

Presentation of the ART SRP to IAMC
December 1st 2000

Introduction: Want to touch on five things.

- ❖ The People Involved and the Real Product
- ❖ The ART SRP TOR
- ❖ Highlights of The ART SRP
- ❖ Outstanding Items in the Plan
- ❖ Conclusion

I) What are we presenting and who is presenting?

Of course it's the ART SRP but:

What we have, is a wrap up of eight years of planning, in the Anahim area. The last four years under the guidance of Sub Regional Planning. It is not just text and maps but what I would like to say is proof of a better understanding and the evidence of the communication that has happened, between all stakeholder in the plan area. With some pain, and a lot of compromise, I can say we now have agreement, and or, have a better understanding of all the objectives and strategies required to accommodate all the representatives.

Who are the signatories representing? Representatives include members of; the Anahim Lake Cattlemen Assoc., Anahim Lake Community Assoc., Anahim Round Table Chair, BC Wildlife Federation, Blackwater Ootsa Comm. Assoc., Charlotte Lake Lease Landowners, Chilcotin Guide Outfitters Assoc., Chilcotin Trappers Assoc., DWB Forestry, BC Assets and Lands Corp., B.C. Environment, Min. of Energy and Mines, MOF Region, MOF Chilcotin Forest District, B.C. Parks, Min. of Small Business, Tourism and Culture, Kleena Kleene Resource Assoc., Nimpo Lake Community Assoc., Ulkatcho Indian Band, West Chilcotin Forest Products, West Chilcotin Tourism Assoc., and finally Yun Ka Whu Ten Holdings.

II) ART SRP TOR

I feel the IPT and the Community have accomplished the tasks outlined in the **ART SRP TOR**.

The **purpose** of the ART SRP was to implement land use designations, targets and strategies identified in the CCLUP. This includes the Caribou and the Biodiversity Conservation Strategy, and the balancing of the targets outlined in the CCLUP 90 day Report and the Integration Report. This plan has done that. As well it has enhanced some strategies and still found an overall balance of the specified targets, plus or minus less than 2 percent. Overlap Analysis summaries to show this are found in Appendix Fifteen.

The **goal** of the ART SRP TOR was to integrate the ART Consensus Document, called the “*ART Resource Management Plan*” with *CCLUP* and the Strategic planning requirements of the Forest Practices Code. I feel this was accomplished and is well summarised in Appendix seven. Contents of the Charlotte Alplands SRDZ Forest Recreation and Wilderness Tourism Opportunity Study were also considered within the ART SRP.

This plan includes results, and recognises the work of past **subcommittees**, including the Access Management Sub Committee with its Final Report, the Lakes Classification Sub Committee and will, continue, with the pilot, Landscape Unit Planning Sub Committee. The Pilot LUPSC will look at three Landscape Units and review draft LU objectives and work to recommend proposed draft LU Strategies.

All of the **TOR objectives** of the ART SRP have been accomplished;

- In particular we have been consistent with the IAMC and the RRB Planning Strategy.
- We have had Native and non Native communities working together to solve local resource management issues,
- The plan will provide clearer information for the SDM’s.
- The very delicate balance of objectives and strategies and the assignment of Agency responsibility to these objectives and strategies, as well as the recommendation for Inter Agency and Community consultation when fulfilling these strategies, is invaluable information for Agencies to be used at the operational level.

In quick summary for the **deliverables** specified in the ART TOR, requesting mapping of conventional, modified, and no harvest areas, the defining of Biodiversity Objectives and Strategies including spatial OGMA planning, the request for Scenic and VQO Areas and for providing recommendations around Access management have all been completed. In fact I feel we have delivered much more and this is evident by just looking at the table of contents of the plan.

III) Plan Highlights include;

- The recommendation of four Community Areas of Special Concern, including the Charlotte Alplands and the Dean River Corridor. **CASC’s, Map 1**
- The enhancement of eight of the sixteen Landscape Unit Biodiversity Emphasis Option’s from either Low to Intermediate or Intermediate to High. As a result of this enhancement there was less than a 1000 hectares of OGMA’s required to be placed outside of constrained areas, to meet Biodiversity targets for OLD. **BEO Emphasis Option, Map 8a**
- Through four public workshops starting in July 2000 and finishing in November 2000 we have accomplished agreement on the placement of Longterm, Transitional and

Alternate choices of Old Growth Management Areas. These areas, as well as assuring targets for biodiversity are met, hold very high importance to the Natural Resource and Culture Committee, the Ulkatcho Community members and the Guide Outfitters Association. In fact I think this is one of the very high points of this plan. This Old Growth planning process, closely followed the document "Planning and Analysis of Old Forest Requirements for SRP's," with an additional allowance, to cover Interior Forest Condition. (ie old 200 m from early seral) We had analysis completed to allow the placement of both longterm and transitional OGMA's as well as having the ability to estimate the sunset date for the transitional OGMA's. **OGMA's, Map 9**

- This plan includes the recommendation for a new community proposed Goal II area in the Kleena Kleene Valley, expected to replace the existing candidates. **Goal II, Map 2**
- And finally although broad in scope for a highlight, this plan presents a compilation of a wide range of objectives and strategies, recommended by the signatories, to allow the progression of resource planning in the ART area, to move to Landscape Unit Planning.
- Just briefly I would like to mention the text and overview maps and Summary of EEA Values on Page 87.

IV) Attachments and Outstanding items, include:

- The need for minor boundary adjustments around the CASC's to confirm that they are in line with the ESSF, Bio Geo Climatic Zone boundaries, which was the understood intent of these areas.
- A need for further review time for the Ministry of Energy and Mines to explore road access around the new proposed Goal II area. MOF and Forestry consultants have already explored and feel comfortable with this boundary but Mines wanted an extension of time. They also wanted it attached to the ART SRP document submitted for approval. The recommended wording change is *"The recommended Goal II area will be more thoroughly reviewed to ensure reasonable access is possible and or required, around the proposed location. Review will be completed within 6 months of the signing of the document." ie. Nov 23, 2000.*
- Some final Quality Lake for Wilderness Fisheries designations are to be completed as part of the Landscape Unit Planning, possibly with the LUP Sub Committee.
- The SRP is presenting Longterm and Transitional OGMA's as reviewed by the Community, and the IPT, but there is still a buffer of additional areas required to fully meet the targets. This will be done through Landscape Unit Planning.

- And finally OGMA Workshop notes for the Appendix are still in progress but just about wrapped up.

V) Conclusion

In **Conclusion** as stated on the signature page; The Interagency Planning Team (IPT) and the Anahim Round Table (ART) hereby provide the Anahim Round Table Sub Regional Plan to IAMC as required in the Terms of Reference. This plan represents a balance arrived at by the Anahim Round Table community group as well as by the Agency participants on the IPT. The IPT and the ART recommend that IAMC and RRB accept and endorse this plan as an option that meets the requirements of the CCLUP.

If there are any questions or need for more details I have my key IPT members here to help out.

Finally Thanks for your Time!!

Beverly Frittenburg
Resource Planning Forester, Cariboo Forest Region
Chairperson, ART SRP IPT.