

## Summary of Public Comment on the Kispiox FRPA Objectives

January 16, 2006

SOURCE	DATE	OBJECTIVE	COMMENTS	RESOLUTION
Monitoring Committee (general)	22-Nov-05	1.4: Floodplains	Modify indicator so all floodplains are considered and not just the mapped one.	Make Change. Instead of using map to guide activities, will use floodplain definition.
Monitoring Committee (M. Clay)	22-Nov-05	1.4: Floodplains	Need to improve wording for target/measure so it is clear the intent is for road building through the floodplain and not harvesting	Make Change
Monitoring Committee (D. Donaldson)	22-Nov-05	2.1: Retention VQO	Change wording so it is clear that Retention means no harvesting.	No change. Retention VQO wording consistent with District direction in 1996 and 1999.
Monitoring Committee (S. McPhail)	22-Nov-05	2.0: Visual Quality – General	LRMP needs to be updated to address new areas of visual concern.	No change. Update would require a public process to redefine balance between visual resource values and other values.
Monitoring Committee (D. Donaldson)	22-Nov-05	2.0: Visual Quality – General	Proposed visual quality objectives need to be reviewed by the recreational community and the broader public in general.	No change. VQO assignment consistent with past approach/LRMP to use the visual sensitivity class. Where the visual sensitivity class suggested a range of options, the least restrictive option was chosen, unless the scenic area was in a special management zone.

<b>SOURCE</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>OBJECTIVE</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>RESOLUTION</b>
Monitoring Committee (S. McPhail)	22-Nov-05	3.1.1: Mountain Goat – General	Mountain goat habitat mapping appears incomplete.	No change. Mapping reflects priority areas that have a forestry interface.
Kitwanga Lumber Company	16-Dec-05	General	Requested an extension to the public review period to allow an opportunity to consider impacts in TSR III and to align with the MoF/Gitanyow planning process.	Add section to order that allows for reconsidering objectives should TSR III show impacts to be greater than anticipated.
Kitwanga Lumber Company	9-Jan-06 (verbal)	1.2: Patch Size	Confusing have an early seral patch defined at ageclass 1-15. Recommend allowing flexibility in defining patch	Make Change. Objective is intended to be very flexible
Len Vanderstar	9-Jan-06	2.0: Visual Quality	Modification Objective inappropriate for the Upper Skeena given LRMP objective to maintain visual quality.	None required. Proposal is now to only establish the scenic areas.