



Sea-to-Sky LRMP

Land and Resource Management Plan

Coordinated Access Management Plan



May 2009



Sea-to-Sky Coordinated Access Management Plan

The Sea-to-Sky Coordinated Access Management Plan was approved by the following agencies at the South Coast Management Committee meeting in May, 2009:

Ministry of Forests and Range
Ministry of Environment
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and the Arts
Ministry of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources
Ministry of Agriculture and Lands, Integrated Land Management Bureau

The Coordinated Access Management Plan was prepared by:

Greg Rowe, RPF
Rowe Forest Management Ltd.,
264 Sunningdale Road E.,
Qualicum Beach, B.C.
V9K 1L3
Office: 250-752-3591

Final Editing of the Coordinated Access Management Plan and the preparation of Appendix 4 was completed by Frank DeGagne.

For more information, please contact:

Frank DeGagne, RPF
Land & Resource Specialist
Regional Operations Division - Coast
Integrated Land Management Bureau
Suite 200, 10428 153rd Street,
Surrey, B.C.
V3R 1E1
(604) 586-4400
<http://ilmbwww.gov.bc.ca/slrp/lrmp/surrey/s2s/index.html>

Cover Photograph by Graham Osborne
Used with Permission

Table of contents

Executive summary	4
1.0 Introduction	5
1.1 The Sea-to-Sky Land and Resource Management Plan	6
1.2 History of access management planning	6
1.3 Current policy framework for access management planning	7
1.4 Purpose, objectives, and scope of the plan	7
2.0 Background	9
2.1 Other planning processes	9
2.2 Road administration and responsibilities	11
2.3 History of access management in the Squamish Forest District	17
3.0 Description of plan process	17
3.1 General direction from LRMP	18
3.2 Consultation process	18
4.0 Management Direction	19
4.1 Access management direction from the S2SLRMP	19
4.2 Access management implementation - factors considered and approaches used in making access related decisions	20
4.2.1 Implementing access controls	20
4.2.2 Existing Forest Service Roads and non-industrial (recreational) access.....	21
4.2.3 Constructing new access or reopening existing closed, deactivated, or impassable roads	23
4.3 Access control options and tools	23
4.4 Description of access objectives.	25
4.4.1 Access control for access sensitive areas	39
4.4.2 Existing Forest Service Roads and non-industrial (recreational) access.....	39
4.4.3 Future road access adjacent to access sensitive areas	40
4.5 Public communication and information strategy	40
4.6 Implementation of the CAMP	41
5.0 References:	41
6.0 Appendices	43
Appendix 1 – List of Acronyms used.....	43
Appendix 2 – Summary of consultation.....	44
Appendix 3 – Summary of access-sensitive areas, present access conditions, access related values and considerations.....	49
Appendix 4. Access Control Points: Spring Closures.....	57
7.0 Coordinated Access Management Plan Map	60

Executive summary

Access management was identified as a major issue in the Sea-to-Sky area by the Sea-to-Sky Land and Resource Management Plan (S2SLRMP). The S2SLRMP recommended that this issue be addressed by completing a Coordinated Access Management Plan (CAMP). The major access related issues in the plan area include managing the use of existing road access to access-sensitive areas, maintaining road access to important recreation resources, and managing future access to access-sensitive areas.

The CAMP is primarily directed at cars and trucks using the road surface, while recognizing that snow mobiles or all terrain vehicles comprise an additional proportion of traffic on roads. The CAMP is intended to address access issues primarily at the strategic level, while providing a link to the operational level, and should assist government agencies in decision making related to access and provide direction to forest licensees and other licensed road users.

Aboriginal rights receive protection under Section 35(1) of the Constitution Act (1982) and the management direction in the plan will not be interpreted or applied in a way that will limit the exercise of aboriginal rights.

The S2SLRMP provided direction on access management which was used as the starting point for the CAMP. This direction included a zoning exercise which created four resource management zones. Only one of these (all resource uses permitted) is intended to allow roads although there are exceptions for particular circumstances in some of the other zones. The LRMP also provided direction on the location of access control points to control access to grizzly bear habitat at certain times of the year.

The CAMP provides a mechanism for public and stakeholder access concerns to be considered by government decision makers along with budgets and technical factors when decisions are being made with respect to road maintenance or deactivation.

The CAMP suggests access control points for a total of 11 areas for spring or fall closures in order to minimize displacement and mortality of grizzly bears. Two other access control points are suggested for year round closures to protect core grizzly bear areas. The CAMP identifies approximately 15 non-industrial recreation use Forest Service Roads (FSR's) as maintenance priorities.

1.0 Introduction

Roaded access can be both beneficial and detrimental to society depending on the perspective and the values being considered. Roads allow industrial users to extract resources, commercial tourism operators to get their clients to the desired areas, and recreationalists to get to campsites and trailheads. However, this roaded access can also bring people and noise to important wildlife habitat which can result in the wildlife abandoning habitat which may be critical to their survival. Roaded access can also create issues with motorized vehicle access to alpine areas, parks, or other sensitive areas. For these reasons, roaded access may need to be controlled or eliminated in some areas or at certain times of the year where wildlife is at risk (from road-induced mortality), or a particular non-motorized recreational activity is at risk. The completion of an access management plan that considers access sensitive resource values, solicits input from stakeholders, and attempts to provide balanced direction for access management is an important step in the process of managing access. Access controls can take a variety of forms including permanent road deactivation and rehabilitation, temporary or permanent removal of bridges, installation of gates or barriers, use of aerial access as an alternative to building roads, posting of signs, educational programs, and appropriate enforcement.

The main types of road access issues in the Sea-to-Sky area are:

- Managing or restricting existing road access to access-sensitive areas. A number of access sensitive areas were identified through the Sea-to-Sky Land and Resource Management Plan (S2SLRMP) process;
- Maintaining road access to important recreation resources on some existing roads, that although originally constructed for an industrial use (in most cases logging), no longer have an industrial use, and consequently do not have an industrial user responsible for maintenance. This is largely a matter of reconciling public desires for recreational access with an ageing road infrastructure, limited funds for maintenance and repair, and concerns about public safety and liability.
- Managing access along potential future industrial roads that may be constructed (or the re-opening of existing impassable or deactivated roads) close to access-sensitive areas.

The CAMP applies to the entire S2SLRMP area. The S2SLRMP includes an area of approximately 1,091,00000 ha located north of Greater Vancouver comprised of two main watersheds; the Squamish River and the Lillooet River. Approximately 22% of the area is included in parks (Garibaldi is the largest). The plan area coincides with the Squamish Forest District. There are three larger communities in the plan area, Squamish, Whistler, and Pemberton, as well as numerous smaller communities.

Aboriginal people live throughout the plan area. There are seven First Nations who have reserve lands and asserted traditional territory in the S2SLRMP area: the Squamish, Lil'Wat (Mount Currie), Tsleil-Waututh, Stó:lō, Musqueam, N'Quatqua, Samahquam, Douglas, and Skatin First Nations. The Samahquam, Douglas, and Skatin are encompassed by the In-SHUCK-ch First Nation.

The plan area also attracts large numbers of visitors from population centers in the Lower Mainland and around the world.

1.1 The Sea-to-Sky Land and Resource Management Plan

The Sea-to-Sky Land and Resource Management Plan (S2SLRMP) was developed through a collaborative process between provincial natural resource agencies, local government officials, and members of the public (the Planning Forum). First Nations were not part of the public process. A draft of the S2SLRMP was produced for public consultation in April of 2006. Subsequent drafts (Version 14, December 2007) have also been referenced in the preparation of this CAMP. The S2SLRMP has now been approved by the provincial cabinet. First Nations interests are being addressed through “government to government” discussions, resulting in three land use agreements.

The S2SLRMP recommends that a Coordinated Access Management Plan (CAMP) be initiated to identify access management controls in sensitive areas to protect specific values (e.g. grizzly bears, recreation). The S2SLRMP included a number of access related objectives and management recommendations that were used as a starting point for this plan. The following objective was included as resource management direction for access in the S2SLRMP:

- To coordinate access requirements among multiple resource users in order to ensure adequate access to the land base while minimizing impacts to other resource values (e.g. wildlife).

The S2SLRMP also included implementation direction relating to access. This is referenced in Section 4.1 of this document.

1.2 History of access management planning

The CAMP process was originally developed by the B.C. Ministry of Forests during the early 1980’s. It was initially designed as a procedure for planning and managing access in areas with historic patterns of use through a multi party forum. The Ministry of Forests document “A Guide to Coordinated Access Management Planning” (Integrated Resources Branch, January 1989) describes the general process for developing a CAMP.

Prior to the 1995 introduction of the Forest Practices Code of BC Act (the Code), some Forest Districts engaged in voluntary coordinated access management planning, which produced district plans that addressed access issues. The Code required forest licensees to include an access management plan with the Forest Development Plan (FDP). This provided a tool for planning and an opportunity for public consultation on road access issues. In 1997 the Code was streamlined and access management plans were no longer required. However, it was still required to show proposed new roads and deactivation plans for existing roads on FDPs. The Forest and Range

Practices Act (FRPA) which replaced the Code has no requirement to show either the proposed location of new roads or deactivation plans for existing roads on Forest Stewardship Plans (FSPs).

1.3 Current policy framework for access management planning

As noted above access management is no longer directly addressed by forest licensee plans. It can be addressed through strategic land use plans, sustainable resource management plans or coordinated access management plans.

Strategic land use plans (e.g. S2SLRMP) can provide high level strategic direction for access management within areas available for resource development. Sustainable resource management plans (SRMPs) can refine and augment LRMP level direction on access management issues by providing landscape level objectives that are more site specific.

Legal implementation of access objectives can take place under section 93.4 of the Land Act and the Land Use Objectives Regulation. This creates objectives that are implemented through the FRPA. These objectives must subsequently be addressed by forest licensees in their Forest Stewardship Plans.

Alternatively the access objectives from the CAMP can simply be endorsed by government agencies and while they would then have no legal standing they can be used as policy guidance by government. This route would not create legal objectives to be implemented through the FRPA however.

There are also a number of elements of legislation, regulations, and Ministry of Forests and Range policy that provide direction for the management of resource roads and therefore are pertinent to access management planning. These are discussed in section 2.2.

The Ministry of Forests and Range (MFR) has responsibility for management of some categories of resource roads (primarily Forest Service Roads and roads with Road Permits). The CAMP can provide direction that can be considered by the MFR along with other factors in making management decisions regarding these roads.

There is new legislation pending called the *Resource Road Act* (Bill 30 – 2008). The *Resource Road Act* is meant to be a comprehensive piece of legislation to govern all resource roads in the province. It will establish the Resource Road Authority, which will grant permits for road construction and usage to parties who have obtained resource exploration and development permits. It will also set out rules governing the use and discontinuation of resource roads, and provide powers to create regulations.

1.4 Purpose, objectives, and scope of the plan

The Sea-to-Sky Land and Resource Management Plan (S2SLRMP) recommended that a Coordinated Access Management Plan (CAMP) be developed in order to coordinate access

requirements among multiple resource users and to minimize impacts to the land base and resource values.

The plan is intended to result in long-term benefits including protection of sensitive resource values, improved access to recreation values, and certainty for industrial access requirements.

The CAMP is intended to:

- address access issues primarily at the strategic level, while providing a link to the operational level;
- act as a tool for public information on access issues;
- assist government agencies in decision making related to access;
- provide direction to forest licensees.

The scope of the CAMP is defined as follows:

- The CAMP will address issues related to motorized access on industrial roads, with the primary focus being on the existing road network;
- The plan will identify access controls to limit public vehicular traffic; it is generally not intended to impact public access using non-vehicular (e.g. foot, bicycle, etc.). It is primarily directed at cars and trucks using the road surface, and while some of the access control measures may also limit access to all terrain vehicles (ATV's) and snowmobiles it is not intended as a motorized/non motorized recreation zoning exercise. Some of the CAMP direction (e.g. with respect to future road development near access sensitive areas) is aimed at avoiding the creation of easy access routes for ATV's and snowmobiles to access sensitive areas (particularly Provincial Parks).
- It is not intended to be a comprehensive listing of all existing roads; rather it is focused primarily at the level of main access to moderate sized and larger watersheds. These are generally 5,000 ha and larger although there are some exceptions where particular access issues have been identified in smaller drainages.
- Boat access is not within the scope of the plan although launching can be influenced by controlling vehicle use of roads.
- Aerial access is not within the scope of the plan. This is a federal responsibility.
- The CAMP is directed primarily at managing access (e.g. use of roads) and is not focused on identifying or addressing the environmental impacts of older roads.
- The degree of stakeholder and First Nations involvement in the CAMP has been limited to consultation, input to and review of draft documents, as opposed to a stakeholder forum as was often done in other CAMP processes. This was done both due to the direction provided to the CAMP by the stakeholder forum based LRMP process and the desire to complete the project within a timeline identified for the implementation of the LRMP.
- The CAMP is intended to provide direction to those responsible for resource roads (government agencies and licensees). In cases where the direction is to restrict access it is expected that those responsible will make reasonable efforts to meet the stated objective. History shows that some users will find a way to get around many access structures. One hundred percent success in preventing access is not a reasonable goal.

- The plan applies only to land and resources administered by the Crown in right of the province and does not apply to federally administered lands and resources, Indian reserves, private land, areas managed by municipal or regional governments, protected areas, conservancies, and provincial parks.
- Aboriginal rights receive protection under Section 35(1) of the Constitution Act (1982) and the management direction in the plan will not be interpreted or applied in a way that will limit the exercise of aboriginal rights. A number of the First Nations within the plan area (Squamish, Tsleil-Waututh and In-SHUCK-ch Nations) are in the treaty process.
- The government of Canada administers federal lands and Indian reserves. The latter are governed by First Nations tribal and band organizations. The CAMP does not apply to these lands.
- The CAMP is consistent with the zones identified in the S2SLRMP. The Province has worked with individual First Nations in the plan area to develop Strategic Land Use Planning Agreements (SLUPAs) that reflect the outcomes of government-to-government discussions. These discussions harmonized First Nations land use plans, where these exist, with the Sea-to-Sky LRMP (see section 1.3). Resource management zoning and direction in the SLUPAs has been incorporated directly into the S2SLRMP. For copies of the SLUPAs, contact ILMB or online at:
<http://ilmbwww.gov.bc.ca/slrp/lrmp/surrey/s2s/plan/g2gagreements.html>.

The primary intent of the CAMP is intended to assist government agencies in making decisions about the existing inventory of resource roads by providing direction based on values identified by stakeholders, both from the S2SLRMP process and from consultation carried out during the development of the CAMP.

2.0 Background

2.1 Other planning processes

There are a number of other planning processes underway in the Sea-to-Sky LRMP area including the following:

- First Nations planning agreements (strategic land use planning agreements (SLUPA's)) that reflect the outcomes of government-to-government discussions between the government of BC and First Nations including:
 - The Agreement on Land Use Planning between the Squamish First Nation and the Province of British Columbia (July 26, 2007). This agreement provides direction on access in several areas (wild spirit areas, village sites, and cultural sites). Three

wild spirit places are identified: (Nsiixnitem tl'a sutich (Upper Elaho Valley), Nexw Ayantsut (Sims Creek Watershed), and Estetiwilh (West Side Squamish River) along with management direction;

- The strategic Land Use Planning Agreement between the In-SHUCK-ch Nation and the Province (July 6, 2007). The In-SHUCK-ch Nation was at Stage 5 of the Treaty process at the time the S2SLRMP was approved.
- The Land Use Planning Agreement between the Lil'Wat Nation and the Province of British Columbia (April 11, 2008). This agreement identifies Nt'akmen areas consisting of several conservancies and cultural management areas, in addition to 59 A7x7ulmecw (Spirited Ground) Areas, where specific implementation direction is provided.
- The Tsleil-Waututh Nation, in partnership with the Province of B.C. is in the process of producing a Sustainable Resource Management Plan for the Indian Landscape Unit. This plan provides direction on access management within the Indian Landscape Unit; First Nations planning agreements do provide direction to the CAMP.
- There is a major project review process underway for the "Garibaldi at Squamish" proposal on Brohm Ridge (located in the Mamquam Landscape Unit). It is expected that this will provide some direction for access management on Brohm Ridge.
- Management Plans for new conservancies - Eight new conservancies have been created in the plan area. Management Plans will be developed for these areas through collaborative management planning by the province and First Nations. New roads are generally not permitted within conservancies. With the exception of the Upper Birkenhead River (Quelimak) and the Upper Soo, there are no or very limited existing roads in the conservancies. Direction for the management of these areas is also contained in the relevant SLUPA with First Nations.
- Grizzly Bear recovery planning – The S2SLRMP directs that this take place. It is presently underway. Access management, along with the S2SLRMP wildland zones, and the designation of Wildlife Habitat Areas is one of the major components of grizzly bear recovery planning. The CAMP takes direction from the grizzly bear access management direction included in the S2SLRMP.
- Forest Stewardship Plans – The forest licensees in the Soo Timber Supply Area and in TFL 38 must prepare Forest Stewardship Plans (FSP's), or in the case of Woodlot Licensees, Woodlot License Plans. The CAMP will provide access management objectives to be implemented in Forest Stewardship Planning. The mechanism can be through legal objectives under section 93.4 of the Land Act if necessary.
- Integrated Watershed Management Plans (IWMP) – IWMPs were prepared for the Stawamus River and Mashiter Creek watersheds (community watersheds for the District of Squamish) by the Ministry of Forests and Ministry of Environment in 1998. Although not formally approved and with no further plans for updates, these IWMPs are still seen as a valuable reference and should provide guidance to agencies. Future activities in these watersheds should be undertaken in a responsible manner according to the IWMPs, particularly above the water intakes.

2.2 Road administration and responsibilities

There are several main types of resource roads as listed in Table #1 below. On a province wide basis it has been estimated that approximately 10% of the total kilometers of resource roads are Forest Service Roads (FSR's), 30% are covered by Road Permits (RP's), 2% by other road authorization tenures, and 58% are non status or deactivated roads (Forest Practices Board, 1995). In the Squamish Forest District there are approximately 1125 km of FSR's. The ratio of FSR's relative to RP roads appears to be higher in the Squamish Forest District than it is for the province as a whole.

As noted in section 1.4 the CAMP is primarily concerned with main access to moderate size and larger drainages. This means that most of the roads of interest are Forest Service Roads with a lesser amount being Road Permit roads. In some cases, however, minor drainages have some significant access issues and therefore are addressed in the CAMP. The non-status roads, while a major proportion of the total length of resource roads, are in most cases, not the ones that are the focus of this CAMP.

The following (Table #1) is a general description of road administration as of February 2008. This can change over time as legislation and policy changes are made. The "Resource Roads Act" was introduced in April 2008. Approval may result in changes to the information presented in Table #1 below, specifically with regard to regulatory alignment issues.

Table #1 – Types of resource roads, permits, licenses, and agreements

Type of resource road or road related document	Categories	Maintenance obligations	Issuing authority, applicable legislation and regulations	Comments
Forest Service Roads with Road Use Permit (RUP)	Industrial use	MFR-Road use permit holder has surface maintenance obligations.	MFR issues permit Forest Act (S. 115 & 119)/ FRPA (S. 22.1)/ FPPR Part 5.	Industrial users need a Road Use Permit to use an FSR, and then have defined maintenance responsibilities.
Forest Service Roads – no Road Use Permit	Non-industrial community use (formerly public use FSR's)	MFR	FPPR (S. 79), MFR policy	Community access level of maintenance (2 WD). Maintenance for user safety (sight line brushing, surface maintenance) as well as environmental protection.
	Non-industrial recreation use	MFR	FPPR (S. 79), MFR policy	Recreation access level of maintenance in accordance with vehicle access objectives (either high clearance 4 WD or high clearance 2 WD).
	Non-industrial general use	MFR	FPPR (S. 79 and 81)	Wilderness level of maintenance - Maintenance to protect environment

Type of resource road or road related document	Categories	Maintenance obligations	Issuing authority, applicable legislation and regulations	Comments
	Closed	MFR	FPPR (S. 79 and 81)	only, not for user safety or convenience. Wilderness level of maintenance. Fully deactivated FSRs may have their FSR status dropped.
Road Permit (RP)	Industrial use	Road permit holder	MFR issues permit. Forest Act (sec. 115 & 118), FRPA (S. 22.1), FPPR Part 5.	For “industrial use”. Maintenance may be shared with road use agreement.
	Wilderness	Road permit holder	MFR issues permit FPPR (S. 81)	Maintenance to protect environment only, not for user safety or convenience, no industrial use at present.
Non-status and deactivated roads	NA	The ownership of and liability for these roads is unclear.	NA	MFR does some work to address environmental and safety concerns on these roads as budgets permit.
License of Occupation	NA	License holder	ILMB/MTCA issues license of occupation, MFR issues license to cut if necessary.	Allows non forest users to build and upgrade roads. Used by IPP’s, commercial recreation operators, etc.
Works/Road Permit	NA	NA	ILMB/MTCA (for ski resorts) issues permit for construction or maintenance of a public road or bridge.	Allows non forest users to build and upgrade roads.
Road Use Agreement	NA	RP or RUP holder but responsibilities shared according to Road use agreement	Agreement between industrial users, not issued by the MFR.	Used to share maintenance responsibilities where there is more than one industrial user on either a FSR or a RP road.
Maintenance Agreement	NA	MFR but responsibilities shared according to maintenance agreement.	MFR enters into agreement with road user.	Used by the MFR to allocate maintenance responsibilities to non-industrial road users. (E.g. commercial recreation operators). Can also be used between RP holder and other users.

Notes:

- The tenures listed above cover the majority of the roads relevant to this CAMP. Roads can also be built under other tenures (cutting permits, special use permits, etc.), and a number of other agencies that provide authorizations for road construction through other legislative tools (e.g. Land Act, Petroleum and Natural Gas Act, Mines Act, etc.). Access developments approved through these means has not historically been coordinated with access planning related to resource development, and should take direction from the CAMP. Direction for additional coordination may be provided following approval of the Resource Roads Act.
- Industrial use is defined in section 22 of the Forest and Range Practices Act (FRPA) to include all natural resource development.

Forest Service Roads (FSR's) are declared by the Minister (or District Manager). The composition of the FSR network changes over time. Roads may be added in order to facilitate tenure transfer, to provide access to deal with forest management issues (fire, insects, etc.), or to maintain access until the road is required again for industrial purposes and the responsibility for maintenance can be delegated to the forest industry. Surplus roads (those not required for forest operations) may be deactivated or closed in order to reduce government maintenance obligations and liabilities. Roads may be removed from the FSR network by deactivating or transferring to another agency.

The Ministry of Forests has developed a system of classifying FSR's for budgeting and maintenance purposes. FSR maintenance policies define the following categories of FSR's for maintenance purposes:

- “Industrial Use FSR's” – These roads are used primarily by an industrial user under a Road Use Permit. During periods of non-industrial use, the permit holder is responsible to provide for at least a wilderness road level of maintenance but is not obligated to carry out access-related surface and structural maintenance.
- “Non-industrial Community Use FSR's (formerly referred to as Public Use FSR's) - These roads are used primarily by non-industrial users and provide access to communities. Populated reserves are included in this definition. These road are to be provided with a community access level of maintenance (two wheel drive).
- “Non-industrial Recreation Use FSR's.” These roads are used primarily by non-industrial users and provide access to “high value” forest recreation sites and trails, or to “important” recreational areas such as provincial parks and recreation features, as officially designated by a District Recreation Officer of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and the Arts. These roads must be provided with a recreation access level (either two or four wheel drive) of maintenance.
- “Non-industrial General Use FSR's”. At this point in time these roads are used primarily by non-industrial users and do not provide access to communities, or to “high value” forest recreation sites and trials or to “important” recreational areas. They may have a potential for industrial use in the foreseeable future. These roads may provide access to private land, seasonal or year road residences, commercial operations, designated or undesignated parks or recreation sites that have not been identified by a District Recreation Officer to be “high value” forest recreation sites and trails or “important” recreation areas. At a minimum these roads are to be provided with a wilderness road level of maintenance. If access-related road surface and structure maintenance is not provided, it is expected that vehicle use may become limited or even lost over time.
- “Non-industrial closed FSR's” – These roads are barricaded to preclude motor vehicle access during times of unacceptable risks to user safety, or in accordance with higher level plans, until either appropriate repairs are made, or until the road is permanently deactivated.

Maintenance levels for FSR's are defined by government regulations (e.g. Forest Planning and Practices Regulation Section 79) and through MFR policy. These policies are reviewed annually and may change based on government priorities and funding. At present the maintenance levels associated with the categories of FSR's are as follows:

- Industrial level of maintenance - Surface maintenance requirements associated with Road Permits or Road Use Permits are to a standard required for industrial use. The standard and timing of the surface maintenance may or may not well serve the purposes of other, non-industrial road users. There is no requirement for a holder of a Road Permit or Road Use Permit to maintain the road to any particular standard for non-industrial users.
- Community access level of maintenance – Vehicle access objective: 2 wheel drive. Maintenance is for user safety (sight line brushing, surface maintenance, snow removal and sanding, structural maintenance of bridges, major culverts, and other engineered structures) as well as environmental protection. Cross-ditches and water bars are not used.
- Recreation access level of maintenance - Vehicle access objective: 2 wheel drive high clearance (e.g. ¾ ton pickup) or 4 WD high clearance. Maintenance is to the wilderness road standard plus access-related surface maintenance activities as appropriate to provide a running surface to meet the vehicle access objective. Cross ditches and water bars are permissible except if the road has high traffic volumes and provides access to high value recreation sites.
- Wilderness level of maintenance - Vehicle access objective: None, access is not guaranteed and may be lost over time. Focus is to protect environment only, not for user safety or convenience. Activities do not include surface maintenance or sight line brushing. As such, the only work carried out will be for bridge repair and those maintenance projects required to mitigate environmental problems, like mass wasting or washouts, which may impact residential or worker safety, improvements, or natural resources. Wilderness road maintenance activities will include culvert and bridge removal, waterbars, cross ditches, and partial or full pullback of site slopes. Washouts or road slumps may or may not be repaired.

In reality the classification and levels of maintenance are somewhat more complicated than the system described above suggests. In some cases there may be one or more industrial users (with a Road Use Permit and Road Use Agreements) on a FSR, but the majority of the use could still be by non-industrial (recreational) users at some times of the year (or even for a period of a year or two if there is little or no industrial activity). Situations like this may require supplementary maintenance in addition to the levels required of the Road Use Permit. In many cases there is a mixture of use between the forest industry, other industrial users (independent power producers, mining), commercial recreation operators, and non commercial recreation use. The use of roads also evolves over time and the proportion of use by industry as compared to other users changes. The distribution of use can also vary significantly over the length of the road.

Road Permits are issued by the District Manager to holders of forest tenures under the authority of the Forest Act. If the access is not a FSR or under tenure, a road permit is needed to upgrade, construct or use a road for an industrial purpose.

A road permit provides ongoing, non-exclusive authority for industrial use. The public and other industrial users can use a road that is under RP. Other industrial users must give the RP holder notice of use and must pay the RP holder a reasonable cost for maintenance. RP's do not have a term, they continue until the road is deactivated or the RP holder is relieved of obligations by the district manager. A holder of a RP is responsible for maintenance of the road. Once an industrial

user has no further need for a road it is generally in their best interests to have the road permit cancelled.

At present, MFR policy is not to create any more non-status roads. This implies that when industrial use is completed on a RP road and the permit holder requests that the RP be cancelled, one of the following must happen:

- The road must be deactivated;
- The responsibility for maintaining the road must be transferred to another party;
- The road must be declared a FSR. (Sec 79.9 of FPPR).

Maintenance responsibilities vary by road type and are described in Table #1.

When a RP road is being deactivated (in order to have the RP cancelled), while the deactivation must meet certain standards with respect to environmental criteria (lack of future maintenance requirements), there is no reference in the legislation to maintain particular levels of access (e.g. 4WD or ATV). In general it is easier to meet the definition of deactivation in the current legislation and leave some degree of access where roads are located on flat or gently sloping terrain with few or no stream crossings than it is in steeper areas with more stream crossings. In much of the plan area it will likely be difficult to do this.

The wilderness road designation described in Section 81 of the Forest Planning and Practices Regulation (FPPR) can apply to a FSR or a RP road. As noted above, required maintenance activities include only environmental protection related items, not items relating to use of the road. There is no requirement to maintain the road for safe use. A road maintained to the wilderness road level of maintenance may eventually need to be closed if it deteriorates to the point where it poses a threat to property, public health, public safety, or forest resources.

A FSR or RP road may be a candidate for deactivation where there is no apparent current or future industrial use planned for the road, a second party has not taken over responsibility for the road, and the road does not provide access to a community nor to “high value” forest recreation sites and trails, or “important” recreational areas.

A number of factors are considered when a decision regarding deactivation is being made including:

- Current and future access needs;
- Road and structure (bridges, major culverts, etc.) condition;
- Current and future hazards that could endanger property, public health or safety, or forest resources;
- On site or downslope hazards to worker safety;
- Costs, liabilities, and available funding sources.

As part of the process of deactivating and closing roads the MFR must solicit and consider stakeholder (e.g. licensees, public, First Nations) input. Proposed deactivation is to be advertised for a 30 day period.

There are a number of legal routes to close or restrict access to roads including the following:

- Section 22.2 of FRPA and Section 79.3 of FPPR – The District Manager may close or restrict the use of a FSR, or the holder of a road permit or woodlot license may close the road under permit or license if use of the road would cause significant damage to the road, cause significant sediment delivery, endanger property, public health, public safety, or other forest resources. Forest licensees may apply to the District Manager for permission to install a gate for security and safety considerations on active logging sites.
- The Forest Service Road Use Regulation (Section 6) for the erection of traffic control devices (e.g. gate, signal, or notice) if, in the District Manager’s opinion, restrictions on the use of the road or the traffic on the road are required to achieve the purposes of Section 4 (b) and (c) of the Ministry of Forests and Range Act. These sections refer to “manage, protect, and conserve the forest and range resources...” and “plan the use of the forest and range resources ... so that ...natural resource values are coordinated and integrated”.
- The Wildlife Act (Public Access Prohibition Regulations), the Land Act (Section 66), and the Motor Vehicle (All Terrain) Act (Motor Vehicle Prohibition Regulations) provide mechanisms to close areas to motor vehicles (including ATV’s and snowmobiles) for wildlife, environmental, and recreation management-related purposes. This approach provides for closures and enforcement, but does not specifically refer to erecting physical barriers on FSR’s.
- In order to discontinue and permanently close an FSR the road must either be deactivated or transferred to another user or agency (FPPR Sec. 79, Section 121(9) of the Forest Act). At present government direction is to close or transfer responsibility to other agencies or road users any FSR’s that are surplus to requirements. If there is no other user the roads may be deactivated and permanently closed. Deactivating roads in the terrain typical of the plan area will usually eliminate motor vehicle access as unstable road fill is removed, bridges and culverts are removed, and cross ditches are created. Once deactivated the road must be barricaded (FPPR Section 82) unless this requirement is waived by the District Manager.

Several provincial government agencies have roles that relate to management of resource roads including:

- Ministry of Forests and Range (MFR) - issuing tenures, maintenance for FSR’s, compliance and enforcement with respect to road permits, decisions on road closures and access restrictions. BC Timber Sales (BCTS) is also responsible for maintenance of some FSR’s;
- Ministry of Environment (MOE) - implementation of wildlife related access controls; while MOE is directly responsible for Provincial Parks and not the roads leading to them, MOE may allocate funding for maintenance of roads leading to some parks;
- Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and the Arts (MTCA) - while MTCA is directly responsible for recreation sites and trails, and not the roads leading to them, MTCA may allocate funding for maintenance of roads leading to some sites or trails, and is also responsible for

road permits for roads in controlled recreation areas such as through a master development agreement associated with resort development;

- Ministry of Agriculture and Lands and the Integrated Land Management Bureau (ILMB) - responsible for some roads through the permitting process and also for strategic planning (in this case implementing the S2SLRMP and associated projects);
- Ministry of Transportation - generally not responsible for resource roads, but does presently have a program to fund maintenance for some FSR's which serve residences;
- Ministry of Energy, Mines, and Petroleum Resources - responsible for some roads through the permitting process.

2.3 History of access management in the Squamish Forest District

The Squamish Forest District has gates on many forest roads. Most of these are left unlocked except for emergency situations (storm damage making roads unsafe) and times of extreme fire hazard. These are an important asset, since they allow the District Manager to exercise his mandate with respect to protection of property, public health, or public safety (under FRPA), and fire protection (under the Wildfire Act), in a district which is subject to extreme storm events. A recent inventory indicated that there were a total of 63 gates on Forest Service Roads and road permit roads in the district. The District is presently conducting a review of the gates, including updating the inventory and reassessing their role in access management. Some of these gates were installed in the past at MOE request in order to manage access to grizzly bear habitat but have not been locked.

There has been a substantial amount of deactivation of older roads in the plan area within the last 10 years.

In the fall of 2003 there was a major storm event that washed out numerous bridges and parts of resource roads. Some of these, particularly ones without industrial use, have not restored to a passable condition. Some other roads, especially ones accessing significant recreational values, have been repaired with LRMP implementation funding.

As noted in the previous section it is presently government policy not to create additional non status roads. Given that there is no longer (and won't be for the foreseeable future) industrial forestry use on parts of the existing road network, government budgets for recreational access maintenance are limited, and that climate and terrain considerations often limit the period for which roads remain useable with a "wilderness" level of maintenance it appears that over time parts of the existing resource road network in the plan area will no longer be available for use by motor vehicles. In some cases this will occur by planned deactivation, in other cases by gradual deterioration or storm damage while subject to "wilderness" level maintenance.

3.0 Description of plan process

3.1 General direction from LRMP

The S2SLRMP recommends that a Coordinated Access Management Plan (CAMP) be initiated to identify access management controls in sensitive areas to protect specific values (e.g. grizzly bears, recreation). The LRMP also provides direction with respect to consultation to be undertaken in the process of developing a CAMP. The S2SLRMP included a number of access related objectives and management recommendations that were used as a starting point for this plan.

3.2 Consultation process

An initial step in the development of the CAMP was to initiate consultation with relevant stakeholders. In particular this included the following:

- First Nations;
- Selected S2SLRMP forum members;
- Government resource agencies.

Table #2 provides a summary of consultation efforts undertaken in the process of developing the draft CAMP. More detail about the comments received during the consultation process is provided in Appendix 2.

Table #2 – Summary of consultation

Organization	Type of contact	Date
1-Provincial government agencies		
Ministry of Forests	Meeting	July 30, 2007
Ministry of Environment	Meeting	Nov. 5, 2007
Ministry of Tourism, Sport, and the Arts	Meeting	Sept. 26, 2007
Ministry of Energy, Mines, and Petroleum Resources	Meeting	Nov. 2, 2007
Ministry of Forests	Meeting	January 25, 2008
MFR, MOE, MTCA	Meeting	Feb. 12, 2008
2-First Nations		
Squamish First Nation	Meeting	Nov. 1, 2007
Lil' Wat First Nation	Meeting	Sept. 26, 2007
Inshuck-ch First Nation	Meeting	Sept 13, 2007
N' Quatqua First Nation	Phone & email	Oct. 26, 2007
Tseil-Waututh First Nation	Meeting	Nov. 28, 2007
3- Former LRMP table members		
Soo Forestry Coalition	Meeting	Sept. 14, 2007
TFL 38	Meeting	Oct. 18, 2007
Pemberton Valley Wildlife	Meeting	Oct. 18, 2007
AWARE	Meeting	Oct. 18, 2007
BC Whitewater Association	Phone	Sept. 27, 2007
Federation of BC Mountain Clubs	Phone & email	Sept 28, 2007

4- Others		
Association for Mineral Exploration BC	Meeting	Nov. 2, 2007
BC Timber Sales	Meeting	Nov. 2, 2007
Soo Forestry Coalition. TFL 38, and MFR	Meeting	Jan. 25, 2008

Consultation topics included the starting point provided by the S2SLRMP access management direction, the scope of the CAMP, and site specific access management issues. A first draft was circulated to all participants for review in late December 2007.

A summary of comments received on the draft document is provided in Appendix 2.

4.0 Management Direction

4.1 Access management direction from the S2SLRMP

The S2SLRMP provides implementation direction with respect to access. The key items are as follows:

- The S2SLRMP has four resource management zones (1-All resource uses permitted; 2-Wildland zones; 3-Conservancies; 4-Existing Parks). Wildland zones are intended to remain free from roads except for those associated with mining, oil and gas, and geothermal development. Where these roads are necessary they are to be subject to access controls to restrict public motorized access. Roads are not permitted in conservancies except where access is required to development opportunities beyond the conservancy and no feasible alternative is available. This plan is primarily focused on the “All resource uses permitted” zone.
- The S2SLRMP is consistent with the Province’s two-zone land use system for mineral exploration and mining. The two-zone policy provides that all Crown Land outside of protected areas is open to tenure acquisition, mineral exploration, and mine development, including suitable access required to undertake these activities. Consistent with the two-zone policy and legislation, this plan is not intended to unduly delay, restrict, or prohibit responsible mineral exploration or mining activity. However, it is expected that in cases where areas are seasonally closed (e.g. spring grizzly bear closures) that justification (that it was necessary to undertake the particular activity during the closure period) would be required before undertaking activities during the restricted period.
- Access management is a very contentious issue and it must be implemented very carefully and concurrently with a public information program that explains the reasons for the access controls.
- Access control points should be chosen so as to restrict access to the minimum amount of area necessary to protect the resource of concern and should not unduly restrict motorized access.
- Access control is generally meant to restrict motorized access, not close an area to human access. If people want to walk, bicycle or ski past the gate, they may do so.

- Some areas may have spring and/or fall access closures to protect grizzly bears in important habitat areas. Forestry crews will be allowed into the closed areas for the purposes of conducting seasonally required survey work, monitoring and tree planting operations. Similar “exemptions” can be made to allow access into these closure areas for mineral exploration activities above the proposed control points because the expected level of use associated with these activities is not expected to result in displacement of grizzly bear from these areas.
- In areas with year round motorized access control, forestry and logging operations are permitted to be conducted beyond the access control point.
- The actual location of an access control point should be determined after consultation with relevant government agencies, First Nations, and stakeholders.

Appendix 3 contains more specific direction for access management that originated from the S2S Planning forum. This direction may provide additional background and detail for specific areas, issues, and concerns, and formed the basis for which the CAMP was initiated.

4.2 Access management implementation - factors considered and approaches used in making access related decisions

A number of considerations are important in reviewing and prioritizing the list of access sensitive objectives identified by the S2SLRMP table and in developing access related objectives, targets/measures, and management considerations. These include:

- The range of resource values that require consideration for access management (e.g. wildlife species and habitat, First Nations values and uses, public uses, industrial uses);
- The definition and extent of access-sensitive areas;
- Operational considerations with respect to access control including funding levels, logistics, and workable locations for access control points;
- The need to describe the objective for each access control point, rather than a prescription that describes how to achieve the objective;
- Management direction on how competing access needs (restrictions to access versus maintaining access) may be integrated.

4.2.1 Implementing access controls

Section 4.4 (Table 5) provides direction (objectives , targets, and management considerations) for controlling access to access-sensitive areas. Options and tools which can be used to control access are listed in Section 4.3. In order to select the most appropriate approach for each specific situation the following items should be considered:

- How much use is there at present? Does the present level of use pose a significant risk to the access sensitive value? Do the present use and risk levels justify the expense of access control measures? Is there a need for more control of access now or is it a

situation that requires monitoring and control action if use increases or if the road is improved for industrial use?

- Is there still a need for access past the proposed access control point at other times of the year? If not, deactivation/bridge removal may be an appropriate solution.
- Is the proposed access control point in the most appropriate location with respect to meeting objectives, minimizing impact on other resource users, safety, convenience (parking, turning around), and maintenance of access control structures?
- Consider communication requirements both prior to and following implementation of access control measures;
- Develop a protocol for key management if a gate is used.

The goal is to meet the objectives (as expressed in Table #5) while minimizing the impact on other users and minimizing the costs (both budgets and ongoing staff time) of implementation.

Year round closures with gates should generally be used only in extenuating circumstances where ongoing forestry operations are expected due to the difficulty and expense involved in managing this system.

Signage associated with access control measures should explain the rationale for the closure and include contact information for the proponent agency.

Suggested locations for access control points are provided in Appendix 3. These can be adjusted in order to better meet objectives and operational considerations, while considering other access details provided in Appendix 3, in addition to the following:

- In cases where there are users wanting access as well as a legitimate reason for controlling access, try to keep the access control point as high up the drainage as possible while still meeting objectives so that access is not un-necessarily restricted;
- Select a safe and visible location;
- Select a location that is not easily bypassed – the middle of a short steel bridge is good;
- Consider ease of parking and turning around.

Site specific judgment is necessary to balance the above considerations. For instance a gate in the middle of a long bridge may lead to unsafe backing up.

4.2.2 Existing Forest Service Roads and non-industrial (recreational) access

This CAMP identifies a number of priority recreation access corridors. These areas are very important for recreation access and the plan identifies them so that operational access decisions can provide for the maximum level of public access that is consistent with obligations to manage roads for public safety and environmental protection. The priorities for recreational access may change over time as recreational user patterns change or industrial maintenance of other roads changes.

Individual decisions on maintaining access versus deactivating and permanently closing existing FSR's are made by the District Manager of the Ministry of Forests and Range. There are a number of factors that are considered by the District Manager in making a decision of this nature. A general overview of the decision making process is shown below:

Table #3 – Existing roads and recreational access

#	Question	Yes	No
1	Is the road presently used and maintained by the forest industry?	Maintained by industry, not a candidate for deactivation at present.	Proceed to the next question.
2	Is the road used for a non forestry industrial purpose?	Consider tenure options to have road maintained by industry.	
3	Is there likely to be an industrial use in the foreseeable future?	Subject to risks, condition, and relative costs consider a wilderness level of maintenance until an industrial user takes over.	
4	Does the road serve a forest management purpose (fire access, forest health management, etc.)?	Subject to risks, condition, and relative costs consider a wilderness level of maintenance.	
5	Is the road identified as a priority recreational access route in the LRMP or CAMP?	Consider maintenance in one of the two categories below.	
6	Does the road provide access to a community?	Community level of maintenance.	
7	Does the road provides access to “high value” forest recreation sites and trails, or “important” recreational areas?	Recreational level of maintenance.	
8	Provides access to private land, residences, camps, commercial recreation, etc?	Examine options with respect to maintenance agreements.	
9	Is there a low level of risk to forest resources, public safety, etc. and still drivable?	Wilderness level of maintenance – no access restrictions.	
10	Is there a higher level of risk?	Wilderness level of maintenance, close until funds available to deactivate.	
11	Highest level of risk?	Advertise for 30 days and deactivate.	

The table above is only a generalized overview of the decision making process. Actual decisions involve a considerable amount of judgment in order to make tradeoffs between recreational values, road related liabilities, and costs to maintain and/or upgrade a particular road. For example it may be more attractive to keep a road open that provides access to moderate recreational values if the costs are low than one that accesses a higher value recreational area if that road requires expensive upgrades.

In the above process stakeholder and public input can be considered at step #5 and at step #11. The priorities developed through the S2SLRMP and this CAMP provides guidance to the decision making process primarily through question #5. This input is considered along with technical and operational factors as mandated in government legislation, regulations, and policy.

Road maintenance for recreational access can include surface maintenance, brushing, filling minor washouts, snow plowing, bridge maintenance and repair, or dust control. In some cases more major repairs to the road or structures are required or additional construction is necessary (e.g. extra pullouts or a parking area).

4.2.3 Constructing new access or reopening existing closed, deactivated, or impassable roads

The CAMP is primarily directed at existing access. However it does also address potential new access in sensitive areas as well as re-opening existing access routes that are presently not passable. Formal designation of the S2SLRMP zone objectives may provide the mechanism that will guide future access development, and other issues not specifically addressed by the CAMP.

The principle in these cases is that if new access is created or existing access re-opened in order to facilitate industrial activity then the proponent is responsible for controlling access in accordance with the direction provided by the access management plan. When a developer proposes to construct or maintain a road in an area that has an identified access management objective and target the developer will be responsible to assess the specific type of access management measure that meets the requirements of the site. The types of access management measures that are usually considered are listed in Table #4. This direction is also applicable to the mining, oil and gas, and geothermal industries if any roads are developed in the S2SLRMP wild land zone.

The following items should be considered by the developer in choosing an access management strategy to meet the objectives for the areas listed in Table #5:

- Distance from the newly developed or opened road to the park boundary or access sensitive area and ease of access for motorized vehicles (including ATV's and snowmobiles). In some cases no specific action will be necessary to control access;
- Consider access management objectives when locating roads;
- Selection of a suitable access control technique from those listed in Table #4;
- Amount of expected use;
- Need for access control during development while considering that restricting access immediately will be less controversial than doing it later.

In cases where licensees are identified as being responsible for controlling access it is expected that they will address the following aspects of access control:

- Consultation with stakeholders, the public, and appropriate government agencies in order to update and clarify expectations;
- Construction and maintenance of any necessary physical works to control access;
- Appropriate deactivation measures to an impassable state;
- Communication of access restrictions including appropriate signage;
- Development and implementation of a key management protocol in any cases where gates are used.

4.3 Access control options and tools

There are a number of ways to control access including the following:

Table #4 – Access control measures

Access control tool	Pro's	Con's
Deactivation and/or rehabilitation of a road to the extent that it is no longer passable by vehicles.	-prevents access.	-can be expensive.
Removing bridges.	-effective for stopping ATV's. -effectively stops access while preserving the rest of the road for future use. -depending on the type of bridge may allow it to be used elsewhere.	-expensive, no emergency access. - may unduly restrict public non-motorized recreation
Removing bridge decking and replacing it with a narrow strip to allow foot access.	-allows foot access.	-may allow motorcycle access.
Temporary removal of a section of bridge decking.	-relatively inexpensive.	-not practical where some access is still required during closure period.
Permanent barriers – Placing boulders, fill, lock blocks, felled timber, etc. across the road.	-effectively stops access while preserving the rest of the road for future use.	-no emergency access.
Temporary barriers – large rocks, lock blocks, etc.	-less subject to vandalism than gates, good for isolated locations.	-not practical where some access is still required during closure period. -may be removed by some individuals.
Tank traps	-stops vehicle access while preserving the rest of the road for future use.	-no emergency access -may or may not stop ATV access, depending on terrain and design.
Gates	-useful for temporary or seasonal closures, particularly where some industrial access is still required during the closure period.	-these can require significant amounts of maintenance and repair. -controversial to manage, can be seen as being unfair. -easily vandalized.
Manned gate house	-useful where industrial access is required during the closure period	-expensive.
Signs	-moderate cost. -can provide education as well as control. -suitable as a first step in areas with low use levels.	-easily vandalized. -easily ignored.
Enforcement	-can be used as part of an overall strategy in conjunction with other approaches.	-expensive. -difficult to time enforcement action. - hampered by a lack of manpower and resources
Education	-may increase acceptance of the need for access control. -can be used as part of an overall strategy in conjunction with other approaches.	-easily ignored.

Gates are generally most effective if they are installed in a high traffic/ highly visible area so that there is little privacy for anyone trying to damage or get through the gate. The middle of a steel bridge is often a good location since it prevents circumventing the gate.

Signs need to serve several purposes and therefore need to be placed in a variety of locations. One should be placed at the bottom of the drainage in order to provide advance warning of the closure to prevent un-necessary travel to find out that a road is closed, another may be needed to provide advance warning of the gate or barrier so that vehicles can stop safely; and another to explain the reasons for the closure and provide contact information. If signs are used alone (without any

physical barriers) then an explanation about the road being closed to motorized traffic and the legal implications will be necessary.

Some of the above tools work well in combination with one another. It is important to match the particular method to the site. In general the best choice is the one that meets the objectives at the lowest cost.

4.4 Description of access objectives.

A description of individual access-sensitive areas, present access conditions, access sensitive values and related factors is located in Appendix 3.

Objectives, targets, and management considerations for individual areas are provided in Table #5.

This information is presented in tabular format with the landbase being subdivided by landscape unit.

The table refers to three general types of access management issues:

- Specific access-sensitive areas (generally defined by watershed) where the LRMP provided direction regarding access control (primarily for grizzly bear protection);
- Specific, existing forest roads which presently have no industrial use (and in some cases no agency or budget for maintaining them) but are important for recreational access (non-industrial recreation use FSR's);
- Areas where it is important to provide direction regarding non-industrial use of potential future resource roads.

The access management recommendations included in the tables are based on the following principles:

- Access control points should be chosen so as to restrict access to the minimum amount of area necessary to protect the resource of concern and should not unduly restrict motorized access. The suggested access control points are intended to do this, however there is flexibility to move them in order to better accommodate operational concerns;
- In general the intention is to minimize or avoid situations that provide access to one group of users but not to others except where necessary to reconcile industrial use with resource protection;

Table #5 - Access objectives, targets, and management considerations

Landscape Unit: Gates				
Description of subunit or access corridor	Access sensitive values	Objectives	Target	Management considerations (where applicable)
1-Haylmore and Common Johnny	-Grizzly bear habitat (WHA) in	-Minimize access induced displacement	-Closed to all motor vehicles	-The suggested ACP is at the bridge over Common Johnny

watersheds	Common Johnny Creek. -Goat kidding areas and winter range in all drainages. -Twin Lakes trailhead, historic motorized use up the Barclay Valley to the alpine. - access to showing and claims at Twin Lakes probably not affected if access control is at Common Johnny Creek	and mortality risk to grizzly bears for high value habitat in Common Johnny Creek. -Haylmore Creek FSR up to ACP and Twin Lakes trailhead should remain available for vehicle use. -Discourage road construction between Haylmore and Melvin, Lost Valley, or Downton watersheds.	past the ACP between April 1 and June 15. -4WD or better access to Twin Lakes (Elliott Barclay) trailhead.	Creek (just past the trailhead). There is an existing, unlocked gate on the bridge. -Consideration could be given to removing the Common Johnny bridge once harvesting and reforestation operations are completed or just leaving enough decking for foot access.
2-Blackwater FSR	-Access to Birkenhead Lake Provincial Park.	-Continued vehicle access to Birkenhead Lake Provincial Park.	-2WD access to Birkenhead Lake Provincial Park.	
3-Remainder of LU	-General access values.	-All existing, useable FSR's and other resource roads should remain available for motorized use, subject to legislation and MFR policies on maintenance and deactivation.	No access controls except those necessary for public safety and environmental protection.	

Landscape Unit: Birkenhead

Description of subunit or access corridor	Access sensitive values	Objectives	Target	Management considerations (where applicable)
1-Birkenhead River watershed above Tenquille Creek	-Quelimak (Upper Birkenhead) conservancy above the suggested ACP. -Goat winter range, important grizzly bear spring range on south slopes. -Trailhead for "east" Tenquille Lake trail. - Access to mineral properties here should not be affected as long as the access control is at or above Tenquille Creek	-Minimize access induced displacement and mortality risk to grizzly bears for use of high value habitat in the Upper Birkenhead. -Continued vehicle access for recreation past Birkenhead Lake up to the suggested ACP location and to "east Tenquille" trailhead (lower priority).	-Closed to all motor vehicles past the ACP between April 1 and June 15. -4 WD access to trailhead.	-The suggested ACP is at the bridge over Tenquille Creek. There is an existing, unlocked gate on the bridge. -In the event that the existing bridges are removed beyond the ACP (within the conservancy) no further access control will be necessary.
2-Phelix Creek watershed	-Grizzly bear habitat. -Prime alpine recreation area. -VOC cabin (Brian	-Minimize access induced displacement and mortality risk to grizzly bears. -Phelix FSR should be	-Closed to all motor vehicles past the ACP between April 1 and June 15.	-Suggested locations for the ACP are the start of the Phelix FSR or at the bridge approximately 3 km up the road.

	Waddington Hut). - no properties, or known mineral occurrences outside the park	available for vehicle use for the remainder of the year subject to road condition and MFR policies on deactivation and maintenance. -Discourage road connections to the Bridge River watershed.		
3-Owl Creek watershed (Owl Creel FSR)	-Owl Lake Trailhead. -Cultural sites.	-Continued vehicle access to trailhead.	-4 WD or better access to the trailhead.	
4-Remainder of LU	-General access values.	-All existing useable FSR's and other resource roads should remain available for motorized use subject to legislation and MFR policy regarding maintenance and deactivation.	No access controls except those necessary for public safety and environmental protection.	
5-Areas adjacent to Birkenhead Lake Provincial Park	-Birkenhead Lake Provincial Park.	-No motorized access into Birkenhead Park.	No enhancement of motorized access potential into the park.	-Complete road de-activation and rehabilitation subsequent to completion of industrial activities for any future roads adjacent to park.
Landscape Unit: Railroad				
Description of subunit or access corridor	Access sensitive values	Objectives	Target	Management considerations (where applicable)
1-North Creek watershed above Delilah Creek	-Grizzly bear habitat. -BCMC cabin, the trail to this is from the west side of North Crk. so it is not affected by the ACP. - no claims or known showings	-Minimize access induced displacement and mortality risk to grizzly bears. -no access control below Delilah Creek on either side of valley.	-Closed to all motor vehicles past the ACP between April 1 and June 15.	Suggested location for the ACP is at or near Delilah Creek.
2-Tenquille Lake (west access) Hurley River/Tenquille FSR)	-Prime alpine recreation area, highly used by hikers and mountain bikers (recreational and commercial groups).	-Allow vehicle access to Tenquille Lake trailhead.	4WD or better access to trailhead.	-Consider fixing road and construct new parking area just outside the edge of the wildland zone. -High priority for recreation access.
3-Hurley River FSR	-Access to Goldbridge and Bralorne, several recreation sites, Railroad Pass, back	-Continued vehicle access through the pass to Goldbridge.	4WD or better access through the pass.	-High priority for recreation access.

	country skiing, and snowmobiling.			
4-Mackenzie Basin FSR	-Hang gliding and para gliding.	-Continued vehicle access.	4WD or better access.	-High priority for recreation access.
5-Remainder of LU	-Recreational access through the unit to the Meager Creek area along the Upper Lillooet FSR.	-All existing useable FSR's and other resource roads should remain available for motorized use subject to legislation and MFR policy regarding maintenance and deactivation.	None.	-Spring avalanche hazards in the area make winter/spring plowing unlikely

Landscape Unit: Upper Lillooet

Description of subunit or access corridor	Access sensitive values	Objectives	Target	Management considerations (where applicable)
1-Salal Creek watershed	-Grizzly bear habitat -Trailhead for Athelney Pass and Mt Athelstan trail. -Snowmobile travel corridor on the west fork of Salal Creek. - proposed ACP may affect access to northernmost portions of pumice properties	-Minimize access induced displacement and mortality risk to grizzly bears using high value habitat in Upper Salal Creek drainage. -Allow vehicle access to Athelney Pass trailhead.	-Closed to all motor vehicles past the ACP between April 1 and June 15.	-The suggested ACP is approximately 3km up the road. -Low-medium priority for recreational access.
2-Remainder of LU	-Upper Lillooet Provincial Park.	-No motorized access into Upper Lillooet Provincial Park.	No enhancement of motorized access potential into the park.	Complete road de-activation and rehabilitation subsequent to completion of industrial activities for any future roads adjacent to park.

Landscape Unit: Meager

Description of subunit or access corridor	Access sensitive values	Objectives	Target	Management considerations (where applicable)
1-Meager Creek	-Grizzly bear habitat. -Recreational use of Meager Creek Hot Springs. -Trail head access to 100 lakes plateau and Upper Elaho Wild Spirit place. -Capricorn Creek safety issues – this area is very geologically active. - Access to VOC Harrison Hut in Barr Creek near	-Minimize access induced displacement and mortality risk to grizzly bears. -Allow vehicle access to Meager Creek Hotsprings (when they are open) throughout the spring to fall operating season as long as weather conditions permit safe use. -Allow vehicle access beyond ACP to 100 lakes trailhead after	-Closed to all motor vehicles past the ACP's between April 1 and June 15. -2WD (high clearance) access to the hot springs during the operating season.	-There are two suggested ACP's, one on the south side of Meager Creek just past the hot springs and one on the north side approximately 2 km past the junction to the hot springs. -There is also an existing gate on the bridge over the Lillooet River at the bottom of the Meager road; this is to be operated as necessary for public safety. -There may be a need to consider supplementary surface maintenance for recreational traffic on the Meager Creek

	Overseer Mountain - Important that operators keep access to pumice quarries farther up Lillooet River.	June 15.		FSR. - ACPs along Meager Creek probably would have little impact on mineral exploration
2-South Creek	-Grizzly bear habitat.	-Minimize access induced displacement and mortality risk to grizzly bears.	-Closed to all motor vehicles past the ACP between April 1 and June 15.	Suggested ACP location at bridge crossing on South Creek.

Landscape Unit: Ryan

Description of subunit or access corridor	Access sensitive values	Objectives	Target	Management considerations (where applicable)
1-Ryan River	-Grizzly bear habitat- this is the most important area in the plan for grizzlies. -Good kayaking below 8 km. - This is road access to Molygold property, active in 2006. Proposed ACP's affect access.	-Minimize access induced displacement and mortality risk to grizzly bears. -Allow vehicle access up to 8 km for kayaking. -Maintain future access options for timber harvesting.	-No use (motorized or non-motorized) past the lower ACP between April 1 and June 15. -Closed to all non-industrial motor vehicles past the upper ACP at any time.	-There are two suggested ACP's, a lower one where the Ryan road leaves the Pemberton Meadows road and a second one at the 8 km bridge.
2- Remainder of LU	-General access values.	-All other FSR's should be available for vehicle use subject to road condition and MFR policies on maintenance and deactivation.	None.	Where roads cross private property, public access may be considered through agreement with the land owner.

Landscape Unit: Soo

Description of subunit or access corridor	Access sensitive values	Objectives and description of desired future condition	Target	Management considerations (where applicable)
1-Soo River	-Ungulate winter range (moose) and wetlands. -Su7a (Upper Soo) conservancy. -Nt'akmen Area. -Squamish First Nation cultural values in Upper Soo valley. -Lil'Wat cultural values.	-No new roads in proposed conservancy. -Soo FSR outside the conservancy should be available for vehicle use subject to road condition and MFR policies on maintenance and deactivation.	None.	
2-Rutherford Creek watershed	-The road is usually a snowmobile trail	-Rutherford FSR should be available for	4WD or better access to Echo	

	in the winter, provides an alternative route to the Pemberton Ice Cap. -Summer recreational access to Echo Lake.	vehicle use subject to road condition and MFR policies on maintenance and deactivation.	Lake.	
3-Wedgemount Lake	-Access to Wedgemount Lake trailhead.	-Allow continued vehicle access to Wedgemount Lake trailhead.	4WD or better access to trailhead.	High priority for recreation access.
4-Remainder of LU	-General access values.	-Other FSR's should be available for vehicle use subject to road condition and MFR policies on maintenance and deactivation.	None.	

Landscape Unit: Callaghan

Description of subunit or access corridor	Access sensitive values	Objectives and description of desired future condition	Target	Management considerations (where applicable)
1 - Callaghan Creek	-Callaghan Lake Provincial Park -Payakentstut/Scwalem conservancy -Wild spirit place. -Grizzly bear habitat -Olympic Nordic centre. -SFN cultural values.	-Continued vehicle access to Callaghan Lake Provincial Park. -No roads are to be constructed through the conservancy unless access is required to development opportunities beyond the conservancy and no feasible alternative is available. -Consistency with the management plan for conservancy (to be developed) and the SNLUPA. -Protect SFN cultural values and ecological integrity of the wild spirit place (as per Agreement on Land Use Planning between SFN and government of BC).	-4WD or better access to Callaghan Lake Provincial Park.	Limited winter parking on Callaghan Valley Road.
2 - Brandywine Creek	-Snowmobile route.	-Maintain opportunities for using the FSR as a snowmobile route in winter.	None.	
3 - Roe Creek	Varsity Outdoor Club's Brew Hut	- Improvement of access to trailhead	None	Road used to access hut is currently NSR. Consider

				maintenance priority and limited deactivation.
4 - Chance Creek	Backcountry skiing access to Cloudburst Mountain	- Improvement of access to trailhead	None	No parking along portion of Chance Creek FSR within Rubble Creek landslide hazard area.
5 - Remainder of LU	-General access values.	-Other FSR's should be available for vehicle use subject to road condition and MFR policies on maintenance and deactivation.	None.	

Landscape Unit: Whistler

Description of subunit or access corridor	Access sensitive values	Objectives and description of desired future condition	Target	Management considerations (where applicable)
1-Upper Cheakamus River area	-One branch of Cheakamus Lake FSR is adjacent to the Garibaldi Park boundary at one point. -Access to the parking lot at the trail head. -Kwayatsut (Cheakamus) Wild Spirit Place.	-Prevent motorized vehicle access to Garibaldi Park.	-No enhancement of motorized access potential into park. -No motorized access past existing locked gate at 5 km. -4WD or better access to the parking lot.	-Prompt deactivation that prevents vehicle access of any future roads near park boundary. -High priority for continued vehicle access to 5 km parking area.
2-Daisy Lake east side	-Daisy Lake FSR is close to Garibaldi Park boundary at one point. (not an issue at present)	-Prevent motorized vehicle access to Garibaldi Park. -Continued access to recreation site.	-No enhancement of motorized access potential into park. -4WD access or better to the recreation site.	-Ongoing dust control near recreation site.
3-Conroy Creek area	-One branch of Conroy Creek FSR (9176-03) ends close to the Garibaldi Park boundary. (not an issue at present)	-Prevent motorized vehicle access to Garibaldi Park. -Maintain Conroy Creek FSR for recreation access.	-No enhancement of motorized access potential into park. -4 WD access along FSR.	-High priority for recreational access.
4-Remainder of LU	-General access values.	-Other FSR's should be available for vehicle use subject to road condition and MFR policies on maintenance and deactivation.	No access controls except those necessary for public safety and environmental protection.	

Landscape Unit: Elaho

Description of subunit or access corridor	Access sensitive values	Objectives and description of desired future condition	Target	Management considerations (where applicable)
--	--------------------------------	---	---------------	---

1-Sims Creek watershed	-Grizzly bear habitat. -Trailhead to Princess Louisa Inlet located just before ACP. -Nexw-ayantstut (Sims Creek) Wild Spirit Place. - There are currently no mineral tenures and only one past-producing granite quarry in this area. Not affected by proposed ACP's	-Minimize access induced displacement and mortality risk to grizzly bears. -Protect SFN cultural values and ecological integrity of the wild spirit place (as per Agreement on Land Use Planning between SFN and government of BC).	-Closed to motor vehicles past ACP B between April 1 and June 15 and past A at any time. -No new roads to be constructed for forestry.	-Suggested locations for ACP's are at the Sims Creek bridge (approx. 56 mile), and G main bridge over the Elaho River (approx. 43 mile). -Consider removal of the bridge at 16A or allow road to become impassable.
2-Upper Elaho Valley Conservancy Nsiilwx-nitem tl'a sutch Conservancy	-Upper Elaho Valley Conservancy. -Comprises part of Nsiilwx-nitem tl'a sutch Wild Spirit Place.	-Consistency with management plan for conservancy (to be developed) and SNLUPA. -Protection of biological diversity and natural environment (as per Agreement on Land Use Planning between SFN and government of BC). - Allow continued vehicle access to Elaho - Meager Creek trailhead.	No motor vehicle access past the ACP.	-Suggested ACP location at the bridge over the Elaho River. -Alternatives include, removing decking except just enough to walk over, or moving the ACP to the end of the present road (approx. 2 km inside the conservancy).
3-Remainder of Nsiilwx-nitem tl'a sutch Wild Spirit Place	-Wild Spirit Place values.	-Manage consistent with Schedule F of "Agreement on Land Use Planning" between SFN and Province of BC.	No new roads to be constructed for forestry.	
4-Remainder of LU	-Blanca Lakes area is sensitive to extending existing roads to the south. It is identified as a SFN cultural area. -Clendinning Provincial Park.	-Manage Blanca Lakes area consistent with objectives as noted in the SNLUPA, Schedule H.	No enhancement of motorized access potential closer to Blanca Lakes from the south side.	
Landscape Unit: Upper Squamish				
Description of subunit or access corridor	Access sensitive values	Objectives and description of desired future condition	Target	Management considerations (where applicable)
1-Ashlu Creek watershed	-Grizzly bear habitat. -Road access to Sigurd Creek	-Minimize access induced displacement and mortality risk to grizzly bears.	-Closed to all motor vehicles past the ACP between April 1 and June	-The suggested ACP is at 32 mile, just above Pikett Creek. -Keep spur to Sigurd trail available for use.

	trailhead (A-200 Road-approx. 22 mile). -SFN cultural and wildlife values in Upper Ashlu and Tatlow watersheds. -Access to Ashlu Mountain. Lil' Wat cultural values.	-Allow continued vehicle access to back end of drainage for climbers and to lower parts for kayakers. -Maintain access options for future timber harvesting.	15. -No vehicle access to old mine site.	-Proposed ACP should allow continuing access to past-producing Ashlu quarry and claims/showings around Ashlu Mine
2-Squamish – Ashlu to Elaho-	-Estetisilh wild spirit place on west side of Squamish River. -on going forest operations on the east side of the river.	Do not construct roads on the west side of the Squamish River above Ashlu Creek except for in the small development areas at the north and south ends.	None.	
3-Buck Mountain area	-SFN cultural use. -some wildlife values.	Protect cultural values.	None.	
4-Remainder of LU	-Tricouni area is sensitive to extending existing roads to the south. It is a SFN cultural area. -Main road access for recreation along valley bottom.	Protect sensitive values of Tricouni meadows.	No extension of High Falls Creek Road into Tricouni Meadows.	

Landscape Unit: Lower Squamish

Description of subunit or access corridor	Access sensitive values	Objectives and description of desired future condition	Target	Management considerations (where applicable)
1-West side of Squamish River	-Tantalus Provincial Park	No roads on west side of Squamish River.	No motorized non-industrial access on west side of river.	
2-Levette Lake FSR (6425-01)	-Short-term timber values. -High use recreation site.	Allow continued vehicle access to recreation site.	2WD access to the recreation site.	High priority for recreation access.
3-Remainder of LU	-General access values. - Mineral showings/properties along Howe Sound unaffected	-Other FSR's should be available for vehicle use subject to road condition and MFR policies on maintenance and deactivation.	No access controls except those necessary for public safety and environmental protection.	

Landscape Unit: Mamquam

Description of subunit or access corridor	Access sensitive values	Objectives and description of desired future condition	Target	Management considerations (where applicable)
1-Swift Creek	-Garibaldi Park is	-Minimize potential for	-No access	-Prompt deactivation that

	adjacent. - To the north at Swift Creek, access should be maintained to Spumoni quarry (ie no de-activation)	motorized recreation encroachment into Garibaldi Provincial Park. -All existing FSR's and other resource roads should be available for vehicle use subject to road condition and MFR policies on maintenance and deactivation.	controls except for public safety, environmental protection, and preventing access to park. -No enhancement of motorized access potential into park.	prevents vehicle access of any future roads near park boundary.
2-Brohm Ridge	-Garibaldi Park is adjacent. -Major project review process (Garibaldi at Squamish).	Minimize potential for motorized recreation encroachment into alpine areas or Garibaldi Provincial Park.	-No enhancement of motorized access potential into park.	
3-Cheekeye River	-Used for access by snowmobilers. -Lower part of road accesses Cat Lake recreation site. -SFN cultural values.	Minimize potential for motorized recreation encroachment into alpine areas or Garibaldi Provincial Park. Maintain recreation access to Cat Lake.	-2WD access to Cat Lake.	-Posting of signs, ensuring park boundary markers are visible. -High priority for recreation access to Cat Lake, lower beyond.
4-Mashiter Creek	-Community watershed for the District of Squamish. -mountain biking trails. -Garibaldi Park (Elfin Lakes area) is in the upper reaches of watershed. -SFN cultural values. -Proposed Mashiter Creek ACP affects no mineral properties.	-Maintain water quality, quantity and timing of flow.	-Manage access as directed in the Stawamus River and Mashiter Creek IWMP.	
5-Mamquam (lower)	-Access road to Diamond Head trail starts from here (from Mamquam Road).	-Minimize potential for motorized recreation encroachment into Garibaldi Provincial Park. -All existing FSR's and other resource roads should be available for vehicle use subject to road condition and MFR	-No enhancement of motorized access potential into park.	-Prompt deactivation that prevents vehicle access of any future roads near park boundary.

		policies on maintenance and deactivation.		
6-Crawford Creek and Skookum Creek	-potential motorized access to the alpine and the park if road re-opened.	-Minimize potential for motorized recreation encroachment into alpine areas or Garibaldi Provincial Park. -Other FSR's and other resource roads should be available for vehicle use subject to road condition and MFR policies on maintenance and deactivation.	-No enhancement of motorized access potential into park.	-Control access at the upper end of road if roads re-opened. -Post signs to identify park boundary.
7-Upper Mamquam	-Garibaldi Park is adjacent.	Minimize potential for motorized recreation encroachment into alpine areas or Garibaldi/Pinecone Burke Provincial Parks.	-No enhancement of motorized access potential into park.	-Post signs to identify park boundary.
8-Raffuse Creek	-General access values.	-Other FSR's and other resource roads should be available for vehicle use subject to road condition and MFR policies on maintenance and deactivation.	None	

Landscape Unit: East Howe

Description of subunit or access corridor	Access sensitive values	Objectives and description of desired future condition	Target	Management considerations (where applicable)
1-Stawamus	-Community watershed for District of Squamish. -Access through to Indian River drainage and to Indian Arm Provincial Park (potential closure through Tseil-Waututh Nation SRMP). -Shannon FSR provides recreational opportunities for Climbers (Sky Pilot) and kayakers. -Squamish First	-Maintain water quality, quantity and timing of flow. -Manage access as directed in the Stawamus River and Mashiter Creek IWMP. -Maintain access options for industrial activities, fire fighting and slide rehabilitation.	None.	-Complete road de-activation and rehabilitation subsequent to industrial activities for future roads. - Tseil-Waututh Nation's Indian River SRMP may influence access objectives. - Managing in accordance with the IWMP could restrict access to Shannon FSR. -Access control on the Stawamus River could affect access to claims/showings on Ray Creek and Indian River

	Nation cultural values.			
2-Britannia Creek	-Hazardous areas associated with the mine, no public access as directed by Ministry of Mines. -Access to Mtn. Lake hut and Sky Pilot.	-Public safety with respect to old open pits, shafts, etc. from past mining activity.	None.	-The LRMP recommends that the road to Utopia Lake (Britannia Creek FSR) be “reopened and made drivable.”
3-Furry Creek	-Hazardous areas associated with the mine, no public access as directed by Ministry of Mines.	-Public safety with respect to old open pits, shafts, etc. from past mining activity.	None.	Public Accesses the Mountain Lake Hut (BCMC) and Sky Pilot area through Furry Creek.
4-Remainder of LU	-General access values.	-Any other FSR’s and other resource roads should be available for vehicle use subject to road condition and MFR policies on maintenance and deactivation.	None.	

Landscape Unit: Indian

Description of subunit or access corridor	Access sensitive values	Objectives and description of desired future condition	Target	Management considerations (where applicable)
1 - Entire landscape unit (mostly Tsleil-Waututh Nation tenures)	-Access through to Indian River drainage and to Indian Arm Provincial Park. -Tsleil-Waututh values and SRMP. -Access for forest harvesting operations (Tsleil-Waututh Nation woodlot license, timber licenses, and NRFL). -Fisheries values and vehicle access into the river. -High recreation values, and Norton Lake recreation site.	-Further direction forthcoming from the Tsleil-Waututh Nation’s Indian River SRMP.	Access in accordance with selected SRMP option.	-Signage regarding vehicles in river and fish/wildlife values. -Barriers to river access from roads. -See also the Indian River Watershed Plan. - See the Tsleil-Waututh Nation options described above in Stawamus.

Landscape Unit: Billygoat

Description of subunit or access corridor	Access sensitive values	Objectives and description of desired future condition	Target	Management considerations (where applicable)
1 - Entire	-Borders the east	Do not promote access	No enhancement	-Prompt deactivation that

landscape unit	side of Garibaldi Park. -South half is a First Nations cultural management area. -Ure Creek Nt'atmen area.	to east side of Garibaldi Park.	of motorized access potential into the park.	prevents vehicle access of any future roads near park boundary.
----------------	---	---------------------------------	--	---

Landscape Unit: Lizzie

Description of subunit or access corridor	Access sensitive values	Objectives and description of desired future condition	Target	Management considerations (where applicable)
1 - Lizzie Creek (In-SHUCK-ch /Lizzie FSR)	-Access to trailhead and campsite at Lizzie Lake, high value alpine recreational area.	-Restore public recreational access.	-4WD access or better to the trailhead and campsite.	-The road needs rebuilding.
2 - Twin two Creek watershed	-K'uzalt conservancy.	No roads are to be constructed through the conservancy unless access is required to development opportunities beyond the conservancy and no feasible alternative is available.	No roads.	
3 - Remainder of landscape unit	-Recreation sites throughout the Lillooet Lake and Lower Lillooet River corridor.	Maintain opportunities for all users (industry, local residents, and recreational) on the In-SHUCK-ch FSR. -Other FSR's and other resource roads should be available for vehicle use subject to road condition and MFR policies on maintenance and deactivation.	-2WD access on In-SHUCK-ch FSR.	-Dust control on In-SHUCK-ch FSR near settlements.

Landscape Unit: Rogers

Description of subunit or access corridor	Access sensitive values	Objectives and description of desired future condition	Target	Management considerations (where applicable)
1 - Rogers Creek watershed	-Koli7 (Upper Rogers Creek) Conservancy located in headwaters of Rogers Creek.	No roads to be constructed through conservancy unless access is required to development opportunities beyond the conservancy and no feasible alternative is available.	No enhancement of motorized access potential into the park.	
2 - Remainder of landscape unit	-Recreation sites throughout the	-Maintain opportunities for all	None.	-Dust control on In-SHUCK-ch FSR near settlements.

	Lower Lillooet River corridor.	users (industry, local residents, and recreational) on the In-SHUCK-ch FSR. -Other FSR's and other resource roads should be available for vehicle use subject to road condition and MFR policies on maintenance and deactivation.		
--	--------------------------------	--	--	--

Landscape Unit: Tuwasus

Description of subunit or access corridor	Access sensitive values	Objectives and description of desired future condition	Target	Management considerations (where applicable)
1 - Entire landscape unit	-Entire unit is a First Nations cultural management area. -Borders the east side of Garibaldi Park.	-FSR's and other resource roads should be available for vehicle use subject to road condition and MFR policies on maintenance and deactivation. -Do not promote access to east side of Garibaldi Park.	None.	-Prompt deactivation that prevents vehicle access of any future roads near park boundary.

Landscape Unit: Sloquet High

Description of subunit or access corridor	Access sensitive values	Objectives and description of desired future condition	Target	Management considerations (where applicable)
1-Sloquet Creek	-Grizzly bear habitat.	-Minimize access induced displacement and mortality risk to grizzly bears for use of high value habitat in the Sloquet Creek. -No non-industrial motorized traffic between Sloquet and Stave drainages if a connecting road is built. -Other FSR's and other resource roads should be available for vehicle use subject to road condition and MFR policies on maintenance and deactivation.	-Closed to all motor vehicles past the ACP between April 1 and June 15.	-the suggested ACP is located just past the junction to the North Sloquet FSR. -Suggested ACP affects access to recently active grassroot exploration property on Sloquet Creek
2-Remainder of landscape unit	-Borders the east side of Garibaldi and Golden Ears Provincial Parks.	-Parts of this are a First Nations cultural management area. -Other FSR's and other	-All existing useable FSR's and other resource roads should	

		resource roads should be available for vehicle use subject to road condition and MFR policies on maintenance and deactivation.	remain available (not maintained to any specific standard) for motorized use.	
--	--	--	---	--

4.4.1 Access control for access sensitive areas

A total of 11 areas are identified for access controls in the spring (April 1 to June 15) in order to minimize displacement and mortality of grizzly bears during the spring feeding period. Five of these areas are located in the Upper Lillooet River area (Meager Creek, North Creek, South Creek, Salal Creek, and the Ryan River), two in the Birkenhead Lake area (Upper Birkenhead River and Phelix Creek), two in the Squamish/Elaho River area (Sims Creek and Ashlu Creek), one in the Anderson Lake area (Haylmore Creek), and one in the Lower Lillooet River area (Sloquet Creek). Most of these areas are immediately adjacent (usually down valley) from areas designated as wildland zones in the S2SLRMP. In many of these cases the access control point is located approximately 3-5 kilometers from the end of the existing road. In some cases there is significantly more road beyond the access control point (e.g. Ashlu and Sloquet). Some of these areas may have little use by cars and trucks beyond the proposed access control points due to present road conditions.

There are also two areas identified for year round closures to protect grizzly bears, Upper Sims Creek and the Upper Ryan River. The Upper Ryan is presently not accessible due to missing bridges; the Upper Sims road is presently passable for a short distance beyond the proposed access control point.

There are two community watersheds (Mashiter Creek and Stawamus River) where it is directed by the S2SLRMP that access be restricted in accordance with the previously completed Integrated Watershed Management Plan. Access is presently restricted in both of these watersheds: Mashiter due to locked gate, and Stawamus due to gate and washed out bridges. Following the IWMP direction for the Stawamus could impact some of the recreational activity which currently occurs within the drainage.

4.4.2 Existing Forest Service Roads and non-industrial (recreational) access

Approximately 15 non-industrial recreation use FSR's have been identified in the table as being priorities for maintenance at this time. These roads include access to important trails, recreation sites and recreation areas including provincial parks. They were identified from a number of sources including:

- The LRMP – Appendix 6 – Management Direction for Summer Recreation;
- Consultation with members of the Sea-to-Sky LRMP planning forum;
- Consultation with government agencies.

Many of these roads are presently heavily used by recreational users from within the plan area, the lower mainland, and elsewhere.

It is recognized that priorities for maintaining roads for recreational access may and likely will change over time. This will be in response to both changes in recreational use and to changes in industrial maintenance patterns of existing roads. These priorities can be incorporated into the CAMP by a periodic review.

Many of the remaining FSR's (non-industrial general use), while not identified as accessing "high value" recreation sites or trails, or "important" recreational areas still have some recreational use. While individually they are not as important at this time, in total they do contribute significantly to the recreation opportunity in the plan area. These are not identified as important recreational access routes in the appendix. It is expected that the recreational use will be considered by the District Manager as one of a number of factors when deciding whether to deactivate or keep these roads open.

There are also a number of other roads, which while not specifically identified as non-industrial recreation use FSR's they do provide critical recreational access. Some of these (e.g. the In-SHUCK-ch FSR) are industrial use FSR's with a significant recreational traffic component.

4.4.3 Future road access adjacent to access sensitive areas

There are a number of areas identified in Table #5 where development of access (either by building new roads or re-opening deactivated or impassable ones) will require access control measures be taken by the access developer. Many of these areas are located adjacent to existing provincial parks.

4.5 Public communication and information strategy

Access management is a multifaceted issue and it must be implemented very carefully and concurrently with a public information program that explains the reasons for the access controls. Public communication on the draft CAMP occurred during open house sessions for the S2SLRMP where the draft plan was available and ILMB staff were on hand to answer questions. The draft CAMP was also provided to former members of the S2SLRMP planning table, stakeholders, and First Nations who were consulted during development of the draft CAMP.

A 60-day public review period (ending July 7 2008) allowed the public to download the draft plan from the ILMB website and to provide comments, which assisted in clarifying sections of the CAMP. Public input will continue during plan implementation.

Communication during the implementation phase may include the following:

- Signage explaining the reasons for any access controls;
- Newspaper advertisements and notification of local recreation groups that the CAMP has been completed;
- Advertisements regarding adoption any of legal objectives resulting from the CAMP;
- Providing copies of the CAMP for distribution at the Squamish Forest District office.

4.6 Implementation of the CAMP

The CAMP will be used as a plan to provide direction to government resource agencies and licensees with respect to access management. The CAMP will assist agencies in the decision making process with respect to access management. The decision making process is described in section 4.2 of this plan.

The Ministry of Forests and Range will play an important role through its approval of forest stewardship plans prepared by forest licensees.

The CAMP should be reviewed and revised as necessary in response to changes in access related factors such as regulations and land use issues.

5.0 References:

Forest Practices Board. December 2005. Access Management in British Columbia – Issues and Opportunities.

Ministry of Forests and Range. September, 2006. Cutting Permit and Road Tenure Administration Manual.

Ministry of Forests and Range. November 2007. Engineering Bulletin No. 1 Planning Forest Road Deactivation.

Ministry of Forests and Range. July 2007. Business Area 5 – Engineering - Funding Policy for Road and Structure Maintenance, Road Deactivation, and Road Closure.

Ministry of Forests. January 1989. A Guide to Coordinated Access Management Planning.

Forest Act – Part 8 Roads and Rights of Way.

Forest and Range Practices Act. – Part 3 Forest Practices – Division 2 – Roads.

Forest Planning and Practices Regulation (FRPA Regulation – BC Reg. 14/2004).

Forest Service Road Use Regulation (FRPA Regulation. – BC Reg. 70/2004).

6.0 Appendices

Appendix 1 – List of Acronyms used

ACP – access control point
BCTS - BC Timber Sales
FA - Forest Act
FDP - Forest Development Plan
FPC - Forest Practices Code
FRPA - Forest and Range Practices Act
FPPR - Forest Planning and Practices Regulation
FSP - Forest Stewardship Plan
FSR - Forest Service Road
ILMB - Integrated Land Management Bureau
IPP - Independent power producer.
LRMP - Land and Resource Management Plan
MOEMPR - Ministry of Energy, Mines, and Petroleum Resources
MOE - Ministry of Environment
MFR - Ministry of Forests and Range
MOT - Ministry of Transportation
MTCA - Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and the Arts
RP - Road Permit
RUP - Road Use Permit
SFD – Squamish Forest District
SRMP - Sustainable Resource Management Plan

Appendix 2 – Summary of consultation

A- Initial Consultation

Organization	Comments
Ministry of Forests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -the meeting included a general discussion on the scope of the CAMP. It was noted by the MOF that the proposed scope makes it important to manage expectations (be up front with scope limitations). -it was noted that there has been LRMP money for road maintenance/repair for the last 3 years; this is the last year for it. They are still fixing roads from the washouts of October 2003. They need a long term source of funding to work on these recreation access roads that no longer have an industrial use. In some cases MTCA provides money to the MOF for road work. -the “Resource Roads Act” is supposed to be passed this year; it apparently will clarify responsibility for roads. -MOF cannot guarantee access -gates are difficult to implement; they work best if in public view. If they are located in an isolated spot, near the back end of a valley, there is lots of time to work at cutting through a gate. -the agency who wants the gate should pay for it. -the government retains liability in the case of road maintenance agreements. -road maintenance agreements are used with some commercial recreation operators but not as frequently in the SFD as in the interior of BC. -there is a “split list” which defines which FSR’s the SFD maintains and which ones BCTS maintains. The District Manager is still responsible for any decisions regarding access restrictions on all of the FSR’s. -discussed resource requirements to manage gates, enforcement takes staff, gate repairs take time. -RP holders can reduce their levels of maintenance to “wilderness” if they aren’t using the road for awhile. This is their decision to make. They would generally consult with the MFR but do not need approval. -discussed where “recreational” road maintenance had been done in the last few years. -if there is no money to maintain an FSR the #1 priority is to reduce liability, this may mean closing the road. -Meager Creek FSR will need emergency shutdown procedures now that the bridge has been rebuilt. MTCA should look after this.
Ministry of Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -interests included access interactions with grizzly bear habitats, access to or near existing parks, access to new conservancies. -Steve participated in the S2S forum; he provided additional details on intentions with respect to proposed ACP’s relating to grizzly habitat. -it was noted that the proposed seasonal closures for spring grizzly habitat were one component of an overall grizzly bear management plan and represent only the most important areas. - MOE expressed their support for gates where the rationale included wildlife values, as long as this did not offload full responsibility to MOE.
Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and the Arts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -discussed the scope of the plan and MTCA’s role in road maintenance to recreation sites. -Tim later reviewed and provided comments on a list of proposed priorities for road maintenance relating to access to recreation sites or trails.
Ministry of Energy, Mines, and Petroleum Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -in general as long as mineral exploration operators are operating on a tenure they should be able to get a key to whatever gates are closed and therefore will not be adversely affected. -deactivation will affect mineral exploration however. -provided maps showing where mineral claims were located.
Squamish First Nation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -the meeting included a discussion of the scope of the CAMP. It was noted that the agreements from the land use agreement with the SFN should be incorporated into the CAMP, particularly in the case of any maps that are produced for the CAMP. -it was brought up that SFN is TFL holder and would be bound by any FRPA objectives that come out of the CAMP. -discussions were held on all of the proposed access control points in SFN asserted territory and several other access sensitive areas of interest to SFN. -TFL 38 has an approved wildlife management plan. -SFN requires some consultation on the Indian Landscape Unit SRMP. -SFN would prefer that the gate in the Upper Ashlu (ACP#1) be closed year round not just for the spring

	<p>grizzly period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -SFN would like the access to the old mine site, from roads on the south side of the lower Ashlu made impassible. -the short spur road off Ashlu Main to the start of the foot trail into Sigurd should remain open. -the existing gates on Brohm ridge are not effective in controlling motorized access to the alpine. -the Mamquam watershed has been identified by SFN as a restoration area and potential community forest area. -both the Mashiter and Lower Stawamus watersheds contain sensitive SFN cultural values. Elk re-introduction in the Stawamus area requires careful access management. -SFN support exclusion of motorized use from the Soo River wetland area. -SFN also proposed the following ACP's: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -the Elaho River bridge at the entrance to the Upper Elaho conservancy. -the Sims Creek bridge. -Buck Mountain – suggest a permanently locked gate to protect cultural values.
Lil'Wat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -the scope of the CAMP was discussed -it was noted that Lil'Wat may assume responsibility for maintenance on some roads where they have an interest in keeping roads open.
In-SHUCK-ch First Nation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -it was noted that IFN is currently negotiating a treaty; nothing in the CAMP should affect the treaty. -it was agreed to treat the CAMP as a technical exercise. -some individual access sensitive areas were discussed, it was agreed that IFN would provide further input following internal consultation. -Sloquet Creek – we support access control for grizzly bears. -Lower Lillooet area- we are lobbying for an upgrade to the road. -Fire Creek –we support motorized access into Fire Creek, but do not support motorized recreation. -have grave concerns about motorized recreation due to impacts on traditional cultural and ecological values. Do not support un-tenured motorized recreation in their traditional territory.
Tseil-Waututh Nation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -TWN has purchased private land and Timber Licenses in the Indian River area, has a woodlot license, and is in the process of negotiating a Forest and Range agreement volume based tenure in the area. -TWN works on restoring fish runs in the Indian River. -TWN has produced a Bioregional Atlas of the watershed and provided a copy. -There was a watershed assessment done in 1999, which recommended road deactivation, some of which was undertaken but this was getting near the end of the Forest Renewal BC watershed restoration funding. -TWN is looking for a commitment to do some restoration in here. -fixing the FSR so that it is drivable through to Squamish would be expensive, require ongoing maintenance and probably doesn't make sense from a timber harvesting perspective given the adverse haul and limited volumes. -TWN needs a meeting with MOF, BC Hydro (BC Transmission), and Terasen to decide what to with access. -The SRMP at present has 2 options for access in the Indian LU, these were discussed and documentation provided. -TWN would like to review and provide comments on the East Howe and Mamquam Landscape Units.
N'Quatqua First Nation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -no discussions were held.
LRMP Forum (forestry)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -discussed scope of the plan. Mike noted that an important aspect of access management/planning is to explain who is responsible for various roads at present. -industry does not mind access controls as long as they are not responsible for the gates.
LRMP Forum (forestry)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The meeting started with a discussion of the scope of the CAMP. It was noted that the LRMP access recommendations are really just “gates for grizzlies”. Two other important components of access planning are maintaining access for non-industrial users and ensuring that we don't create further motorized access where we don't want it. (E.g. adjacent to existing parks). There was also some discussion about air access and motorized boat use on the Upper Soo river. It was noted that air access is under Federal jurisdiction, motorized water access could possibly be addressed by the CAMP through put ins/take outs. -there was some discussion on how the CAMP would be managed/implemented in the future – should an advisory committee with both government and local stakeholders be set up or should it be run by government through IPIT and PIMSY? -detailed discussions were held on approximately 2/3 of the access control point recommendations from the LRMP.

BC Whitewater Association	-Contacted but could not attend meeting.
Federation of BC Mountain Clubs	-Contacted but could not attend meeting.
Association for Mineral Exploration BC	-in general as long as mineral exploration operators are operating on a tenure they should be able to get a key to whatever gates are closed and therefore will not be adversely affected. (Two zone policy provides this security of access).
BC Timber Sales	-the scope was discussed as was BCTS road responsibility. -BCTS plans for development in various access sensitive areas were reviewed. -BCTS agreed to provide more detailed comments once he consulted with their engineering person.

Note: The above summary of comments reflects comments of a general nature. Each meeting also included a review of the individual access control points proposed in the LRMP. Many of the site specific comments were incorporated into the table in Appendix 4 and not all are documented in the above summary.

B –Review of the draft CAMP (first and second drafts)

Comment from	Comment	Response
Review of the first draft		
MOF (from Feb. 12 meeting and email)	Scope –would like the CAMP to address issues related to the management of existing network of roads, particularly roads not actively used by industry but there is pressure to maintain them for recreation.	This issue has been included in the CAMP.
	The plan should focus on specifying the result to be achieved, not how to do it.	This has been incorporated into the latest draft.
	The plan should not create expectations that roads will still be drivable following deactivation.	A statement to this effect has been included.
	The plan needs to set a reasonable level of expectations around how effect we expect any access measures to be. History show that some users will get around many structures. The government should not be “on the hook” for 100% prevention of access.	A statement to this effect has been included.
	Closures need to consider the entire forestry operations cycle (including reforestation).	The wording has been changed to reflect this concern.
	Ensure the CAMP is compatible with the latest MFR policies on road administration, maintenance, and deactivation (copies were provided by MFR).	The policies provided were reviewed and changes to the plan were made accordingly.
	Distinguish carefully between existing and future roads in the CAMP since there can be differences in the degree of licensee responsibility and funding mechanisms (appraisal considers, etc.).	The plan was revised to address this concern.
	Discussed how to present the interface of the CAMP with MOF decision making, can describe in general terms, need to leave flexibility for District Manager to make decisions in accordance with legislation, regulations, and policy.	Additional sections were added to address this.
MTCA (Feb. 12 meeting)	Need to consider access to provincial parks.	The plan was revised to address this concern.

Comment from	Comment	Response
	Need to consider roads like the In-SHUCK-ch FSR which are basically industrially maintained but have a significant recreation use component.	The plan was revised to address this concern.
	Need flexibility to modify the priorities for recreational maintenance identified in the CAMP as conditions change.	A statement to this effect has been included.
MOE (Feb. 12 meeting)	ACP's for grizzly bear all protect areas important to grizzly bear recovery. The locations have already been subject to considerable negotiation (at the LRMP table) in order to move them to locations that protect bears while minimizing impact on other resource users.	No changes were necessary.
	Under the wildlife act motorized vehicles include snowmobiles, ATV's etc as well as cars and trucks.	No changes were necessary.
	Signs alone will not be effective, since the seasonal closures are aimed at poaching as well as just disturbance.	This is more of an implementation issue that something that can be dealt with at the CAMP stage.
	There was a discussion about using the wildlife act to close areas to snowmobiles, etc. but it was suggested that this would not be applied as widely (possibly to only 2 or 3 of the areas proposed in the LRMP/CAMP).	No changes were necessary.
	It is important to identify the areas proposed for seasonal closures in the CAMP in order to carry it through from the LRMP.	No changes were necessary.
LRMP Forum (forestry) (Jan 25 meeting)	This is not a CAMP, it is an access restriction plan.	The subsequent drafts have been modified to provide more balance in terms of relative focus on different aspects of access management.
	There needs to be an ongoing maintenance budget associated with the CAMP in order to address recreational access (surface maintenance, creation of parking lots, pullouts, snow plowing, etc.) Recreational use of the land base was identified as a major issue in the LRMP. To be consistent government should follow through with funding to maintain roads so that people can access it.	This is beyond the scope of the CAMP and was not addressed.
	The draft CAMP proposed too many gates. These are expensive and unpopular. The seasonal access controls for grizzly bears were only agreed to reluctantly at the CAMP level by many of the sectors.	The CAMP has been refocused on objectives not procedures or specific control measures which should at least partially address this concern.
	Delete references to summer back country recreation zones.	These references have been deleted.
	Many individual comments on specific drainages and roads were also provided.	Many of these comments were incorporated into the objectives table.
LRMP forum – wildlife (email)	No further comments.	No action necessary.
Squamish First Nation (email)	Need to reference the Agreement on Land Use Planning between the Squamish Nation and the government of BC. This provides direction with respect to access management in the wild spirit places.	This has been included in the CAMP.
	Many individual comments on specific drainages and roads were also provided.	Many of these comments were incorporated into the objectives table.
Tseil-Waututh Nation (email)	Spelling of Tseil-Waututh Nation was incorrect.	This has been changed as specified.
	Several individual comments on specific drainages and roads were also provided.	Incorporated into the objectives table.
In-SHUCK-ch	The In-SHUCK-ch desire no impediments to improvements on	The table in question is no longer

Comment from	Comment	Response
First Nation (meeting between Frank DeGagne and David Carson)	the Forest Service Road from the north end of Harrison Lake to the Duffy Lake Road. The CAMP tables should be changed to reflect this.	included in the CAMP.
	The CAMP table and the LRMP are inconsistent with respect to seasonal closures in the Sloquet drainage (one says spring and the other fall). The In-SHUCK-ch desire that access into the Stave drainage is sufficiently impeded.	Incorporated into the objectives table.
Comments on second draft		
BCTS (email)	-To meet legal requirements if a road is to be deactivated a barrier must be erected unless this requirement is waived by the District Manager.	A statement to this effect has been included.
	Licenses can and often do apply to the District Manager for permission to install a gate for security and safety during logging operations.	A statement to this effect has been included.
	Gates should be put on the town end of a bridge rather than in the middle, it may be dangerous for some less experienced drivers to back up across a bridge.	Some discussion of this consideration has been added.
	With new roads, it is less controversial to install access control immediately, before anyone has gotten used to using the road.	A statement to this effect has been included.
	What about helicopter access for planting during the spring access control period. From a noise perspective this can be just as or more disruptive as vehicles on the ground.	Aerial access is outside the scope of the plan, no changes were made.
Lil'Wat First Nation (email)	Many individual comments on specific drainages and roads were also provided.	Many of these comments were incorporated into the objectives table.
LRMP forum – wildlife (email)	One comment pertaining to Rutherford Creek was made, otherwise no further comments.	Incorporated into the objectives table.
LRMP forum – environment (email)	Comment that earlier direction from forum on access was missing from both LRMP and CAMP.	Provided summary in introduction to explain
MFR	Several comments from email April 4 that provided clarification on details of responsibility, legislation, and implementation.	Comments were incorporated into the Public Review Draft.
MOE	Several comments from email April 22 that provided clarification that motorized vehicles should include ATV and snowmobiles, legislative details, and other scope issues.	Comments were incorporated into the final draft.

C: Review of the Public Review Draft

Comment From	Comment	Response
Public comments	Comments include: access control points should apply to all motorized vehicles, including snowmobiles and ATVs. Acknowledge additional roads used for recreation, recommend other roads for improvements and additional maintenance.	Comments acknowledged and added to final draft introduction and area-specific objectives.
MFR	Additional clarification on the draft, mainly in response to public comments.	Clarified sections of the plan.
MTCA	Provided general comments that confirmed agency responsibility in access management	A statement has been included to this effect.
MAL/ILMB	Points of clarification and accuracy,	Changes made

Appendix 3 – Summary of access-sensitive areas, present access conditions, access related values and considerations

LU: Gates		
Access sensitive subunit or access corridor description	Present access conditions and road status	Access sensitive values and access related factors
1-Haylmore and Common Johnny watersheds	-Haylmore Creek FSR (5694-01-maintained), Common Johnny Branch (5694-03-wilderness). -BCTS responsible for roads. -drivable to at least the ACP. -existing gate (unlocked) on Common Johnny bridge.	-Grizzly bear habitat (WHA) in Common Johnny Creek -goat kidding areas and winter range in all drainages -Twin Lakes trailhead, historic motorized use up the Barclay Valley to the alpine (recognized as non-motorized though). -IPP application lower down on Haylmore Creek. -short-term timber values in Common Johnny Creek and Middle Haylmore.
2-Remainder of LU	Blackwater Creek FSR (FSR 8354-01&07)- Public use – maintained, access to Birkenhead Lake Provincial Park. King Creek FSR (FSR 9298-01)-listed as “inspect”. Spruce Creek FSR (FSR 9034.01) King Creek FSR (FSR 9290) Eight Mile Creek FSR (FSR 9299) (segment 02-permanent deactivation).	-general access values.
LU: Birkenhead		
Access sensitive subunit or access corridor description	Present access conditions and road status	Access sensitive values and access related factors
1-Birkenhead River watershed above Tenquille Creek	-Birkenhead River FSR (5733), gate to restrict access to Br. 10. (wilderness FSR). -RP - R11681-Squamish Timber at back end). -BCTS responsible for this road. -Br. 10 may get deleted as an FSR if it no longer leads to any timber.	Zoning-wildland and approach zone. -Quelimak (Upper Birkenhead) conservancy above ACP. Values: goat winter range, important grizzly bear spring range on south slopes. -Trailhead for “east” Tenquille Lake trail -short-term timber values on the south side of Tenquille Creek (unaffected by ACP).
2-Phelix Creek watershed	-Phelix Crk. FSR (8354-02)- wilderness – BCTS responsibility. -Blackwater FSR as far as Birkenhead Lake. This road is required for access to the provincial park. -ACP affects branches 3-5 – these are listed as permanent deactivation. -the road is rough beyond the park, it may be possible to drive up to 5 km past junction with 4WD, but it is too rough for most vehicles to get up even the first hill. The Blackwater FSR (8354-01) is a “public use” FSR –requires ongoing maintenance, grading, dust control, etc.	-Grizzly bear habitat. -goat winter range. -prime alpine recreation area. -VOC cabin (Brian Waddington Hut). -wildland approach area. -short term timber values on the east side of Phelix Creek, ending just before proposed ACP at bridge across Phelix Creek.
3-Owl Creek watershed	-FSR (8458) –Wilderness FSR. -Lil’ Wat First Nation RUP over first part of	-Recreational access to Owl Lake Trailhead. -Cultural sites.

	road (in WL), then BCTS area. -some rough areas at present-4WD.	-IPP application. -short term timber values near end of road, BCTS presently in discussions with Lil'Wat FN re upgrading road.
4-Remainder of LU	Birkenhead/Tenquille (FSR 5733-01) – maintained by BCTS. Spetch Creek FSR (9302)-wilderness Mount Currie FSR (8675)	-general access values.
LU: Railroad		
Access sensitive subunit or access corridor description	Present access conditions and road status	Access sensitive values and access related factors
1-North Creek watershed above Delilah Creek	R09492 (Squamish Mills) -The Upper Lillooet FSR is not usually plowed past the Hurley Pass Road.	-Zoning-wildland and approach zone. -Grizzly bear habitat (WHA's). -Goat winter range. -BCMC cabin –trail appears to access this from west side of North Creek so not affected by proposed ACP. -IPP application near Delilah confluence with North Crk.
2-Tenquille Lake (west access)	-Hurley River/Tenquille FSR (FSR 7973-02) (wilderness FSR., (also called Branch 12). It is difficult to drive the last 2 km to the trailhead at present. -This is an important recreational access.	-prime alpine recreation area, highly used by hikers and mountain bikers (recreational and commercial groups).
3-Hurley road	-Hurley River FSR (7973) wilderness FSR – This is important for recreational access and is well used at present.	-access to Goldbridge and Bralorne, several recreation sites, Railroad Pass, back country skiing, and snowmobiling.
4-Mackenzie Basin	-Mackenzie Basin FSR (7867). -MOT responsible for part of this. -This is an important recreational access route.	-hang gliding and para gliding. -important for recreational access.
5-Remainder of LU	-Upper Lillooet FSR (6123.01)-not open beyond Hurley Pass Road in winter. There is avalanche hazard along this stretch. This road is important for recreational access to Meager Creek during the operating season for the hot springs.	-access to Meager Creek area in season.
LU: Upper Lillooet		
Access sensitive subunit or access corridor description	Present access conditions and road status	Access sensitive values and access related factors
1-Salal Creek watershed	-Upper Lillooet FSR (6123.01), then RP road up Salal Creek -Can drive to trailhead at end of road now.	-Zoning-wildland and approach zone. -Grizzly bear WHA. -Trailhead for Athelney Pass and Mt Athelstan trail. Also possibly a trail to White Cross Mtn. -IPP application near end of existing Salal Creek road. -pumice mine and mineral claims at front end. -snowmobile travel corridor on the west fork of Salal Creek.
2-Remainder of LU	-Upper Lillooet FSR.	-general access values.
LU: Meager		
Access sensitive subunit or access corridor description	Present access conditions and road status	Access sensitive values and access related factors
1-Meager Creek	-Meager Creek FSR (6123-03) and Hotsprings Creek FSR (6123-04). These roads are	-Grizzly bear habitat. -recreational use of Meager Creek Hot Springs.

	<p>important for recreational access to the Meager Creek hot springs and trailheads.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -ACP 10-just past hot springs on FSR 6123-04, approx. 3km past bridge crossing Meager Crk, may be existing gate. -ACP 10-Approx. 1.5 km on FSR 6123-3 (or look for spot on bridge) -Bridge has just been rebuilt over Meager Creek at 6.5 km. -The Lillooet River FSR (6123-01) is usually not plowed, so this area will be summer access only -There is a gate at the Lillooet River crossing. -road is not maintained now since the bridge has been out, there will be more logging now that the bridge is rebuilt. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -trail head access to 100 lakes plateau and Upper Elaho Wild Spirit Place. -Capricorn Creek safety issues-very geologically active. There are shutdown guidelines for this area based on precipitation and temperature. -several IPP applications beyond both ACP's. -short-term timber values beyond ACP's.
2-South Creek	-RP road from Lillooet South Crk FSR (FSR 7977) –industrial use FSR.	-Grizzly bear habitat
3-Remainder of LU	-Lillooet South FSR.	-general access values.
LU: Ryan		
Access sensitive subunit or access corridor description	Present access conditions and road status	Access sensitive values and access related factors
1-Ryan River	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -access controlled at gate on private property near Lillooet River, apparently only business users are allowed in at present. -Back half of drainage - Ryan River FSR (8015- 01, 02)-Wilderness FSR. -front half-non status road. -bridges are now out at 2km, 8km, 16 km – closed with no anticipated repair date. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Grizzly bear habitat- most important area in S2S LRMP for grizzlies. -good kayaking below 8km. -IPP application appears to be above missing bridge (approx. 15 km). -future timber values. -some short term timber values, most at front end, otherwise mostly longer term values. -mineral claims.
2- Remainder of LU	Pemberton Crk FSR (8188-01&02) in WL Miller Bench Crk FSR (9717-01)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -some short term timber values. -ski touring loop -2 existing IPP's, 1 on Miller, 1 on S. Miller
LU: Soo		
Access sensitive subunit or access corridor description	Present access conditions and road status	Access sensitive values and access related factors
1-Soo River	Soo River FSR 7910 (01-05) Industrial use FSR (RichPly) – 4WD recommended.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -ungulate winter range (moose) and wetlands. -1 existing IPP. -short term timber values. -Su7a (Upper Soo) conservancy includes back part of the watershed including several km of FSR. -Lil-Wat and Squamish First Nation cultural values. -Nt'akmen area.
2-Rutherford Creek	-Rutherford Creek FSR (5673-01).	-public use of and access to Echo lake.

watershed	-0-11.7 km Wilderness-BCTS responsibility. -11.7-22.3 km permanent deactivation. -Lil'Wat has concrete plant near where FSR joins highway. -Industrial use FSR, seasonally deactivated – 4WD only.	-Lil'Wat may want commercial recreation tenures here. -2 existing IPP's at approx. 12 km. -the road is usually a snowmobile trail in the winter, it provides an alternative route to the Pemberton Ice Cap. -mineral claims at back end.
3-Wedgemount Lake	-Wedge Creek FSR (8723-01). This road is important for recreational access and has had some recent work has been done for this purpose.	-access to Wedgemount Lake trailhead. -IPP proposal on Wedgemount Creek.
4-Remainder of LU	-Hwy 99.	-general access values.
LU: Whistler		
Access sensitive subunit or access corridor description	Present access conditions and road status	Access sensitive values and access related factors
1-Upper Cheakamus River area	-Cheakamus Lake FSR (3077-01) and FSR (3077-03) to Black Tusk micro wave tower – both Wilderness FSR's – BC Hydro gate is presently locked at approximately 5km in order to restrict access to the park. The road up to 5 km is important for recreational access and therefore some surface work was done and a parking lot built here recently.	One branch of Cheakamus Lake FSR (3077-03) (also called Westside Main) is adjacent to the Garibaldi Park boundary at one point.
2-Daisy Lake east side	Daisy Lake FSR (9281-01) Industrial Use FSR. Some dust control done by MOF near recreation site.	Daisy Lake FSR is close to Garibaldi Park boundary at one point. (not an issue at present)
3-Conroy Creek area	Conroy Creek FSR (9176-01) -This road is important for recreational access and consequently some upgrading has been done here for recreational access. -wilderness FSR.	-One branch of Conroy Creek FSR (9176-03) ends close to the Garibaldi Park boundary. (not an issue at present) -rock climbing, potential for recreation site
4-Remainder of LU	-Hwy 99 and Wedge Creek FSR -various, mostly non-status roads extending close to Garibaldi Park boundary.	-general access values.
LU: Elaho		
Access sensitive subunit or access corridor description	Present access conditions and road status	Access sensitive values and access related factors
1-Sims Creek watershed	-All RP road – presently drivable to at least ACP. -expected to only be drivable for another year or so.	-Grizzly bear habitat. -trailhead to Princess Louisa Inlet located just before ACP #16. -Nexw-ayantstut (Sims Creek) Wild Spirit Place.
2-Upper Elaho Valley Conservancy	All RP road, bridge built across Elaho River and road extends approximately 2 km into the conservancy.	-Upper Elaho Valley Conservancy -access to trailhead for Elaho Canyon/Meager Creek wilderness route (not affected by ACP). -comprises part of Nsiiwx-nitem tla sutch' Wild Spirit Place.
3-Remainder of Nsiiwx-nitem tla sutch' Wild Spirit Place	-some existing roads in southwest corner.	-SFN cultural values.
4-Remainder of LU	-main roads along valley bottoms.	-Blanca Lakes area is sensitive to extending

		existing roads to the south. It is a SFN cultural area. -active logging area, short-term timber values.
LU: Upper Squamish		
Access sensitive subunit or access corridor description	Present access conditions and road status	Access sensitive values and access related factors
1-Upper Squamish watershed above Elaho confluence	All RP road	On going forest operations.
2-Ashlu Creek watershed	Squamish River/Ashlu River FSR (9160-02) Industrial use FSR to just before ACP, RP beyond that to the back end. -presently maintained by IPP operator to 26 mile, wilderness RP road now.	-Grizzly bear habitat. -1 existing and 1 proposed IPP. -road access to Sigurd Creek trailhead (A-200 Road-approx. 22 mile). -SFN cultural and wildlife values in Upper Ashlu and Tatlow watersheds. -Lil'Wat cultural values. -access to Ashlu Mountain (summer recreation recommendation) should be kept open. -kayaking access to Ashlu -remove access to old mine site on the south side of the Lower Ashlu (Osprey Mines on Marten Creek). -not active for logging now but significant short-term timber values. -concentration of mineral claims.
3-Squamish – Ashlu to Elaho-	Squamish River FSR (9160-01) – Industrial use FSR.	-Este-tiwilth wild spirit place on west side of Squamish River. -on going forest operations on the east side of the river.
4-Buck Mountain area	RP road.	-SFN cultural use. -some wildlife values. -SFN want a permanently locked gate here. -Future timber operations are likely here so permanent deactivation is not an option.
5-Remainder of LU	-main roads along valley bottoms.	-Tricouni area is sensitive to extending existing roads to the south.
LU: Lower Squamish		
Access sensitive subunit or access corridor description	Present access conditions and road status	Access sensitive values and access related factors
1-West side of Squamish River	No road access at present.	-Tantalus Provincial Park -some private land and Crown forest land (BCTS) between the park and the river.
2-Levette Lake FSR (6425-01)	Levette Lake FSR (6425-01). This road is important for recreational access.	-Short-term timber values. -high use recreation site.
3-Remainder of LU	Squamish River Road, Paradise Valley Road.	-general access values.
LU: Mamquam		
Access sensitive subunit or access corridor description	Present access conditions and road status	Access sensitive values and access related factors
1-Swift Creek	-Brohm Creek FSR 6527-02 (maintained), 04 (wilderness)	

2-Brohm Ridge	-Brohm Ridge FSR (6527-01 – Wilderness FSR 6527 -05 -Brohm crossover FSR 6527 -06 –Wilderness -2 existing gates, may not be effective in controlling access.	-Garibaldi Park is adjacent. -Presently the subject of a major project review process (Garibaldi at Squamish).
3-Cheekeye River	-Brohm-Cheekeye FSR (6527-03) – permanent deactivation	-used for access by snowmobilers. -Lower part of road accesses Cat Lake recreation site.
4-Mashiter Creek	-Mashiter Creek FSR (8035-01). -Ring Creek North FSR (6782-01)-Maintained BCTS. -Access is currently restricted by two locked gates, one at Alice Lake Park and the other at the Branvold Creek bridge (5.3 km on Ring Creek FSR).	-Community Watershed for the District of Squamish. -back up source of water. -mountain biking trails. -Diamond Head/Elfin Lakes part of Garibaldi Park in upper reaches of watershed.
5-Mamquam (lower)	-Mamquam FSR (9283-01). -Industrial use-open. Some dust control done by MOF here. -Ring Creek South FSR (9244-01).	-some BCTS blocks here. -access road to Diamond Head trail starts from here (from Mamquam Road).
6-Crawford Creek and Skookum Creek	-Mamquam Crawford FSR (9283-05)-BCTS permanent deactivation. -Mamquam Skookum West FSR (9283-02) BCTS permanent deactivation. However both these may still be ATV accessible. -Mamquam Skookum East FSR (9283-03) BCTS permanent deactivation.	-potential motorized access to the alpine and the park if the roads are re-opened. -recreation access to Mamquam Mountain. -1 IPP application near the back of each drainage may result in the roads being reopened.
7-Upper Mamquam	Mamquam FSR (9283-01).	
8-Raffuse Creek		-IPP application. -general access values.
LU: East Howe		
Access sensitive subunit or access corridor description	Present access conditions and road status	Access sensitive values and access related factors
1-Stawamus	Stawamus Indian FSR(4823-01) –Wilderness – Closed (gate) at 3km, bridge out at 16.5 km Stawamus Indian-Shannon FSR (4823-02) – Wilderness - permanently deactivated. Stawamus Indian FSR (4823-03)	-Community watershed for District of Squamish (backup water source). -access through to Indian River drainage and to Indian Arm Provincial Park. -climbers (Sky Pilot) and kayakers want access to Shannon FSR. -it was suggested in the LRMP that the Shannon FSR should be re-opened to 4x4 access.
2-Britannia Creek	Britannia Creek FSR (8321-01)-permanently closed to public access with gate at the start.	-hazardous areas associated with the mine, no public access as directed by Ministry of Mines. -short-term timber values. -the draft LRMP recommends that the road to Utopia Lake (Britannia Creek FSR) be “reopened and made drivable” (page 20), providing access to Mtn. Lake hut and Sky Pilot.
3-Furry Creek	Furry Creek/Phyllis FSR (8210-02) Wilderness Furry Creek/Downing Creek FSR8210-03 – Permanent Deactivation Furry Creek Porteau FSR8210-04 - permanently closed to public access with gate	-hazardous areas associated with the mine, no public access as directed by Ministry of Mines. -hikes and recreation values, people ride in on mountain bikes now. -short-term timber values. - 2 IPP’s here, 1 in operation.

	at the start.	
4-Remainder of LU	Hwy. 99 and various non status roads.	-general access values.
LU: Indian		
Access sensitive subunit or access corridor description	Present access conditions and road status	Access sensitive values and access related factors
Entire landscape unit	-Stawamus Indian FSR-4823-01 –Wilderness – Closed (gate) at 3km, bridge out at 16.5 km. -Stawamus Indian/Meslillooet FSR4823-04-permanent deactivation. -Stawamus Indian/Hixon FSR4823-05-Wilderness-this is connected to the Greater Vancouver watershed road from Coquitlam Lake. -Stawamus Indian/Young Lake FSR4823-06/07-Wilderness - provides access to woodlot license. -BCTS Log dump/barge ramp at the Indian River estuary.	-access through to Indian River drainage and to Indian Arm Provincial Park. -Tsleil-Waututh values and SRMP. -Access for forest harvesting operations (Tsleil-Waututh woodlot license, timber licenses, and NRFL). -access to BCTC transmission line and Terasen gas pipeline. -fisheries values and vehicle access into the river. -some mineral claims. -Norton Lake recreation site.
LU: Billygoat		
Access sensitive subunit or access corridor description	Present access conditions and road status	Access sensitive values and access related factors
Entire landscape unit	Green River FSR (7979-01) Lillooet West FSR (8407) Public Use.	-Borders Garibaldi Park. -South half is a First Nations cultural management area. -short-term timber values shown in Ure Creek and next drainage to the south.
LU: Lizzie		
Access sensitive subunit or access corridor description	Present access conditions and road status	Access sensitive values and access related factors
Lizzie Creek	-Access to trailhead and campsite at Lizzie Lake, high value alpine recreational area.	-minimal short term timber values. -large # of mineral claims. -IPP applications.
Twin two Creek watershed	-K'uzult conservancy. -IPP application.	
Remainder of landscape unit	-In-SHUCK-ch FSR – industrial use, but very important for both recreation and access to communities.	-large number of mineral claims. -recreation sites throughout the Lillooet Lake and Lower Lillooet River Corridor. -access to First Nations communities.
LU: Rogers		
Access sensitive subunit or access corridor description	Present access conditions and road status	Access sensitive values and access related factors
Rogers Creek	-road may be gated at bottom.	-Kolii7 (Upper Rogers Creek) conservancy.
Remainder of LU	-In-SHUCK-ch FSR – industrial use, but very important for both recreation and access to communities.	-access to First Nations communities.
LU: Tuwasus		
Access sensitive subunit or	Present access conditions and road status	Access sensitive values and access related

access corridor description		factors
LU: Sloquet High		
Access sensitive subunit or access corridor description	Present access conditions and road status	Access sensitive values and access related factors
	Sloquet Creek FSR (6780-01) Fire Lake FSR (8879-01) Lillooet West FSR (8407-01)	-Grizzly bear habitat -In-SHUCK First Nation cultural values.

Appendix 4. Access Control Points: Spring Closures

The following access direction applies to specific watershed areas in the Sea-to-Sky Forest District, and was confirmed during a March 9, 2009 meeting between MFR, MOE, TFL 38, and ILMB.

The purpose of this implementation direction is to control motorized access into areas that are sensitive during the spring season (April 1 – June 15) for emerging grizzly bear (sow and cub) populations.

Access Control Point - Area Location	Agreed Prescription
<p>1. Haylmore and Common Johnny watersheds in the Gates Landscape Unit.</p> <p>Location of the ACP would be on the bridge crossing at Common Johnny Creek.</p> <p>The road is currently in poor condition with ongoing slides, and this restricts the passage of vehicles. Mainly ATV access.</p> <p>The road is snow-covered in April with some access to snowmobiles during this time.</p>	<p>Existing gate on bridge to be locked.</p> <p>MFR – Advertise road closure and post signs, and assess gate for operability. Communicate closures to clients, websites.</p> <p>MOE – Check gate, ensure it is closed during period of closure (April 1 – June 15) and open during all other times. Notify MFR if signs missing. Communicate closures to clients, websites.</p> <p>ILMB and other agencies – Communicate closures to clients, online, and update CAMP.</p> <p>Note: If bridge or gate is damaged, repairs are not possible without repairing the road. MFR will re-assess at that time.</p>
<p>2. Tenquille Creek in the Birkenhead Landscape Unit.</p> <p>Location of the ACP is the bridge on the South side of the River.</p>	<p>Recent discussions between BC Parks, BCTS and Lil'wat Nation have addressed questions regarding access to the new Birkenhead conservancy.</p> <p>With no further need for industrial access, a footbridge for non-motorized access is preferred upon bridge removal.</p> <p>Bridge footings should be retained when bridge is removed in order to facilitate footbridge installation.</p>
<p>3. Phelix Creek in the Birkenhead Landscape Unit.</p> <p>Location of ACP is at the lower bridge.</p>	<p>MFR – Advertise closure, post signs, and flag location where closure begins. Communicate closures to clients, websites.</p>

Access Control Point - Area Location	Agreed Prescription
Signs to be placed at the start of the road and at the bridge.	MOE – Evaluate road for condition and location of gate, ensure it is closed during period of closure (April 1 – June 15) and open during all other times. Notify MFR if signs missing. Communicate closures to clients, websites.
<p>4. Delilah Creek in the North Creek Watershed in the Railroad Landscape Unit.</p> <p>No gate is necessary as the road quality is very poor. Each year boulders from the upslope cut banks cover the road and make travel impossible.</p> <p>This area is a Squamish Mills forest tenure area. Unsure about their long-term plans in the area.</p>	MFR – Advertise closure, post signs, and flag location where closure begins. Communicate closures to clients, websites. Evaluate future use of road by Squamish Mills. If Squamish Mills proposes activities, they will be instructed to install a seasonal gate.
5. Salal Creek in the Upper Lillooet Landscape Unit.	MFR - Advertise closure, post signs, and flag location where closure begins. Evaluate future use of road by Squamish Mills.
<p>6. Meager Creek in the Meager Landscape Unit. Access Control Points at North Meager road and South Meager road.</p> <p>Long-term solution would involve putting a gate on a bridge on either Hotspring Creek or Barr Creek.</p>	<p>North Meager Road</p> <p>MFR - Advertise closure and post signs. Close gate.</p> <p>MOE – Check gate, ensure it is closed during period of closure (April 1 – June 15) and open during all other times. Notify MFR if signs missing. Communicate closures to clients, websites.</p> <p>South Meager Road</p> <p>MFR – Advertise closure, post signs and flag area with a temporary barricade where closure begins.</p> <p>MTCA contractor responsible for Meager Creek hot springs will be requested by MFR to monitor access. Notify MFR if signs missing. Communicate closures to clients, websites.</p>
<p>7. South Creek</p> <p>This is considered a high-maintenance</p>	MFR - Advertise closure, post signs and flag area with a temporary barricade where closure begins.

Access Control Point - Area Location	Agreed Prescription
<p>road. Currently there is IPP exploration in this area.</p> <p>The long-term solution would involve putting a gate on South Creek.</p>	<p>MOE – Check gate, ensure it is closed during period of closure (April 1 – June 15) and open during all other times. Notify MFR if signs missing. Communicate closures to clients, websites.</p>
<p>8. Ryan River</p> <p>There is currently a permanent year-round closure on this road, starting from the private property near where the road begins.</p> <p>Bridge at 8 km is not passable.</p>	<p>MFR – If bridge replacement at 8 km is approved, re-examine need for gate at this location.</p>
<p>9. Sloquet Creek</p> <p>There is currently considerable construction activities on this road. There is low reported grizzly bear populations.</p>	<p>No action to be taken in this area.</p>
<p>10. Sims Creek</p> <p>This access sensitive area is within TFL 38. The crossing at Wingate Creek (50.5 km) is likely to be most effective location for closure.</p>	<p>MFR – Advertise closure</p> <p>TFL 38 – Post signs and flag area with a temporary barricade where closure begins. If logging activity will occur in this area, the licensee will control access appropriately.</p>
<p>11. Ashlu Creek</p> <p>This access sensitive area is within TFL 38. The bridge at 25.5 km is likely to be the most effective location for closure. The long-term solution would be to find an appropriate location for a gate.</p>	<p>MFR – Advertise closure</p> <p>TFL 38 - Post signs and flag area with a temporary barricade where closure begins.</p>

7.0 Coordinated Access Management Plan Map

The following reference map has been reduced in size to fit within this document. A full-size map and shape files may be downloaded from the following internet location:

<http://ilmbwww.gov.bc.ca/slrp/lrmp/surrey/s2s/index.html>