

# Foreshore Development Guide

## Whiteswan Lake

---

Prepared For:  
Living Lakes Canada

March 2021

**Suggested Citation**

Masse, S. de Zwart, I. and T. Ehlers. 2021. Foreshore Development Guide – Whiteswan Lake. Prepared for Living Lakes Canada. Prepared by: Masse Environmental Consultants Ltd.

**Acknowledgements**

The following people are gratefully acknowledged for their assistance and contributions:

**Foreshore Inventory Management Planning Technical Committee:**

- Bruce Mac Donald, B.Sc., B.Ed., FIMP Program Director, Terra Limnic Consulting.
- Heather Leschied, B.E.S. (Hons), FIMP Program Manager, Living Lakes Canada.
- Jason Schleppe, M.Sc., R.P.Bio., Senior Biologist, Ecoscape Environmental Consultants Ltd.
- Teri Ridley, Senior Integrated Planning Biologist, Fisheries and Oceans Canada.
- Brad Mason, M.R.M, Director, Community Mapping Network.
- Louise Porto, M.Sc., R.P.Bio., Wood Canada Ltd.
- Peter Holmes, B.Sc., Habitat Biologist (retired), Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development.
- Sherri McPherson, B.Sc., R.P.Bio., Aquatic Biologist, Lotic Environmental Consulting Ltd.
- Kristen Murphy, Habitat Biologist, Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development.
- Andrea Evans (and Julia Podealuk, RFT), Authorization Specialist, Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development.
- David De Rosa, B.Sc., P.Ag., Wildlife Biologist, Okanagan Nation Alliance.

**Financial and in-kind contributions were provided by:**

Fisheries and Oceans Canada  
Regional District of Central Kootenay  
Regional District of East Kootenay  
Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Suggested Citation .....	i
Acknowledgements .....	i
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Important Contact Information.....	1
2.1. First Nations Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) .....	2
3. FDG Process Overview .....	3
3.1. Interpret the FDG Map.....	4
4. Step 1. Locate Project Relative to Shoreline Colour Zones and Zones of Sensitivity .....	5
5. Step 2 – Review Colour Zone, ZOS and Conservation Recommendations .....	5
5.1. Shoreline Colour Zone Recommendations.....	6
5.2. Zones of Sensitivity Recommendations .....	8
5.3. Shoreline Conservation Recommendations .....	10
6. Step 3. Refer to the Activity Risk Matrix (ARM) to Determine Project Risk. .	11
6.1. Using the ARM .....	12
6.2. General Mitigation Hierarchy .....	12
6.3. Very High and High Risk Activities.....	13
6.4. Moderate and Low Risk Activities .....	14
7. Step 4 – Determine Regulatory Requirements and Submit Applications .....	14
7.1. Other Considerations to Facilitate Project Approvals .....	15
8. References .....	16

### Figures

Figure 1. Four steps when planning to develop or modify foreshore habitat.....	3
Figure 2. Zone of Sensitivity with an appropriate buffer. ....	5
Figure 3. How the potential for negative effects relates to sensitivity and risk (DFO 2006). ....	12
Figure 4. Typical Environmental Regulatory Review Decision-Making Process .....	14

### Tables

Table 1. FHSI ecological rank and ZOS colour scheme applied to the FDG map. ....	4
--	---

### Appendices

Appendix A. Foreshore Guidance Document Map .....	17
Appendix B. Activity Risk Matrix (Risk ratings: NA = Not Allowed, VH = Very High, H = High, M = Moderate, and L = Low).....	18
Appendix C. Legal Requirements and Policy .....	21
Appendix D. Best Management Practices.....	27

## 1. Introduction

In recent years, environmental impacts to lake shorelines (e.g., degraded habitat, recreational use conflicts, and water quality impacts) have prompted government agencies to initiate projects focused on increasing our understanding of lake shorelines to support evidence-based lake management strategies. No partnership or working group was established for Whiteswan Lake. The guidelines presented in this document are founded on the concept that sustainable management is the shared responsibility of all stakeholders, including proponents, professionals and all levels of government.

This Foreshore Development Guide (FDG) provides development planning guidelines, aimed at protecting sensitive fish and wildlife species and their habitats identified through the previous FIM and FHSI analyses. The FDG is an initial tool used when planning for, prescribing, or reviewing riparian and shoreline alterations. Based on the environmental (species and habitat) values, the FDG identifies the levels of risk associated with shoreline alteration from various types of development activities. The risks identify the anticipated regulatory steps required to proceed with the project. The guidelines provide important information to support both the landowner in preparing foreshore work applications, and the government agencies during their review of the applications.

The FDG recommends areas to be conserved, where development may present very high or significant risk to high value species and their habitats that require shoreline areas to carry out their life-cycle. These sensitive habitats may be protected by various means, including local government inclusion in local planning processes such as Official Community Plans (OCP) and bylaws. Additionally, the FDG describes how restoration opportunities should be sought to improve habitat previously disturbed, and to potentially aid in obtaining regulatory support for new proposed projects.

The FDG methods were first developed for Windermere Lake by the East Kootenay Integrated Lake Management Partnership (EKILMP et al. 2009). These original methods used the BC Ministry of Environment (BC MoE) document - High Value Habitat Maps and Associated Protocol for Works along the Foreshore of Large Lakes within the Okanagan (BC MoE 2008), and input from the various EKILMP members including: Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO), BC MoE, Regional District of East Kootenay (RDEK) and Wildsight. Additional lake projects followed and expanded on the initial EKILMP FDG. Notable lake projects included: Moyie Lake (Schleppe 2009), Tie Lake (McPherson et al. 2012) and Kootenay Lake (Kootenay Lake Partnership 2019). With each iteration of these documents, the general process for developing a FDG was refined.

## 2. Important Contact Information

Proponents may use the contact information provided below when planning their proposed activities. Even with the use of this document, it is recommended that anyone who is planning work on Crown Land (such as the shoreline), first contact FrontCounterBC or retain the services of a Qualified Environmental Professional (QEP) who will contact FrontCounterBC on their behalf. Depending on the situation, FrontCounterBC will provide guidance on whether the proposed works are allowed or not allowed under the respective legislation. Similarly, works on private lands must also consider local government's requirements (e.g., permitting or notifications).

**FrontCounterBC** - *FrontCounterBC* should be contacted for any works planned on Crown Land, including work along the lake shoreline.

**Phone:** 1-877-855-3222

**Email:** [FrontCounterBC@gov.bc.ca](mailto:FrontCounterBC@gov.bc.ca)

**Regional District** – The Regional District of East Kootenays (RDEK) should be contacted for any works planned on private land within the region’s jurisdiction.

**Phone:** 250-489-2791

**Email:** [info@rdek.bc.ca](mailto:info@rdek.bc.ca)

**First Nations** – The Ktunaxa Nation and Shuswap Indian Band should be contacted for any works that require First Nation engagement.

## 2.1. First Nations Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK)

First Nations have a deep history and connection with the Whiteswan Lake and surrounding area dating back at least 5,000 years (BC Parks 2003). This area provided a geographical link between the Columbia Valley and the Elk Valley and the prairies, and was used as a marshalling point, hunting camp and for religious and social events. The Whiteswan Lake area lies within the asserted traditional territory of the Ktunaxa People and the Shuswap Indian Band also has cultural interests in the area.

Both the Ktunaxa Nation and the Shuswap Indian Band were invited to share Traditional Ecological Knowledge that could be incorporated in the Whiteswan Lake Foreshore Integrated Management Plan. A letter was sent to the Ktunaxa Nation on August 12, 2020 providing information on the project and an invitation to share Traditional Ecological Knowledge. Correspondence from the Ktunaxa was received on August 13, 2020 expressing their interest in the project and the importance of the Whiteswan Lake area to the Ktunaxa People, and the possibility to provide some information, but due to limited capacity would likely not be able to participate in the field work. At the time of writing, no information from the Ktunaxa Nation has been received or incorporated.

Masse Environmental participated in a virtual information session to discuss information sharing protocols and capacity with the Shuswap Indian Band on November 4, 2020 organized by Louise Porto (from Wood PLC). Follow-up communications and a draft Traditional Knowledge Data – Sharing Agreement was developed; however, due to various unforeseen events, no agreement was finalized. At the time of writing, no information from the Shuswap Indian Band has been received or incorporated.

The integration of Traditional Ecological Knowledge of the Whiteswan Lake area in the FDG process would allow protection of important First Nations values. Living Lakes Canada may incorporate Traditional Ecological Knowledge if it becomes available in the future.

### 3. FDG Process Overview

The FDG provides a step-wise process to help direct applicants through the initial planning stages for their proposed shoreline development, project or activity (Figure 1).

**Step 1:** Identify the fish and wildlife habitat values where the project is situated using the FDG map. The FDG map was prepared using the FHSI outputs, and depicts: a) values by segment, with different colours representing high to low values; and b) where Zones of Sensitivity (ZOS) may be present. ZOS are areas with exceptionally high value, which should if at all possible, be conserved according to local, provincial or federal plans or through private land agreements.

**Step 2:** Review the general recommendations for the applicable colour zone and ZOS to understand associated habitat sensitivity of the area, and risk anthropogenic disturbances pose.

**Step 3:** Use the Activity Risk Matrix (ARM) to identify the level of risk of the proposed project on the habitat. The risk is indicative of the acceptability of a project to regulators.

**Step 4:** Determine the necessary regulatory approvals/permits/authorizations (collectively ‘approvals’) that must be obtained. This final step is project dependent and depends on many factors and is subject to change based on government policy. Hence, only an overview is provided here, along with logistical considerations.

*For areas of greater risk, a very high level of detail is needed in order to submit an application that can be considered for regulatory review. In these cases, it should not be expected that because information is submitted that approvals are forthcoming.*




Figure 1. Four steps when planning to develop or modify foreshore habitat.


### 3.1. Interpret the FDG Map

The key results of the FIM and FHSI are presented in tables and maps in the Foreshore Integrated Management Plan (Masse et al. 2021). When planning foreshore development, the FDG map is the primary reference tool because it synthesizes the pertinent fish and wildlife information into an easy to understand map (Appendix A). In the FDG map, the FHSI ecological rankings for each segment are depicted as one of four colour zones, ranging from very high to very low value (Table 1).

**Table 1. FHSI ecological rank and ZOS colour scheme applied to the FDG map.**

Value type	Rank/Sensitivity	Map Colour
Ecological Rank	Very High	Red
	High	Orange
	Moderate	Yellow
	Low & Very Low	Grey
Zones of Sensitivity	Fisheries	Blue
	Wildlife	Brown
	Herptiles	Mauve
	Waterfowl	Teal
	Ecosystem/Habitat Feature	Green
	Rare occurrences	Purple
	Vegetation	Olive

The FDG map also depicts each ZOS in a specific colour scheme. Each ZOS is presented as either a polygon, line, or point, and should include an outer buffer. This buffer accounts for unknowns of the ZOS full extent, and protects the core ZOS from potential impacts from adjacent activities (Figure 2). Details on each ZOS, including how each was defined, and how the buffers (where appropriate) were determined, are presented in Section 5.2.



**Figure 2. Zone of Sensitivity with an appropriate buffer.**

**4. Step 1. Locate Project Relative to Shoreline Colour Zones and Zones of Sensitivity**

Use the FDG map to identify the values present along or within their proposed development area. Together, the FHSI colour zone and the ZOS mapped features provide a science-based tool to guide development planning. The fish and wildlife value/risk and subsequent regulatory review process are highest in red zones and areas with ZOS. Since these areas have the highest natural value and are at greatest risk to shoreline alteration, they require the highest level of on-going protection. The values/risk in the grey zones are lowest. Since there is already likely significant impact from development in grey zones, future development is less likely to cause negative impacts. The specific recommendations for each colour zone and ZOS are provided in the next section.

**5. Step 2 – Review Colour Zone, ZOS and Conservation Recommendations**

For this step, review the recommendations for the respective colour zone and ZOS that aligns with the proposed development. The summary tables below provide detail on the values present, and identify how to potentially minimize impacts. Also, refer to the conservation recommendations to see how your project may align with an area that has been identified as a candidate for protection. Proposed development should adhere to these recommendations to reduce impacts on sensitive fish and wildlife values. Opportunities for restoration or re-development should be explored in any zone where work is proposed.

**5.1. Shoreline Colour Zone Recommendations**

<b>Red Shoreline</b>	
<b>Defined by:</b>	Very High FHSI ecological rank.
<b>FHSI summary:</b>	Red zones account for 27.4 % of the total shoreline length of 12.9 km Lake.
<b>Sensitivity Summary:</b>	Red shoreline areas have been identified as essential for the long term maintenance of fish and/or wildlife values through the FHSI Analysis. These areas are essential for fish and/or wildlife populations. This zone includes the east and west floodplains that have extensive shallow littoral zones, wetlands, and important riparian habitat for wildlife, as well as stream mouths that provide access to stream spawning habitat.
<b>Recommendations:</b>	Due to their high value (sensitive communities present), Red shoreline areas are recommended to have limited development to promote conservation use (Section 5.3). Low impact water access recreation and traditional First Nation uses are examples of acceptable activities in these areas, while permanent structures or alteration of habitats are not. Invasive aquatic plant removal is often acceptable, provided there is an approved aquatic plant removal program, including trained personnel, and appropriate permitting in place. Habitat restoration may be appropriate in these areas, where applicable, and could include encouraging regeneration of cottonwood trees within the east floodplain by limiting livestock access, riparian plantings along the foreshore next to the agricultural fields and limiting disturbance of shallow littoral zones.

<b>Orange Shoreline</b>	
<b>Defined by:</b>	High FHSI ecological rank.
<b>FHSI summary:</b>	Orange zones account for 15.8 % of the total shoreline length of 12.9 km Lake.
<b>Sensitivity Summary:</b>	Orange shoreline segments have been identified as high value habitat areas for fish and/or wildlife. These areas are comprised of relatively natural undisturbed habitats and may include zones of sensitivities and and/or sensitive littoral areas. These areas are sensitive to development, continue to provide important habitat functions, but may be at risk from adjacent development pressures.
<b>Recommendations:</b>	Proponents should consider moving high risk activities to other areas if possible, or pursuing activities that have lower associated risks. The lake environment can benefit from having orange shoreline areas set aside to contribute to the overall lake conservation area. The conservation options identified in Section 5.3 would likely apply through most of the orange areas, benefitting the lake. Restoration opportunities may potentially exist in these areas; however none were identified.

### Yellow Shoreline

**Defined by:** Medium FHSI ecological rank.

**Lake summary:** Yellow zones account for 33.0 %of the total shoreline length of 12.9 km Lake.

**Sensitivity summary:** Some of these areas have experienced a moderate amount of development disturbance and pressures. Although some of these areas have been impacted to some degree, segments along the Forest Service Road have retained some riparian cover along the foreshore.

**Recommendations:** Development along Yellow shoreline areas would likely result in less of an impact, than along Red or Orange areas. However, activities should incorporate protection of habitat features that remain, be well above the high water mark, and/or be situated outside of the riparian area. Restoration may be an option in some areas that have experienced past developments. Development may proceed for low risk activities provided a Best Management Practice (BMP) or Regional Operating Statement (ROS) is available and followed (Appendix B). High risk activities without a BMP or ROS will require an environmental assessment from a QEP.

### Grey Shoreline

**Defined by:** Low and Very Low FHSI Ecological Rank.

**Lake summary:** Grey zones account for 21.4 % of the total shoreline length of 12.9 km Lake.

**Sensitivity summary:** Grey shorelines have a lower ecological ranking. However, they may still contain valuable habitats requiring some protection, such as aquatic or riparian vegetation. Their importance as corridors to neighboring high value areas should also be considered during development.

**Recommendations:** Segments with low and very low FHSI Ecological Rank have been impacted by the Whiteswan Forest Service Road that runs along the entire south side of the lake resulting in disturbances to the natural fish and wildlife habitat. These segments have no to very little riparian vegetation and may include various levels of erosion protection. Important habitats do exist in degraded and developed areas, and at least minimal standards are required to protect fish and wildlife habitat in the grey zone areas. There are very limited development opportunities along these segments due to the presence of the road and steep hillside behind. Any road improvements should incorporate fish and wildlife habitat restoration or improvement features, where feasible and practicable. Road maintenance practices should minimise disturbance to the foreshore. Where possible, grading and/or snow removal should be directed towards the upland side of the road.

**5.2. Zones of Sensitivity Recommendations**

A total of five types of ZOS were identified through the FHSI analysis. The ZOS with their corresponding buffers (where applicable) are identified on the FDG map. For this step, use the map and identify if the proposed development aligns with any of the mapped ZOS (use outer edge of buffer). Then refer to the corresponding ZOS summary table(s) below for general information on the values present and recommendations to reduce impacts.

Fisheries – Rainbow Trout Shore Spawning Areas	
<b>Lake summary:</b>	Known shore spawning areas were mapped as polygons along the shoreline based on field observations collected by the Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development (Kevin Heidt, pers. comm.). Shore spawning areas were mapped in Segments 7, 8, 11, 17 and 18. The most important shore spawning area is located around Cave Creek, where abundant gravel is present.
<b>Sensitivity summary:</b>	Rainbow trout shore spawning habitat is important to the long-term viability of the Whiteswan Lake fishery. The combined number of shoal redds would exceed individual tributary counts with the exception of Outlet Creek. These areas have gravel substrates and are reported to have groundwater upwellings or springs that keep the gravels clean and allow the eggs to be oxygenated.
<b>Recommendations:</b>	Shore spawning areas are sensitive habitats and developments should be avoided within and adjacent to the mapped polygons. A buffer of 30 m is recommended.

### Fisheries – Submerged Vegetation

**Lake summary:** Submerged vegetation is present throughout the shallow littoral areas at the east (Segments 11 – 16) and west ends (Segments 1-3) of the lake. The density of vegetation varies throughout these areas from dense to sparse. This may relate to differences in the underlying substrate, although there were signs that very shallow littoral areas had been impacted by boat propellers which may reduce or prevent vegetation from establishing. For the purposes of mapping the zone of sensitivity, the entire littoral area was used. No buffer was incorporated

**Sensitivity summary:** Submerged vegetation contributes to lake primary productivity, provides habitat for fish, and is sensitive to disturbance.

**Recommendations:** Signage is recommended to educate boaters about the potential for disturbing shallow littoral areas.

### Fisheries – Stream Mouths

**Lake summary:** Most of the rainbow trout spawning occurs in Inlet Creek and Outlet Creek, as well as small tributaries along the lake such as Cave Creek and potentially in Home Basin Creek and Birch Creek. A 100 m polygon on either side of the stream mouths was used for streams that provide spawning habitat and a 50 m polygon was used for non fish bearing streams. Polygons were not designated for streams that did not have a defined channel at the mouth or discharged directly into the lake through a culvert along the FSR.

**Sensitivity summary:** Stream mouths provide a source of nutrients to the lake and are key staging areas for both adult spawners and emergent fry/juveniles. The riparian zones around streams also provide high value wildlife habitat.

**Recommendations:** Development within the mapped polygon areas should be avoided. A buffer of 30 m is recommended.

### Ecosystem/Habitat Feature – Cottonwood Riparian

<b>Lake Summary:</b>	The Cottonwood Riparian polygon located within the floodplain at the east end of the lake along Segment 13 is considered a zone of sensitivity. Black cottonwood riparian ecosystems have been ranked by the BC Conservation Data Centre amongst the rarest plant community in the province. Reduced to fragments, the remaining stands are considered endangered.
<b>Sensitivity summary:</b>	Cottonwood stands develop within riparian zones of streams and lakes in areas that have sufficient water and thrive especially in floodplains. They provide important habitat for a wide range of plant and wildlife species. As the trees mature and decay, they offer important habitat for cavity nesters and are often used by raptors for roosting, nesting and foraging. A stick nest was observed on one of the cottonwood trees.
<b>Recommendations:</b>	This sensitive habitat should be protected, with no permanent developments recommended both within and adjacent to the mapped polygon area.

### Ecosystem/Habitat Feature – Wetlands

<b>Lake Summary:</b>	Wetland polygons are located at the west (Segment 2) and east ends of the lake (Segments 12-14).
<b>Sensitivity summary:</b>	Wetlands are areas of high productivity, provide key habitat for fish, birds and other wildlife, and protect the shoreline from wind/wave erosion.
<b>Recommendations:</b>	This sensitive habitat should be protected, with no permanent developments recommended both within and adjacent to the mapped polygon area. A buffer of 50 m is recommended.

### 5.3. Shoreline Conservation Recommendations

The inclusion of Whiteswan Lake into the Whiteswan Lake Provincial Park has contributed to the protection of a large portion of the lake foreshore, as no additional developments are permitted within the park. The most sensitive habitats are located at the east and west ends of the lake within the floodplains. Zones of Sensitivity (ZOS), which include areas that are identified as important habitats, have been designated for wetlands, the wide shallow littoral zones at the east and west ends of the lake (Segments 2, and 12 to 15), most stream mouths, shore spawning habitat and the riparian cottonwood band at the east end of the lake (Segment 13), and are mapped as polygons (Appendix 1). ZOS were not assigned to all stream mouths, as some did not have a defined channel or discharged directly into the lake via a culvert along the FSR. Streams that provide spawning habitat, such as Outlet Creek, Inlet Creek and Cave Creek, were assigned a wider stream mouth buffer of 100 m in order to allow for fish staging.

Many of the ZOS features located at the east end of the lake (Segments 12 to 15) are surrounded by privately owned land and some future development may be expected. The east end of the lake (Segments 12 to 15) should be designated as sensitive habitat and any future developments should consider the sensitivity of this area. The wetland at the west end of the lake (Segment 2) should also be designated as sensitive habitat with no developments permitted. These areas should be considered as conservation zones due to their sensitivity and ecological importance. Designation of conservation zones along privately owned lands (Segments 13 and 14) will require consultation with landowners.

The following recommendations should be considered:

- Protect designated zones of sensitivity (ZOS) including wetlands, stream mouths that provide staging and rearing habitat for fish bearing streams, shore spawning habitat, shallow littoral zones at the east and west ends of the lake, and riparian cottonwood within the floodplain at the east end of the lake.
- Consider designation of conservation areas at the east (Segment 2) and west ends of the lake (Segments 12 to 15). Landowner acceptance would be required for segments next to privately owned land (Segments 13 and 14).
- Limit use of power boats within the shallow littoral zones at the east and west ends of the lake to reduce disturbance to shallow littoral areas. Since docks are present at either end, use of power boats in these areas cannot be prohibited, however, educational information should be posted at strategic locations to inform users of the sensitivity of these areas.
- ATV use should be prohibited along the lake foreshore, as ATV tracks were observed at the east end of the lake.
- Ensure road maintenance practices on the Whiteswan FSR minimise disturbance to the foreshore. Where possible, grading and/or snow removal should be directed towards the upland side of the road.
- Any future developments should be carefully designed with the assistance of a Qualified Environmental Practitioner.

## **6. Step 3. Refer to the Activity Risk Matrix (ARM) to Determine Project Risk.**

This step involves using the ARM to determine what the predicted level of risk is for your specific proposed activity, given the shoreline colour zone and ZOS present. It is a well understood concept that the potential for negative environmental impacts are deemed greatest in areas where values and risk are highest (Figure 3; DFO 2006). In the ARM, each colour zone and activity combination has been rated as having a risk of either: Very High (VH), High (H), Moderate (M), or Low (L) (Appendix B). These risk ratings reflect the potential impacts on fish and wildlife, with a Very High risk posing the greatest potential concern, and the Low Risk a lower level of concern. The ARM also identifies that if a ZOS is present, the risk also increases.




Figure 3. How the potential for negative effects relates to sensitivity and risk (DFO 2006).

### 6.1. Using the ARM

Clarifications for using the ARM are listed below:

1. If your activity is not listed, assume High Risk and contact FrontCounterBC for advice.
2. Where several activities with differing risk rating are proposed for a single Project, the cumulative risk may increase. Consequently, it is recommended to seek the advice of a QEP to determine if the higher of the two risk ratings effectively captures the cumulative risk, or if the highest risk rating should be used [e.g., Very High]).
3. The ARM distinguishes between several activities above and below the present natural boundary (NB). The NB is the legal term BC Crown Land Branch uses to define the Crown Land property boundary along the shoreline. High Water Mark (HWM) is a similar standard term used by DFO when considering impacts to fish values. The NB and HWM are often located in the same location, but this can vary. Only a registered BC Legal Land Surveyor may determine the NB.
4. In some instances, the project may not seem to have a high degree of risk. However, the ARM also accounts for other accompanying impacts likely to occur once the modification is in place. For instance, once a dock is in place, other likely associated impacts are: prop wash, maintenance, and boat traffic.

### 6.2. General Mitigation Hierarchy

The general principles of shoreline development are to design in such a way that there is “No Net Loss” in the quantity or quality of existing habitat. These principles are supported by the

federal and provincial policy<sup>1,2</sup>). In general, these principles are achieved through application of the following mitigation options: (1) avoidance of environmental impacts and associated components; (2) minimization of unavoidable impacts on environmental values and associated components; (3) restore on site environmental values and associated components, and, (4) offset impacts to environmental values of components for residual impacts that cannot be minimized.

### 6.3. Very High and High Risk Activities

Most in-stream works in Red and Orange shoreline zone areas are considered Very High and High Risk activities. All activities in a ZOS are considered Very High Risk. Development in these areas has the potential to cause long-term or irreparable disturbance to the highly sensitive/unique values present. The Very High Risk activities in particular, are known to have significant challenges related to providing adequate mitigation to address the loss of fish and/or wildlife habitat values. For example, the dredging activity is considered Very High Risk in all colour zones, since it results in a major disturbance to the substrate, aquatic vegetation that may be present, and has the potential for direct impacts on aquatic life, and processes (wave climate and sediment transport). There may also be indirect impacts, such as on water quality, if for example the dredge is to support a marina.

If your activity is identified as being Very High or High Risk, determine if you can modify the activity or location to reduce the risk. This may involve moving the project to a colour zone with less sensitive habitat, or selecting a lower risk activity (Figure 4). If reducing the risk is not possible by re-designing or re-locating the project, there is a high likelihood that a detailed environmental assessment would be required to support the project application. In these areas, the high risks may trigger a request for a Harmful Alteration, Disruption or Destruction of Fish Habitat (HADD) authorization under the federal *Fisheries Act*. If residual effects cannot be mitigated, compensation may be required. Acceptable mitigation and compensation measures would likely be very costly to implement. It is highly advised that a QEP be retained to assist with the project planning in all high and very high risk areas. A QEP should be knowledgeable about both the permitting and application process for proposed activities and will be able to provide guidance on potential environmental risks and impacts. A QEP would likely conduct an environmental assessment within the project area, confirm risks, and make recommendations to reduce impacts to aid in the regulatory permitting process. Applications for these types of developments may not be supported by regulators and may not be approved, even if extensive and detailed information is provided as part of a permitting process.

As an example, the type of information that might be required to support an application for a proposed project located in a sensitive area could include, a detailed erosion control plan that might require a BC Legal Land Surveyor to determine the location of NB and property boundaries, a QEP to provide recommendations to mitigate construction works as part of an environmental assessment, or an engineer may be needed to provide a detailed design for submission of permits under regulatory processes.


---

<sup>1</sup> DFO Projects Near Water website: <https://dfo-mpo.gc.ca/pnw-ppe/index-eng.html>

<sup>2</sup> BC Environmental Mitigation Policy website:

<https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/environment/natural-resource-stewardship/laws-policies-standards-guidance/environmental-guidance-and-policy/environmental-mitigation-policy>.

**Figure 4. Typical Environmental Regulatory Review Decision-Making Process**



<sup>1</sup> Very High or High Risk activities have the potential to raise significant concerns. These activities have great challenges related to providing adequate mitigation or compensation to address the loss of fish and/or wildlife habitat values, and could be costly to implement (may require compensation).

<sup>2</sup> Environmental Assessment

<sup>3</sup>BMP – Best Management Practice; ROS –Regional Operating Statement

**6.4. Moderate and Low Risk Activities**

With appropriate design and planning, Moderate and Low Risk activities could be incorporated along the foreshore with fewer impacts on fish and wildlife habitat values. Where available, these activities should follow applicable Best Management Practices (BMP), Standards and Codes of Practice (collectively BMP; see next section). Where BMPs are not available, or a deviation from the BMP is proposed, a QEP should be retained to complete the application. The application will be reviewed by the applicable agencies.

**7. Step 4 – Determine Regulatory Requirements and Submit Applications**

The final step when planning a foreshore development project is to determine the regulatory requirements necessary for the project to proceed and to submit those applications. Regulatory applications are to be made to the federal, provincial, or local governments for necessary permits, authorizations, notifications, and reviews etc. Essentially any shoreline development will require the preparation of at least one regulatory application. The regulatory application’s acceptance will be required for the project to proceed legitimately. Commencing work without approval may be considered unlawful and result in infractions such as trespass. Work that has not been approved may also be subject to enforcement actions by the

respective agencies, and may require additional effort to mitigate any undesired environmental impacts that occurred. Alternatively, the project proponent could be required to remove all infrastructure and restore the area.

Typical regulatory requirements for each activity listed in the ARM are provided in Appendix C. As well, Provincial BMPs have been listed in Appendix D<sup>3</sup>. Although summarized here, the requirements at the time of planning the project will need to be confirmed, as regulatory changes might occur. Also, the DFO website should be reviewed for applicable Standards and Codes of Practice that may help guide planning and development<sup>4</sup>. Contact FrontCounterBC to determine which provincial permits, approvals or authorizations you need, or retain a QEP for guidance.

---

*This document does not provide a full summary of all potential requirements for a particular project. Proponents must ensure that they have adequately considered, consulted, and determined the necessary approvals required for a project to proceed prior to undertaking any works.*

---

### 7.1. Other Considerations to Facilitate Project Approvals

This FDG addresses both existing and proposed works. Sometimes there are concerns with the installation of past structures, which may include, if the structures:

- Resulted in extensive impacts along the shoreline;
- Were installed without appropriate permits or approvals in place; and/or,
- Were not compliant with standard BMPs.

If any of the above concerns are present on the property where work is planned, then follow these steps, so that new applications, or applications for maintenance or expansion on existing projects, can be reviewed more effectively:

1. Determine if the existing works are on private land or Crown Land.
2. Determine if they are located in an Application Only Area/Reserve area established under the *Land Act*.
3. Determine if the works were authorized by the appropriate authority. If yes, skip to step 5.
4. Seek approval from the appropriate authority. Approval may or may not be granted depending on the situation. Previous projects installed without appropriate permits or approvals may be required to be removed as part of an application process.
5. Plan and update existing works to current Best Management Practices.
6. Include other mitigation practices, such as landscape restoration (planting native riparian vegetation), substrate improvement (removing or mitigating existing groynes), and other habitat improvements.

---

<sup>3</sup> A current list of provincial BMP's are available at:  
<https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/environment/natural-resource-stewardship/laws-policies-standards-guidance/best-management-practices>

<sup>4</sup> DFO Project Near Water website: <https://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/pnw-ppe/index-eng.html>

## 8. References

- BC Ministry of Environment (BC MOE). 2008. High value habitat maps and Associated protocol for works along the foreshore of large lakes within the Okanagan, Region 8. Government memorandum.
- BC MOE. 2019. *Natural Resource Best Management Practices*. Retrieved from <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/environment/natural-resource-stewardship/laws-policies-standards-guidance/best-management-practices>
- DFO. 2006. Habitat Management Program: Standard Operating Policies.
- East Kootenay Integrated Lake Management Partnership (EKILMP), McPherson S. and Hlushak D. 2009. Windermere Lake Shoreline Management Guidelines for Fish and Wildlife Habitats. Combined agency and consultant (Interior Reforestation Co. Ltd) report.
- Kootenay Lake Partnership. 2019. Kootenay Lake Shoreline Management Guidelines – A Living Document (Version 9). Prepared by: Ktunaxa Nation Council; Regional District of Central Kootenay; Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations; Ecoscape Environmental Consultants Ltd.; Tipi Mountain Eco-Cultural Services Ltd.; The Firelight Group Ltd.; and, Wayne Choquette.
- Masse, S., de Zwart, I. and T. Ehlers. 2021. Foreshore Integrated Management Plan. Report prepared by Masse Environmental Consultants Ltd. Report prepare for Living Lakes Canada, Nelson, BC.
- McPherson<sup>1</sup> S.M., D.G. Paton<sup>2</sup> and M.D. Robinson<sup>1</sup>. 2012. Tie Lake Shoreline Management Guidelines of Fish and Wildlife Habitats. Consultant report prepared for Ministry of Forests Lands and Natural Resource Operations, Nelson BC. Prepared by Lotic Environmental Ltd<sup>1</sup>, Anatum Ecological Consulting Ltd<sup>2</sup>.
- Schleppe, J. 2009. Moyie Lake Foreshore Inventory and Mapping. Ecoscape Environmental Consultants Ltd. Prepared for: East Kootenay Integrated Lake Management Partnership.
- Schleppe, J.<sup>1</sup>, S. McPherson<sup>2</sup>, L. Porto<sup>3</sup>, and B. Mason<sup>4</sup>. 2020. Foreshore Integrated Management Plan Methods. Prepared for Living Lakes Canada. Prepared by: Ecoscape Environmental Consultants Ltd.<sup>1</sup>, Lotic Environmental Ltd.<sup>2</sup>, Wood Environment and Infrastructure Ltd.<sup>3</sup>, and BC Community Mapping Network<sup>4</sup>.


## **Appendix A. Foreshore Guidance Document Map**

# Whiteswan Lake Foreshore Inventory and Mapping Mapsheet 1 of 3

-  Dock
  -  Boat Launch
  -  Campground
  -  Shoreline Modification
  -  FISS Record (Rainbow Trout)
  -  Shoreline Segment Break
  -  BC Freshwater Atlas Streams
  -  2020 Mapped Streams
  -  North Shore Trail
  -  Roads
  -  Contour (20 m)
  -  Provincial Park Boundary
  -  Cadastral Boundaries
  -  BC Freshwater Atlas Wetlands
- Foreshore Habitat Sensitivity Index**
-  Very High
  -  High
  -  Medium
  -  Low and Very Low
- Zones of Sensitivity**
-  Submergent Vegetation
  -  Wetland
  -  Cottonwood Riparian
  -  Creek Mouth
  -  Shoal Spawning
  -  2020 Wildlife Observation - Nest

0 100 200 meters

1:6000 NAD83 UTM Zone 11  
March 29, 2021  
Living Lakes Canada  
Masse Environmental Consultants Ltd.




# Whiteswan Lake Foreshore Inventory and Mapping Mapsheet 2 of 3

-  Dock
  -  Boat Launch
  -  Campground
  -  Shoreline Modification
  -  FISS Record (Rainbow Trout)
  -  Shoreline Segment Break
  -  BC Freshwater Atlas Streams
  -  2020 Mapped Streams
  -  North Shore Trail
  -  Roads
  -  Contour (20 m)
  -  Provincial Park Boundary
  -  Cadastral Boundaries
  -  BC Freshwater Atlas Wetlands
- Foreshore Habitat Sensitivity Index**
-  Very High
  -  High
  -  Medium
  -  Low and Very Low
- Zones of Sensitivity**
-  Submergent Vegetation
  -  Wetland
  -  Cottonwood Riparian
  -  Creek Mouth
  -  Shoal Spawning
  -  2020 Wildlife Observation - Nest

0 100 200 meters

1:6000 NAD83 UTM Zone 11  
March 29, 2021  
Living Lakes Canada  
Masse Environmental Consultants Ltd.




# Whiteswan Lake Foreshore Inventory and Mapping Mapsheet 3 of 3

- Dock
  - ◆ Boat Launch
  - ▲ Campground
  - Shoreline Modification
  - ▶ FISS Record (Rainbow Trout)
  - Shoreline Segment Break
  - BC Freshwater Atlas Streams
  - - - 2020 Mapped Streams
  - - - North Shore Trail
  - - - Roads
  - Contour (20 m)
  - Provincial Park Boundary
  - Cadastral Boundaries
  - BC Freshwater Atlas Wetlands
- Foreshore Habitat Sensitivity Index**
- Very High
  - High
  - Medium
  - Low and Very Low
- Zones of Sensitivity**
- Submergent Vegetation
  - Wetland
  - Cottonwood Riparian
  - Creek Mouth
  - Shoal Spawning
  - 2020 Wildlife Observation - Nest

0 100 200 meters

1:6000 NAD83 UTM Zone 11  
March 29, 2021  
Living Lakes Canada  
Masse Environmental Consultants Ltd.



**Appendix B. Activity Risk Matrix (Risk ratings: NA = Not Allowed, VH = Very High, H = High, M = Moderate, and L = Low)**

Activity <sup>1</sup>	Risk rating based on Ecological Ranking				Risk rating if Zone of Sensitivity Present <sup>2</sup>
	Very High	High	Moderate	Low / Very low	
<b>Aquatic Vegetation Removal</b>					
Removing native aquatic vegetation - by hand, or mechanical cutting for swimming areas and private beach access	VH	VH	VH	VH	NA
Removing non-native/invasive aquatic vegetation - by hand or mechanical cutting for swimming areas and private beach access	VH	VH	H	M	NA
<b>Dredging, Infilling and Beach Creation</b>					
Dredging - new or expansion works, no current tenure	VH	VH	VH	VH	NA
Maintenance dredging - dredged in last 10 years, no increase in footprint below the NB <sup>1</sup> , dredged material deposited on land, within existing tenure	VH	VH	VH	VH	NA
Lake infilling - e.g. extension of upland landscaping	VH	VH	VH	VH	NA
Beach creation below the lake NB	VH	VH	VH	VH	NA
Foreshore sediment disturbance and removal of lakebed substrate (e.g., beach grooming)	VH	VH	H	M	NA
<b>Foreshore Erosion, Sediment or Wave Control Structures</b>					
New groyne construction or increase in existing footprint	VH	VH	VH	VH	NA
Maintenance of existing groyne, no increase in existing footprint, within existing tenure	M	M	L	L	NA
Erosion control (e.g. concrete, rip rap, vegetation, etc.)	VH	VH	H	M	NA
Infill breakwaters or boat basins	VH	VH	H	H	NA
Wave control structures (e.g., log booms)	VH	VH	H	M	NA
<b>Boat Launches</b>					
Construction of new hard surface boat launch or repair/upgrade of existing hard surface boat launch without land tenure	VH	VH	VH	H	NA
Upgrade/repair of existing hard surface boat launch with land tenure and within existing footprint	VH	H	H	M	NA
Upgrade/repair of existing hard surface boat launch with land tenure and increasing size of the existing allowable footprint	VH	VH	H	M	NA

Activity <sup>1</sup>	Risk rating based on Ecological Ranking				Risk rating if Zone of Sensitivity Present <sup>2</sup>
	Very High	High	Moderate	Low / Very low	
Construction of new boat rail launch or repair/upgrade of existing boat rail launch without land tenure	VH	H	M	L	NA
Upgrade/repair of existing boat rail launch with land tenure and within existing footprint	H	H	M	M	NA
<b>Buoys</b>					
Placement of up to 2 helical screw anchor mooring buoys for non-commercial use.	VH	H	M	L	NA
Placement of up to 2 non-helical screw mooring buoys for non-commercial use.	VH	H	H	M	NA
Placement mooring buoys for commercial use	Moorage # dependant - see Marina Activity rankings				NA
<b>Docks, boathouses, pile supported structures, float home structures, and other - below NB</b>					
Docks - floating, pile supported or removable	VH	H	M	L	NA
Floating or lake access boat house, covered boat storage, or permanent non-moorage structures	VH	VH	VH	VH	NA
Land boat house - located on land with access directly to the water	VH	VH	VH	H	NA
Pumphouse	VH	VH	VH	H	NA
Boat lifts	VH	H	L	L	NA
Float homes and house boats - refers to long term storage area.	VH	VH	VH	VH	NA
Float home/ house boats - refers to short term mooring (in bays).	VH	H	M	L	NA
Submarine cables, including related land clearing and equipment access.	VH	VH	VH	H	NA
Submarine cables - no land clearing necessary.	L	L	L	L	NA
Overwater piled structure (e.g. building, deck, etc.)	VH	VH	VH	VH	NA
Elevated boardwalk over water	VH	H	H	H	NA
<b>Marinas</b>					
Private dock moorage = < 6	VH	H	M	M	NA
Small Marina = 6 – 20 slips	VH	H	H	H	NA
Marina Large = >20 slips	VH	VH	VH	VH	NA
<b>Water Withdrawal, Use or Discharge</b>					

Activity <sup>1</sup>	Risk rating based on Ecological Ranking				Risk rating if Zone of Sensitivity Present <sup>2</sup>
	Very High	High	Moderate	Low / Very low	
Waterline - directional drilling	M	M	M	M	NA
Waterline - open excavation	VH	VH	H	M	NA
Geothermal heating/cooling - commercial, industrial, strata or multi-family	VH	VH	VH	H	NA
Geothermal heating/cooling - single family residence	H	H	M	L	NA
Treated effluent discharge pipe	VH	VH	VH	VH	NA
Commercial water withdrawals (addressed through water licencing, with physical activities addressed elsewhere in this table)	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Transition to Private Land from Crown Land</b>					
Application to purchase or lease crown land (crown grant)	VH	H	M	L	NA
<b>Land development, on private land - above NB</b>					
Native vegetation modification/removal, including for: buildings (e.g., boathouses, covered boat storage, permanent non-moorage structures), beach creation, landscaping, and septic fields.	VH	VH	VH	H	NA
Non-native vegetation modification / removal, including for: buildings (see above), landscaping, beach creation, and septic fields.	VH	H	M	L	NA
Drilling and blasting	VH	VH	VH	H	NA
<b>Legend:</b>					
<sup>1</sup> NB refers to present natural boundary. NB is the legal term BC Crown Land Branch uses to define the property boundary. Often NB and High Water Mark (HWM) are similar. Only a registered BC Legal Land Surveyor may determine NB.					
<sup>2</sup> For all activities, if species or Critical Habitat listed under the Species at Risk Act are present, refer to DFO Projects Near Water Website for next steps ( <a href="https://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/pnw-ppe/index-eng.html">https://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/pnw-ppe/index-eng.html</a> ).					
<sup>3</sup> Refer to DFO Land Development Guidelines ( <a href="http://stewardshipcentrebc.ca/PDF_docs/StewardshipSeries/LandDevelopmentGuidelines.pdf">http://stewardshipcentrebc.ca/PDF_docs/StewardshipSeries/LandDevelopmentGuidelines.pdf</a> )					

## Appendix C. Legal Requirements and Policy

The following provides a brief summary of environment related legislation that may be applicable to a proponent's project. While this list is fairly inclusive, other pieces of legislation may be applicable, and proponents are to ensure that they have identified all legislation that may apply to their project. The Federal Project Near Water website may be updated to reflect the integration of permitting under the *Species at Risk Act* and *Fisheries Act*. It is the proponents' responsibility to refer to the Projects Near Water website for any updates.

### Federal Acts:

- *The Department of Environment Act*
- *Fisheries Act*
- *Species at Risk Act (SARA)*
- *Migratory Birds Convention Act*
- *Canada Wildlife Act*
- *Navigable Waters Protection Act*
- *Pesticides Act*
- *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA)*
- *Indian Act*

### Federal Regulations:

- *Canada Environmental Protection Act Regulations*
- *Migratory Birds Regulations*
- *Fisheries Act Regulations*
- *Wildlife Area Regulations*

### Provincial Acts:

- *Water Sustainability Act*
- *Fish Protection Act*
- *Wildlife Act*
- *Land Act*
- *Parks Act*
- *Weed Control Act*
- *Environmental Management Act (Contaminated Sites Regulations)*
- *Local Government Act*
- *Heritage Conservation Act*
- *Health Act (e.g., Sewerage System Regulation)*

### Local Government:

- Development Permit Areas (DPAs)
- Subdivision Servicing Bylaw
- Official Community Plans
- Floodplain Management Bylaw
- Building Bylaw
- Zoning Bylaws

The Legal Requirements table, provided below (Table C1) identifies the main fish and wildlife habitat regulatory requirements for typical foreshore activities. These requirements involve three regulatory processes:

1. Obtaining a BC Crown Land tenure - to request permission for use of provincial Crown land.
2. Obtaining a BC Water Sustainability Act Section 11 notification or approval for making changes in and about a stream.

3. Obtaining necessary DFO acceptance through a Project Review. DFO staff will review the project plans to identify the potential risks of the project to the conservation and protection of fish and fish habitat. During the review, it will be determined if the project will: a) impact an aquatic species at risk, result in the death of fish and the harmful alternation, disruption or destruction of fish habitat, or need authorization under the *Fisheries Act*.

Although potential regulatory requirements (e.g., permits) are listed, the requirements at the time of planning the project should be confirmed, as regulatory changes do occur. FrontCounterBC should be contacted to confirm these requirements.

The Legal Requirements table only provides direction related to protecting fish and wildlife habitat values, and as such, does not consider other development factors (such as erosion hazards, drinking water quality, or navigation considerations). Proposed works may be subject to requirements such as: local government zoning or permitting, BC *Water Sustainability Act* approvals or notifications (in addition to those noted above) and Water License applications, Heritage Conservation Act permits, Land Act permits, licenses or permissions for occupation of Crown Lands, or Navigable Waters Protection Act approvals. It remains the responsibility of the project proponent to verify this information and meet all regulatory requirements that may apply to their project.

**Table C1. Summary of typical legal environmental requirements for select development activities.**

Activity <sup>1</sup>	Crown Land Tenure	BC Water Sustainability Act-Section 11 <sup>2</sup>	Federal Fisheries Act Review <sup>4</sup>	Other
<b>Aquatic Vegetation Removal</b>				
Removing native aquatic vegetation - by hand, or mechanical cutting for swimming areas and private beach access	N	Y	See DFO website	-
Removing non-native/invasive aquatic vegetation - by hand or mechanical cutting for swimming areas and private beach access	N	Y	See DFO website	-
<b>Dredging, Infilling and Beach Creation</b>				
Dredging - new or expansion works, no current tenure	Y	Y	Y	-
Maintenance dredging - dredged in last 10 years, no increase in footprint below the NB, dredged material deposited on land, within existing tenure.	N	Y	See DFO website, likely N	-
Lake infilling - e.g. extension of upland landscaping	Y	Y	Y	-
Beach creation below the lake NB	Y <sup>3</sup>	Y	Y	-
Beach creation above the lake NB, assumes on the applicant's land	N	Y	See DFO website, likely N	See DFO Land Development Guidelines <sup>5</sup>
Foreshore sediment disturbance and removal of lakebed substrate (e.g., beach grooming)	N	Y	See DFO website, likely Y	-
<b>Foreshore Erosion, Sediment or Wave Control Structures</b>				
New groyne construction or increase in existing footprint	Y	Y	Y	-
Maintenance of existing groyne, no increase in existing footprint, within existing tenure	N	Y	N	-
Erosion control (e.g. concrete, rip rap, vegetation, etc.)	N	Y	See DFO website	-
Infill breakwaters or boat basins	Y	Y	See DFO website	-
Wave control structures (e.g., log booms)	Y	Y	See DFO website	-
<b>Boat Launches</b>				
Construction of new hard surface boat launch or repair/upgrade of existing hard surface boat launch without land tenure	Y	Y	See DFO website	-
Upgrade/repair of existing hard surface boat launch, within land tenure, and within existing footprint	N	Y	N	-

Activity <sup>1</sup>	Crown Land Tenure	BC Water Sustainability Act-Section 11 <sup>2</sup>	Federal Fisheries Act Review <sup>4</sup>	Other
Upgrade/repair of existing hard surface boat launch, within land tenure, and increasing size of the existing allowable footprint	Y	Y	Y	-
Construction of new boat rail launch or repair/upgrade of existing boat rail launch without land tenure	Y	Y	See DFO website	-
Upgrade/repair of existing boat rail launch with land tenure and within existing footprint	N	Y	N	-
<b>Buoys</b>				
Placement of up to 2 helical screw anchor mooring buoys for non-commercial use.	Y <sup>3</sup>	Y	N	Federal Navigable Waters Act
Placement of up to 2 non-helical screw mooring buoys for non-commercial use.	Y <sup>3</sup>	Y	N	Federal Navigable Waters Act
Placement mooring buoys for commercial use	Y	Y	N	-
<b>Docks, boathouses, pile supported structures, float home structures, and other - below NB</b>				
Docks - floating, pile supported or removable	Y <sup>3</sup>	Y	See DFO website	-
Floating or lake access boat house, covered boat storage, or permanent non-moorage structures	Y	Y	Y	-
Land boat house - located on land with access directly to the water.	Y	Y	See DFO website	-
Pumphouse	Y	Y	Y	-
Boat lifts	Y <sup>3</sup>	Y	See DFO website	-
Float homes and house boats - refers to long term storage area.	Y	Y	Y	-
Float home/ house boats - refers to short term mooring (in bays).	Y	Y	See DFO website	-
Submarine cables, including related land clearing and equipment access.	N	Y	See DFO website	-
Submarine cables - no land clearing necessary.	N	Y	N	-
Overwater piled structure (e.g. building, deck, etc.)	Y	Y	See DFO website	-
Elevated boardwalk over water	Y	Y	See DFO website	-
<b>Marinas</b>				
Private dock moorage = < 6	Y <sup>3</sup>	Y	See DFO website, likely Y	-
Small Marina = 6 – 20 slips	Y	Y	Y	-
Marina Large = >20 slips	Y	Y	Y	-

Activity <sup>1</sup>	Crown Land Tenure	BC Water Sustainability Act-Section 11 <sup>2</sup>	Federal Fisheries Act Review <sup>4</sup>	Other
<b>Water Withdrawal, Use or Discharge</b>				
Waterline - directional drilling	N	Y	See DFO website	May require a Water License
Waterline - open excavation	N	Y	See DFO website	May require a Water License
Geothermal heating/cooling - commercial, industrial, strata or multi-family	Y <sup>3</sup>	Y	See DFO website	May require a Water License
Geothermal heating/cooling - single family residence	Y <sup>3</sup>	Y	See DFO website	May require Water License
Treated effluent discharge pipe	Y <sup>3</sup>	Y	N	Environment Canada
Commercial water withdrawals	Y <sup>3</sup>	Y	See DFO website	Requires Water License
<b>Transition to Private Land from Crown Land</b>				-
Application to purchase or lease crown land (crown grant)	Y	N	N	-
<b>Land development, on private land - above NB</b>				
Native Vegetation modification / removal	N	Y <sup>3</sup>	See DFO website	-
Non-native Vegetation modification / removal	N	Y <sup>3</sup>	See DFO website	-
Drilling and blasting	N	Y	See DFO website	If < 30 m NB, contact local government
Boathouses / covered boat storage / permanent non-moorage structures	N	Y <sup>3</sup>	See DFO website	Refer to Local Government
Building and development permit application	N	Y <sup>3</sup>	Y <sup>3</sup>	Refer to Local Government
Landscaping with Native Vegetation	N	N	See DFO website	Refer to Local Government
Landscaping with Non-native Vegetation	N	N	See DFO website	Refer to Local Government
Septic application	Y <sup>3</sup>	N	N	Refer to Health Authority

**Legend:**

<sup>1</sup>NB refers to present natural boundary. NB is the legal term BC Crown Land Branch uses to define the property boundary. Often NB and High Water Mark (HWM) are similar. Only a registered BC Legal Land Surveyor may determine NB.

<sup>2</sup> BC Water Sustainability Act Approval or Notification.

<sup>3</sup> Although indicated as Yes, the requirement is structure/location dependant. Refer to FrontCounterBC.

<sup>4</sup>DFO Projects Near Water Website (<https://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/pnw-ppe/index-eng.html>). For all activities, if species or Critical Habitat listed under the Species at Risk Act are present, refer to this website.

<sup>5</sup>Refer to DFO Land Development Guidelines ([http://stewardshipcentrebc.ca/PDF\\_docs/StewardshipSeries/LandDevelopmentGuidelines.pdf](http://stewardshipcentrebc.ca/PDF_docs/StewardshipSeries/LandDevelopmentGuidelines.pdf)).

---

---

## Appendix D. Best Management Practices

The BC Ministry of Environment (MOE 2019) defines best management practices (BMPs) as “guidelines that help development projects meet necessary legislation, regulations and policies. For example, legislation might dictate that projects cannot harm a stream, while best management practices provide practical methods to avoid harming a stream.”

The table below provides a summary of potentially applicable environmental and archaeological BMPs. This list is not exhaustive, other applicable BMPs may be available for a given project, and updates occur regularly. Thus, it is recommended that the website be accessed at the following link for a current updated list: <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/environment/natural-resource-stewardship/laws-policies-standards-guidance/best-management-practices>.

FrontCounterBC or a QEP should be contacted for more information on recent Provincial BMP's that may be specifically applicable to the Project. For Federal documents, the *Projects Near Water* website by Fisheries and Oceans Canada should also be referred to (<https://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/pnw-ppe/index-eng.html>).

**Table D1. Summary of BMPs and guidelines that may be applicable to development in the Kootenay Region (Source: Kootenay Lake Partnership 2019).**

Provincial BMPs	Target - species habitat	Applicability	Web Link
Develop with Care: Environmental Guidelines for Urban and Rural Land Development in British Columbia (2014)	Sensitive Species Terrestrial Aquatic Riparian	Works involving any form of land development.	<a href="https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/environment/natural-resource-stewardship/laws-policies-standards-guidance/best-management-practices/develop-with-care">https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/environment/natural-resource-stewardship/laws-policies-standards-guidance/best-management-practices/develop-with-care</a>
Guidelines for Amphibian and Reptile Conservation during Urban and Rural Land Development in British Columbia (2014)	Amphibians and Reptiles	Ecosystems comprised of aquatic habitats, rocky outcrops and forested areas.	<a href="https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/natural-resource-stewardship/best-management-practices/herptilebmp_complete.pdf">https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/natural-resource-stewardship/best-management-practices/herptilebmp_complete.pdf</a>
Guidelines for Raptor Conservation during Urban and Rural Land Development in British Columbia (2013)	Raptors	Terrestrial ecosystems comprised of mature coniferous and mixed woodlands.	<a href="http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wld/documents/bmp/raptor_conservation_guidelines_2013.pdf">http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wld/documents/bmp/raptor_conservation_guidelines_2013.pdf</a>
Best Management Practices Guidelines for Bats during Urban and Rural Land Development in British Columbia in BC (2016)	Bats	Terrestrial ecosystems, insect rich riparian zones, as well as wetlands, forest edges and open woodland.	<a href="http://a100.gov.bc.ca/pub/eirs/viewDocumentDetail.do?fromStatic=true&amp;repository=BDP&amp;documentId=12460">http://a100.gov.bc.ca/pub/eirs/viewDocumentDetail.do?fromStatic=true&amp;repository=BDP&amp;documentId=12460</a>
Standards and Best Practices for In-stream Works (2004)	Aquatic	Works undertaken in-stream.	<a href="http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wld/documents/bmp/iswstdsbpsmarch2004.pdf">http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wld/documents/bmp/iswstdsbpsmarch2004.pdf</a>
General BMPs and Standard Project Considerations	Aquatic	Any projects undertaken in and around a stream.	<a href="http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wld/in-streamworks/generalBMPs.htm">http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wld/in-streamworks/generalBMPs.htm</a>
Bank Stabilization Specific BMPs	Terrestrial Aquatic	Bank stabilization works that could impact fish or wildlife habitat.	<a href="http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wld/in-streamworks/bankstabilization.htm">http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wld/in-streamworks/bankstabilization.htm</a>
Best Management Practices for Hazard Tree and Non-Hazard Tree Limbing, Topping or Removal (2009)	Terrestrial Aquatic	Works involving tree removal.	<a href="https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/natural-resource-stewardship/best-management-practices/hazardtree_26may_09.pdf">https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/natural-resource-stewardship/best-management-practices/hazardtree_26may_09.pdf</a>

**Table D1. Summary of BMPs and guidelines that may be applicable to development in the Kootenay Region (Source: Kootenay Lake Partnership 2019).**

Provincial BMPs	Target - species habitat	Applicability	Web Link
Standards and Best Practices for In-stream Works	Terrestrial Aquatic	Wharves, piers, docks, boathouses, and small moorings in and about a stream	<a href="http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wld/in-streamworks/downloads/Docks.pdf">http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wld/in-streamworks/downloads/Docks.pdf</a>
Best Management Practices for Boat Launch Construction & Maintenance on Lakes (2006)	Terrestrial Aquatic	Boat Launch Construction & Maintenance on Lakes (Okanagan specific)	<a href="http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/okanagan/documents/BMPBoat_LaunchDraft.pdf">http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/okanagan/documents/BMPBoat_LaunchDraft.pdf</a>
Best Management Practices for Small Boat Moorage on Lakes (2006)	Terrestrial Aquatic	Small Boat Moorage on Lakes (Okanagan specific)	<a href="http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/okanagan/documents/BMPSmallBoatMoorage_WorkingDraft.pdf">http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/okanagan/documents/BMPSmallBoatMoorage_WorkingDraft.pdf</a>
Best Management Practices for Installation and Maintenance of Water Line Intakes (2006)	Aquatic	Installation and Maintenance of Water Line Intakes (Okanagan specific)	<a href="http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/okanagan/documents/BMPIntakes_WorkingDraft.pdf">http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/okanagan/documents/BMPIntakes_WorkingDraft.pdf</a>
Beaver Management Guidelines (2001)	Aquatic	Areas that support beaver communities.	<a href="http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/van-island/pa/pdf/Beaver-Guide.pdf">http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/van-island/pa/pdf/Beaver-Guide.pdf</a>
Tree replacement criteria (1996)	Terrestrial	Works involving tree removal and replacement.	<a href="http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wld/documents/bmp/treereplcrit.pdf">http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wld/documents/bmp/treereplcrit.pdf</a>
Kootenay-Boundary Water Sustainability Regulation Terms and Conditions (2018)	Aquatic	Changes in and around a stream of the kind listed in Part 3 of the <i>Water Sustainability Regulation</i> .	<a href="https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/natural-resource-stewardship/best-management-practices/iswstdsbpsmarch2004.pdf">https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/natural-resource-stewardship/best-management-practices/iswstdsbpsmarch2004.pdf</a>
Fish Habitat Rehabilitation Procedures (1997)	Aquatic	Works with an erosion and sediment risk near water.	<a href="https://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hfd/library/ffip/Slaney_PA1997_A.pdf">https://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hfd/library/ffip/Slaney_PA1997_A.pdf</a>
Guidelines for Wetland Protection and Conservation in British Columbia: Land Development (2009)	Wetlands	Wetland protection near development sites.	<a href="https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/natural-resource-stewardship/best-management-practices/wetland_ways_ch_10_development.pdf">https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/natural-resource-stewardship/best-management-practices/wetland_ways_ch_10_development.pdf</a>

**Table D1. Summary of BMPs and guidelines that may be applicable to development in the Kootenay Region (Source: Kootenay Lake Partnership 2019).**

Provincial BMPs	Target - species habitat	Applicability	Web Link
Land Development Guidelines for the Protection of Aquatic Habitat (1992)	Aquatic	Works undertaken in areas adjacent to riparian features.	<a href="http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/Library/165353.pdf">http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/Library/165353.pdf</a>
Ktunaxa Nation Council BMPs	Target Area	Applicability	Web Link
Guidelines for Conducting Archaeological Assessment in Ktunaxa Territory	Archaeology	Activities with moderate to high risk to Archaeological values	<a href="http://www.ktunaxa.org/four-pillars/lands-resource-agency/archaeology-engagement-guidelines/">http://www.ktunaxa.org/four-pillars/lands-resource-agency/archaeology-engagement-guidelines/</a>