction of shade	introduced debris (slash or road material)
soil disturbance	burning
change to lower plant community	

Progress:

This protocol has been through numerous iterations and our district has been closely involved in its development and testing. The five cutblocks tested in 2006 were completed with the assistance of the FREP Resource Value Team for Karst Resource Features. Though data was collected it was only used to inform the team on the utility of the protocol in the field. Below is a brief timeline on our involvement with this protocol to date:

Date	Activity	Location	Number of Days	Number of QCIFD Staff Involved
June 2006	Protocol Training with Licensees	Queen Charlotte	2	3
August 2006	Protocol Training with HHFG	Queen Charlotte	1	2
August 2006	Pilot Testing of Protocol	Queen Charlotte	2	2
December 2006	Protocol Development	Richmond	1	1
February 2007	Status Update (CI Session)	Victoria	2	1
June 2007	Protocol Development/Testing	Campbell River	3	1
October 2007	Protocol Training Workshop	Quadra Island	2	1
Jan/Feb 2007	Pilot Testing of revised Protocol	Queen Charlotte	2	2

Opportunities:

As the first jurisdiction in Canada to protect karst as a resource feature, this district has placed a significant emphasis on the protection of this value. This has been a major driver of our involvement with this protocol to date. Little is known about the management thresholds for karst features and this has been the one of the impediments to the completion of a final product thus far.

There is also potential for C&E to use this protocol (or its results) in observance of s.70(1) of the *Forest Planning & Practice Regulation* under FRPA as "structure and function" may be correlated to "damage and effectiveness" of surface and subsurface karst elements.

Cultural Heritage Resources



Priority Question:

Are cultural heritage resources being conserved and where necessary protected for First Nations cultural and traditional activities as a result of forest practices?

Status of Protocol:

Process Indicators - In Progress. Interview protocols have been developed and are being piloted in 2008, with the intent of province-wide implementation in 2008-2009.

Outcome Indicators - In Progress. Dialogue with participating First Nations in pilot protocol is ongoing. Checklists will be developed for site-level cultural features, while other approaches (e.g., GIS analysis, predictive modelling) will be piloted to evaluate landscape scale cultural concerns (e.g., *protection of culturally significant ecosystems, wildlife management, etc.*)

District Involvement:

Voluntary. Stewardship staff and District Aboriginal Liaison have been funded to assist in the development and field testing of this protocol. Participation by the Haida Nation has been variable subject to shifting priorities and availability.

Selection Criteria:

Process Indicators - The pilot sample includes First Nations, industry, BCTS, and MFR interview respondents. Respondents were selected on a targeted basis for this pilot phase, but different selection criteria will be used in future stages of the project.

Outcome indicators: to be determined.

Potential Indicators to be Assessed:

Pilot Process Indicators
Meaningful First Nations participation in forest management planning, prior to forest stewardship plan (FSP) approval, under the <i>Forest and Range Practices Act (FRPA)</i> .
Clear and effective communication of cultural heritage resource information during post-FSP planning and implementation between First Nations, forestry proponents and government staff.
Technical, logistical and cross-cultural capacity exists to enable informed and meaningful engagement in forest management planning and decision-making affecting cultural heritage resources.
Strategic, operational and site level management plans meaningfully incorporate the conservation or protection of Aboriginal cultural heritage values and resources.
Potential Outcome Indicators
cultural trails/trail networks
culturally significant plants
riparian forest ecosystems
buffers around cultural features
spiritual/sacred sites
archaeological sites

Progress:

Developing a Provincial protocol to monitor Cultural Heritage Resources for more than 100 First Nations is a daunting task to say the least. The coordinator of this project realized that a checklist or protocol that was developed without the assistance of local First Nations would not be widely accepted. Partnerships have been developed with 6 First Nations across the Province, and the team will continue to involve First Nations in every aspect of the program's development.

A Process Indicator framework has been jointly developed by a First Nations-government working group, and is being evaluated using information collected through a series of pilot interviews in

January 2008. Modifications to the framework and interview questionnaires will be incorporated, and a final pilot report completed in March 2008.¹

The outcome or field-based monitoring component of this program is still under development. A checklist that will focus on evaluating the management of site-specific cultural features is being developed with the First Nations partners. A joint research project has been initiated with the Center for Non-Timber Resources at Royal Roads University to develop field protocols for cultural plant inventories and future predictive modelling.

The Haida Nation was invited to be a pilot First Nation in this project due to their political leadership and potential capacity. Though the Haida Heritage & Forest Guardians (HHFG) have identified an interest in being responsible for the monitoring of values under FRPA, they have been hesitant to throw their full support behind this project.

The following table summarizes the involvement of the Haida Nation in the pilot project to date.

Date	Activity	Location	Number of Days	Number of QCIFD Staff Involved
December 2006	CHN Invitation to Participate	<i>n/a</i>		
March 2007	District Dialogue Session	Masset	1	3
March 2007	Haida representation at Provincial Dialogue Session	Victoria	2	2
June 2007	Process Indicators WG Meeting (conference call)	Vancouver		
August 2007	HHFG Intro to SLB/Rip Assessment (field visit)	QCI – various locations	3	3
September 2007	Conference Call to Discuss Participation	<i>n/a</i>	1	1
December 2007	CHN Invitation to Participate – Process Interviews	<i>n/a</i>		
January 2008	Interview Skills Training & CHN Interviews (no participation)	Richmond	1	0

Opportunities:

This tenuous involvement of the HHFG has made for a difficult and complicated process in the coordination of this pilot. The coordinator has indicated that she will continue to solicit input from the Haida Nation, but ultimately needs to continue with the project as many other pilot First Nations are ready to move forward.

Resource stewardship monitoring presents a unique opportunity to have our district and the Haida Nation work collaboratively at an operational level. FREP is open to the idea of training HHFG's to assist in data collection of all of the resource values we monitor, and funding has been secured to support this involvement throughout 2008 through the creation of an auxiliary position. Whether this is considered a priority by the HHFG is unclear at present, but the opportunity will be presented to the Haida Nation for consideration.

¹ The Process Indicator Framework and interview questionnaires can be accessed on the FREP website.

Windthrow



Priority Question:

To determine if post harvest wind throw is affecting the resource values being protected and/or managed under FRPA?

Sub-questions:

- *Are forest management practices effective at reducing the severity and consequences of wind throw to acceptable levels?*
- *Is post harvest stand structure meeting the structural conditions required to conserve or protect identified resource values?*
- *What levels of wind throw are acceptable from biological (biodiversity, forest health etc.), social and economic perspectives?*
- *Are the desired resource values (i.e. wildlife values, cultural values, karst features, riparian values) being protected?*

Status of Protocol:

In Development. QCIFD is one of three districts that has been asked by FREP to participate in the development of a protocol that will assess the impacts of intervention-driven windthrow on FRPA values.

District Involvement:

Voluntary. Our district may act as a co-lead on this project.

Selection Criteria:

Not defined

Potential Indicators to be Assessed:

soil properties	safety
species silvics	reforestation
volume	economics
terrain characteristics	treatment history
stand structure	size/shape of patch reserves
forest health	

Progress:

This protocol and checklist are basically in the initial scoping stages. Our district has participated in several conference calls and we have committed to one face-to-face meeting per year with the Windthrow Working Group. Discussion so far has centered around specifying a measurable priority question and deliberating whether or not a site-level checklist should exist as a stand alone protocol or as an extra card that accompanies existing protocols. The Working Group is also looking into the best way to integrate a landscape level assessment of windthrow into the FREP program.

Opportunities:

The QCIFD has been actively involved in local monitoring of windthrow to identify its impact on revenue, salvage and identified resource values. This information has been used to inform the District Manager's determinations and has assisted in professional dialogue between government and industry. Assessment on local cutblocks to date has been predominantly qualitative with aerial reccis, Google Earth and site-level visits with licensees. This has been productive, but empirical data from a protocol designed with expert advice and scientific rigor is fundamental. This has been a major driver of our Stewardship section's involvement with the development of a FREP protocol to assess windthrow impacts at site and landscape levels.

Other District Involvement in FREP

Current Involvement:

Besides routine assessment and development of the protocols above, our Stewardship section is involved in several other activities related to FREP. The following is a list of these initiatives:

- **FREP IMS:** The FREP Information Management System is an online database that stores the results of every checklist we fill out when assessing any given cutblock. It is also able to create reports based on these results. Data entry by districts this year was voluntary, but it is expected to be mandatory in the future. Our district entered data recorded this year on 30 checklists for Fish/Riparian and Stand Level Biodiversity values.
- **Quality Assurance:** This was the first field season that our district had a FREP auditor come to review our fieldwork. We assisted in logistics and planning, but for the most part the auditor worked alone reassessing randomly selected cutblocks (Stand-Level Biodiversity) and stream reaches (Fish/Riparian) from the 2007 field season. For the most part, feedback was positive with the auditor coming to the same assessment conclusions as our field team. Some concerns that were brought to our attention were:
 - o Biodiversity: missed pieces of coarse woody debris on transects, missed trees in prism plots
 - o Riparian: misclassification of streams, misunderstandings with large woody debris processesQuality assurance helps us improve the accuracy of our fieldwork and will ultimately help resource value team leads decide where to place more emphasis in future training.
- **Quality Management Team:** A district representative has been asked to sit on the FREP QMT to assist in the development and delivery of quality assessment in the program. Commitment to this initiative entails participation in regular conference calls and assistance in the production and review of quality control protocols.
- **Continuous Improvement:** At the end of February each year FREP holds their annual CI Workshop in Victoria. This usually runs for 2 days and provides an opportunity for various districts to network with each other and with team leads from the Forest Practices Branch. Depending on our involvement with developing protocols, we are sometimes required to present to the group an outline of work completed over the past year. We typically send 2 to 3 individuals to this workshop.
- **Training:** Every spring in May and June FREP holds introductory and refresher training in various locations throughout the Province for the resource protocols being implemented in that field season. We have typically sent 2 to 4 individuals to Campbell River for a period of 3 days each year.

Future Opportunities:

As the Forest and Range Evaluation Project grows there will be additional responsibilities and opportunities for the Stewardship section in the QCIFD to contribute. The following list outlines where some of these may exist:

- **New Resource Protocols:** Currently we are mandated to implement 2 protocols and we have volunteered to implement another 3. By 2010, we will be required to implement 6 protocols on an annual basis with another 6 being optional from year to year.
- **Assisting Other Districts:** With ample preparation and successful field days we were able to complete our 2007 field season by early August. Other districts have expressed a desire to have some assistance mid-season. There may be a potential in future years to travel to neighboring districts like North Coast and Kalum to help complete assessment targets.

- **Capacity Building:** As mentioned earlier, we believe an important step in collaborative work with the Haida Nation will be made with the available funding for contracting or hiring a Forest Guardian for the upcoming FREP field season (2008)
- **Targeted Monitoring:** There is an excellent opportunity for assessment of FSP blocks to occur prior to the next round of FSP submissions. The results of these assessments would be useful to both DDM's and prescribing professionals.
- **Intra-District Initiatives:** As evident with the Windthrow Project, the Karst Pilot and the Water Quality checklist, there is a great opportunity to use FREP to achieve other in-house program needs especially in the Tenures and Compliance & Enforcement program areas.
- **SLUA: Strategic Land Use Agreement (SLUA):** A significant component of the newly signed SLUA for Haida Gwaii will be the development of monitoring protocols for newly established objectives. There is excellent potential for FREP to inform these processes.
- **Stakeholder Awareness:** This report is one of several initiatives implemented by our districts Stewardship team to bring the process and results of our monitoring to industry, First Nations and the public. For the last three years we have presented updates of our field seasons at the district all-licensee meetings, our local Network of Forest Professionals showcased the SLB and Riparian protocols on a field trip in 2006 and last summer we staffed a booth at the local fall fair to explain how our fieldwork can result in change at the operational level of management in our district. Both the CHN Haida Heritage & Forest Guardians and Junior Stewardship Rangers (summer students) participated in overview and data collection during our 2007 field season.

Conclusion

This has been a brief look at the results of our district's involvement in the Forest & Range Evaluation Program over the last three years. Much of the information we collect will eventually be rolled up into higher level reports from Victoria that will present results by region, by Province or by BEC zone. The QCIFD, however, will continue to look at our results under a district lens to inform local decision-makers in government and industry.

Some of these protocols are collecting information that predates our current legislation to provide a Forest Practices "Code benchmark" from which to compare FRPA samples against. This is expected to shift once a viable sample size of FPC samples have been collected.

As the sample size of the completed checklists increase in the future, we will be able to place more weight on these results and analyses. The quality of the data collected will also improve as we gain more experience with these assessment protocols in the field. Data quality continues to be a priority under this Program as evident through annual protocol training of district staff, mentoring visits by resource value team leads, quality assurance and checklist validation for completeness and accuracy before the data entry into the FREP IMS. In 2007, FREP became the first government program in BC to be certified by the National Quality Institute.

For more detailed information on the Forest & Range Evaluation Program and the protocols developed to monitor the resource values under FRPA, check out the Provincial website at: <http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hfp/frep/>.

For more information on district involvement with resource stewardship monitoring or for clarification of results, please contact Sean Muise, Stewardship Forester at (250) 559-6258 or sean.muise@gov.bc.ca.