

FORESHORE INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT PLANNING

PRIORITIZATION OF LAKE SURVEYS



CANDIDATE LAKES

The candidate lake list is provided in Table 1. It was created based on the geographic location of a lake, stakeholder interest, and professional judgement and experience of the LLC FIMP Project Team. Professional judgement includes the use of information obtained during the FIMP Technical Workshops (held in early 2020) and past discussions between FIMP Project Team members and government representatives, qualified environmental professionals (QEPs) and other stakeholders.

The candidate lake list is not meant to be exhaustive. Instead, it is a carefully curated list of potential lakes for which the FIMP methodology could be meaningfully applied. Candidate lakes were pre-screened and then underwent a detailed assessment to determine the final, prioritized lake list (these results currently undisclosed).

Table 1. Candidate Lake List

Lake Number	Lake Name	Year First FIMP Survey was Completed	Lake Size*	Lake Type	Site Visit Completed	Duration Since First Survey
1	Arrow	NA	Large	Reservoir	No	NA
2	Baynes	NA	Small	Natural	Yes	NA
3	Brilliant Headpond	2018	Medium	Natural	No	3
4	Columbia	2007	Medium	Natural	Yes	13
5	Edwards	2015	Small	Natural	No	5
6	Jim Smith	2010	Small	Natural	Yes	10
7	Koocanusa	2015	Large	Reservoir	No	5
8	Kootenay	2011	Large	Reservoir	No	9
9	Moyie	2008	Medium	Natural	Yes	12
10	Munroe	2008	Small	Natural	Yes	12
11	Norbury	NA	Small	Natural	Yes	NA
12	Rosen	2009	Small	Natural	Yes	11
13	Slocan	2010	Large	Natural	Yes	10
14	St Mary	2010	Small	Natural	Yes	10
15	Summit	NA	Small	Natural	Yes	NA
16	Tie	2009	Small	Natural	Yes	11
17	Trout	NA	Medium	Natural	Yes	NA
18	Wasa	2009	Small	Natural	Yes	11
19	Whatshan	NA	Medium	Reservoir	Yes	NA
20	White Swan	NA	Medium	Natural	Yes	NA
21	Whitetail	NA	Small	Natural	Yes	NA
22	Windemere	2007	Medium	Natural	Yes	13

Notes: "Lake Size" assigned subjectively by the LLC Project Team; "Lake Type" reflects whether a drawdown zone is known to exist. "Site Visit" reflects whether the LLC Project Team has ever visited the lake. "NA" indicates "Not Applicable".

PRIORITIZATION CRITERIA

Candidate lakes were assessed and prioritized using the criteria in Table 2. The criteria include key considerations outlined in the DFO-LLC Contribution Agreement, among others that support a robust and defensible rationale for selecting which lakes will be surveyed as part of the FIMP Project.

Table 2. Lake Prioritization Criteria

Criteria	Description	Rational for Inclusion
1. Geographic Location	Refers to the geographic location of a lake. Candidate lakes must be located in the Upper Columbia basin.	Candidate lakes must be located in the Upper Columbia Basin—lakes outside this area were not considered further.
2. Accessibility and Feasibility	Refers to the ability to safely, economically, and reliably access the lake.	<p>Accessibility and feasibility are considered because they represent potential safety and economic challenges relevant for Project success.</p> <p>Lakes with barriers to accessibility or feasibility were de-prioritized for assessment.</p>
3. Stakeholder Interest	Refers to the level of interest expressed by First Nations, government, community groups, and other stakeholders towards surveying a particular lake.	<p>Stakeholder interest is considered because it embodies various elements crucial for overall Project success, including Project buy-in, utility, and likelihood of implementation and impact.</p> <p>Lakes with high stakeholder interest were prioritized for assessment.</p>
4. Development Pressure	<p>Development pressure refers to known or anticipated developments on the lake foreshore. Development pressure was quantified via:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of permits submitted to regulatory agencies for lake foreshore developments • Observations made during field reconnaissance surveys • Professional judgement based on the social, economic, and political landscapes • Land ownership distribution (e.g., crown versus private). 	<p>Development pressure was considered because it helped identify which lakes had the highest urban development pressure. Urbanization can have negative effects on fish and wildlife and their habitats.</p> <p>Lakes with high development pressure were prioritized for assessment.</p>
5. Species at Risk	<p>Species at Risk (SAR) refers to species that are at risk of being extirpated and includes sightings of individual species or their mapped habitats. The following SAR designations were included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provincial conservation status rankings (e.g., blue-, red-, and yellow-listed plants and animals) • COSEWIC-listed species • Schedule 1-listed species under the <i>Species at Risk Act</i> 	<p>Species at Risk were considered because protecting SAR is one of the overarching objectives of the Project.</p> <p>Lakes with many documented SAR (or their habitats) were prioritized for assessment.</p>

6. Field Reconnaissance	<p>Field reconnaissance refers to observations made during site visits to select lakes, and might include observations such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New foreshore infrastructure (e.g., docks, marinas, buildings) • Changes to foreshore vegetation (e.g., lost riparian vegetation) • Changes to foreshore substrates (e.g., erosion areas or manicured beaches) • Changes in accessibility. 	<p>Field reconnaissance was included in the assessment to help verify development pressure, stakeholders concerns, and accessibility.</p> <p>Field observations have the potential to prioritize or de-prioritize a lake for assessment, depending on the factor considered and field observations recorded.</p>
7. Financial Considerations	<p>Refers to various funding considerations, which might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall cost to survey a lake • Availability of in-kind funding • Funds required to survey a lake (which might be influenced by lake size, weather). 	<p>Financial considerations were included in the assessment because funding is finite, and LLC aims to deliver the best possible results given the available budget.</p>
8. Professional Judgement	<p>This criterion reflects the professional judgement, experience, and knowledge of the LLC Project Team. Professional judgement includes considerations such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FIM Technical Committee advice or recommendations (on which lakes should be re-surveyed) • Anecdotal knowledge of nearby productive fish and wildlife habitats (e.g., lakes that support an abundance of sport fish or important winter range for ungulates) • Professional judgement based on the social, economic, and political landscapes. 	<p>Professional judgement was considered because it provided the flexibility to consider ideas, beliefs, and other anecdotal information (that don't fit nicely in the other criterions) to be included in the prioritization process.</p> <p>Professional judgement has the potential to prioritize or de-prioritize a lake for assessment, depending on the factor considered.</p>

If you have any comments or suggestions, please email the FIMP Project Manager, **Ryan Cloutier** at: ryan@livinglakescanada.ca