

[Part 1. Marbled Murrelet Management Strategy](#)

**Appendix 1-1: Evaluation of Potential Marbled Murrelet Reserves: Bedwell/Ursus/Bulson Planning Unit**

Total area: 29 402.4 ha

Area of Important Habitat: 10 086.6 ha

Area of Important habitat within Existing Reserve Network: 5147.7 ha

<i>Potential MaMu Area</i>	<i>Area (ha)</i>	<i>Area of Proposed Reserve (ha)</i>	<i>Amount of Important Habitat Area Assessed (ha)</i>	<i>Amount of Important Habitat within the Proposed Reserve (ha)</i>	<i>Tree Species</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Platforms</i>	<i>Fragmentation</i>	<i>Overlap with Existing Reserves</i>	<i>Other Comments</i>	<i>Overall Rank (1=very high – 6=nil)</i>	<i>Inclusion as Reserve</i>
B1	724.17		314.7		Hw, Cw	Back bowl of Ursus	Low	No		Many unstable areas (slides)	4	No
B1A	143.84		133.4		Ba CwYc (Fd vets)	Back end of Ursus; south aspect	Low	No		Exposed; not many platforms	4	No
B2	886.16	303	509.4	224.7	Hw, Ba, Ss; Cw	Area around the north end of Bulson Lake; kept the best habitat to the north and the west of the lake	High	Yes; broken by rock face	265.0	Patchy habitat; Cw areas=4; Ba/Hw/Ss areas = 1 and 2; bowl and creek bottom excellent	1-2	Yes
B2A	13.67	84	13.4	68.8	Hw, Ba, Cw	Two areas; to the west of the lake and the south edge of the drainage above the lake	Moderate	No	28.5	Area to the west rated higher than the area on the south side of the creek	2-3	Yes
B3	522.44	482	448.3	417.2	Hw, Ba, Ss	Bulson Creek; valley bottom; combined portions of B3 and B3a	High to very high	No	374.3	Many Ss in valley bottom; many small wetlands	1	Yes
B3A	195.68		156.3		Hw, Ss, Cw	North side of Upper Bulson Lake; maintained braided area to the northeast of the lake.	High	No		Included in B3; north side very rocky; south side better. Along braided creek very good habitat.	2	A portion
B4	392.51		199.8		Hw, Ba, Cw	Thunderbird Creek	Low	Yes; broken by many landslides		Very rocky at the top end of creek; many landslides; adjacent to slides there is some good habitat; east side is poor; west side is better	3-4	No
B5	327.73	71	206.3	68.9	Hw, Ba, Cw	Tributary from the north draining into Ursus	Moderate	No	40.4	Gully at lower end is better than other areas	4	Yes

<i>Potential MaMu Area</i>	<i>Area (ha)</i>	<i>Area of Proposed Reserve (ha)</i>	<i>Amount of Important Habitat Area Assessed (ha)</i>	<i>Amount of Important Habitat within the Proposed Reserve (ha)</i>	<i>Tree Species</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Platforms</i>	<i>Fragmentation</i>	<i>Overlap with Existing Reserves</i>	<i>Other Comments</i>	<i>Overall Rank (1=very high – 6=nil)</i>	<i>Inclusion as Reserve</i>
B6	195.33		113.5		Ba, Hw, Cw, Yc	Tributary from the west draining into Bedwell	Low	Yes, by landslides		Not good overall; southern lower sections better habitat	4	No
B6A	147.54		69.3		Hw, Cw, Ba, Yc	Penny Creek	Moderate to low	No		Fast flowing creek (sluicing)	3-4	No
B7	210.46	104	149.3	87.2	Hw, Cw	West side of Bedwell	Moderate	Yes; broken by many avalanche tracks	53.6	Good habitat between avalanche tracks	3	Yes
B8	127.46	94	92.1	82.3	Hw, Ba	Tributary draining from the NE into the lower reaches of Bulson	Moderate	No	73.3	Northern part of polygon has unstable areas; south end better	3	Yes
B9	164.73	120	157.0	117.6	Hw, Ba, Cw, some Yc	Tributary draining from the NE into the lower reaches of Bulson	Low; high	No	55.0	Gullies very good; bottom poorer habitat; top Section better Hw, Ba	3	Yes
B10	185.12		119.8		Hw, Cw, Ss, some Fd vets	Ursus Creek	Moderate	No		Valley bottom of Ss excellent habitat; side hills not as good	1-4	No
B11		262	314.7	222.3	Hw, Cw	Ursus Creek; valley bottom and lower slope	High	No	169.0	Good valley bottom habitat	2	Yes
B12					Hw, Cw, Ss	Ursus Creek; valley bottom and lower slope	High	No		Good valley bottom habitat; combined to form B11	2	No
PB1 (Park)						Small lake at the headwaters of the Bedwell River		Yes, numerous avalanche tracks		3 on lower slopes; 4 higher up	3-4	No
PB2 (Park)						Ashwood Creek	Low	No		Two areas of blowdown in the upper portion; back portion good	2-3	Yes
PB3 (upper portion in Park)					Hw, Cw, Ss	Blaney Creek	High	No		Lower gentle slope; bowl; good habitat	2	Yes
PB4 (Park)					Hw, Cw	You Creek, back end of Bedwell	Low	Yes		Unstable watershed; many young trees within the gullies	4	No

**Appendix 1-2: Evaluation of Potential Marbled Murrelet Reserves: Clayoquot River Planning Unit**

Total area: 7738.1 ha

Area of Important Habitat: 3827.6 ha

Area of Important habitat within Existing Reserve Network: 1860.8 ha

Potential MaMu Area	Area (ha)	Area of Proposed Reserve (ha)	Amount of Important Habitat Area Assessed (ha)	Amount of Important Habitat within the Proposed Reserve (ha)	Tree Species	Location	Platforms	Fragmentation	Overlap with Existing Reserves	Other Comments	Overall Rank (1=very high – 6=nil)	Inclusion as Reserve
CI1	213.5	206.2	175.9	174.3	Hw, Ba, Cw	Upper bowl of west tributary of upper Clayoquot River	High	Some	116.2	A lot of steep ground with gullies and cliffs; lower slope and area around lake floodplain is good.	2	Yes
CI2	349.6	242.4	206.6	195.6	Hw, Ba, Cw; some Fd vets	Surrounds Norgar Lake	High	No	115.5	Numerous small cliffs; overall habitat very good	2	Yes
CI3	406.7	49.4	213.0	47.1	Hw, Ss, Ba	West side of Clayoquot Lake	Low overall; high in lower portion	No	49.4	Kept the lower portion along the lake and river with the higher rated habitat	4 (bottom part 2)	Yes
CI4	397.3	135.7	287.7	127.2	Cw, Ss, Fd	Back end of Clayoquot drainage	Moderate	No	89.5	Ss predominant in alluvial fan; good platforms on Fd; side slope is unstable	3	Yes
CI5	281.3	104.2	254.5	103.0	Hw, Ba, Cw	South side of east tributary of lower Clayoquot River	Moderate	No	12.3	Good platforms throughout	2-3	Yes
CI6	405.4	131.2	304.4	115.8		Western tributary above Clayoquot lake	Moderate	Broken by avalanche slopes in the back end of valley		Upper portion of the drainage has higher rating	2	Yes
CI6A	234.8		75.7		Hw, Cw	Eastern side of Clayoquot lake	Low	No		poor	5	No
CI7		214.3		192.5	Hw, Cw, Ss	Above and to the east of Clayoquot Lake	High	No	169.6	Continuous with CI4	2	Yes

Appendix 1-3: Evaluation of Potential Marbled Murrelet Reserves: Fortune Channel Planning Unit

Total area: 9157.9 ha

Area of Important Habitat: 1871.6 ha

Area of Important habitat within Existing Reserve Network: 505.7 ha

<i>Potential MaMu Area</i>	<i>Area (ha)</i>	<i>Area of Proposed Reserve (ha)</i>	<i>Amount of Important Habitat Area Assessed (ha)</i>	<i>Amount of Important Habitat within the Proposed Reserve (ha)</i>	<i>Tree Species</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Platforms</i>	<i>Fragmentation</i>	<i>Overlap with Existing Reserves</i>	<i>Other Comments</i>	<i>Overall Rank (1=very high – 6=nil)</i>	<i>Inclusion as Reserve</i>
F1	129.5	129.46	111.5	75.8	Hw, Ba	West slope overlooking Fortune Channel	Low-Moderate	No; cutblocks below	25.8	Very open and exposed; some good pockets; steep	3-4	Yes
F2					Hw, Ba, Cw, some Fd	Top bowl of Rankin Creek	High	no		Retained as part of F1	2	Yes
F3	52.4	52.37	41.5	41.2	Hw	West slope overlooking Fortune Channel	Low-Moderate	Yes, cutblocks below; landslides within	3.8	Moderate habitat	3-4	Yes
F4	43.3	43.28	19.7		Cw, Hw, Yc	South tributary of Virge Creek	Low	Yes, surrounded by previous logging		Poor habitat; abundance of Cw	5	No
F5	189.1	189.11	101.9		Hw, Ba, Cw	Back end of drainage that flows NW into Deer Bay	Very low	No		Steep area near 2800' poor habitat, steep and rocky	5	No
F6	266.1		191.2		Ba, Hw, Cw	Back end of Rolling Stone	Low-Moderate	No		Some patches are good	3	No

**Appendix 1-4: Evaluation of Potential Marbled Murrelet Reserves: Kennedy Lake Planning Unit**

Total area: 29 604.1 ha

Area of Important Habitat: 3384.8 ha

Area of Important habitat within Existing Reserve Network: 1775.5 ha

<i>Potential MaMu Area</i>	<i>Area (ha)</i>	<i>Area of Proposed Reserve (ha)</i>	<i>Amount of Important Habitat Area Assessed (ha)</i>	<i>Amount of Important Habitat within the Proposed Reserve (ha)</i>	<i>Tree Species</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Platforms</i>	<i>Fragmentation</i>	<i>Overlap with Existing Reserves</i>	<i>Other Comments</i>	<i>Overall Rank (1=very high – 6=nil)</i>	<i>Inclusion as Reserve</i>
K1 (Park)	3.6		3.6		Hw, Cw, Ss in patches	Within Pacific Rim Park, draining into Grice bay	Low	No		Low, very flat; patch near clearcut is better. Osprey nest	3	No (in Park)
K2	148.33	84	148.3	72.8	Cw, Ss, Hw	Lower portion of Kootowis Creek	High	No	79.5	Abundance of Sitka Spruce, excellent mossy platforms	2	Yes
K3 (park)					Hw, Cw	Sandhill Creek; within the PR Park	Low	No		Platforms are on lower branches; better pockets of habitat along creeks	4	No (in Park)
K4	42.2		42.2		Cw, Hw	Kennedy Flats; upper Sandhill Creek	Very low	No		Near bogs; flat, abundance of PI, very small branches, no platforms	5	No
K5	515.39	331	515.4	313.5	Ss, Hw, Cw	West side of Clayoquot Arm	Moderate to High	No	331.0	High habitat in floodplain and gullies; Cw areas poor habitat	3	Yes
K6	115.9	97.0	115.9	88.3	Hw, Cw, Ba		Moderate	No	11.0		2	Yes
K7	204.4	90.3	204.4	89.1	Hw, Cw, Ba	Above Sand River on the west side	Moderate		27.7	Kept lower portion as reserve	3	Yes
K8	196.4	77	196.4	72.7	Hw, Cw, Ba	Above the west shore of Kennedy Lake	Low to Moderate	Yes, previous harvesting and roads on all edges	15.8	Kept the northern portion	3-4	Yes

<i>Potential MaMu Area</i>	<i>Area (ha)</i>	<i>Area of Proposed Reserve (ha)</i>	<i>Amount of Important Habitat Area Assessed (ha)</i>	<i>Amount of Important Habitat within the Proposed Reserve (ha)</i>	<i>Tree Species</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Platforms</i>	<i>Fragmentation</i>	<i>Overlap with Existing Reserves</i>	<i>Other Comments</i>	<i>Overall Rank (1=very high – 6=nil)</i>	<i>Inclusion as Reserve</i>
K9A	155.33	92.6	155.3	80.6	Cw, Hw, Ss, some Fd	Above Angora Lake	Moderate	No	28.6	Hw has few large branches or platforms	2-4	Yes
K9B	231.7		231.7		Hw, Cw, Ss	North shore of Kennedy Lake, below Mt. Maitland	Low	No		Exposed the wind off Kennedy Lake, patchy Ss area (2); mostly poor habitat (4)	4	No
K10	20.55		20.5		Hw, Cw, Ss, Fd	South shore of Kennedy Lake	Low	No		Large branches on Fd, very little moss	4	No

**Appendix 1-5: Evaluation of Potential Marbled Murrelet Reserves: Upper Kennedy Planning Unit**

Total area: 20 591 ha

Area of Important Habitat: 36 537.3 ha

Area of Important habitat within Existing Reserve Network: 2653.3 ha

<i>Potential MaMu Area</i>	<i>Area (ha)</i>	<i>Area of Proposed Reserve (ha)</i>	<i>Amount of Important Habitat Area Assessed (ha)</i>	<i>Amount of Important Habitat within the Proposed Reserve (ha)</i>	<i>Tree Species</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Platforms</i>	<i>Fragmentation</i>	<i>Overlap with Existing Reserves</i>	<i>Other Comments</i>	<i>Overall Rank (1=very high - 6=nil)</i>	<i>Inclusion as Reserve</i>
UK1	269.7	208.5	212.7	179.8	Cw, Fd, Hw, Yc	Back end of an east-flowing tributary of the Kennedy River	Moderate to high	No	135.5	Cool drainage	3	Yes
UK2	249.5	99.3	126.6	76.3	Cw, Hw	Below the Clayoquot Plateau	Moderate	No	41.1	Gullies have good habitat; rock faces – poor habitat	3	Yes
UK3	186.7	117.5	117.7	107.9	Hw, Cw, Ba, Ss	West-facing slope above the Kennedy River	Moderate to High	No	57.6	Creek valley has the best habitat	2-3	Yes
UK4	288.1	170.0	198.7	156.7	Cw, Hw, Ba	To the west of Snag Lake	Moderate	No	60.0	Pockets along the river have the best habitat	2-3	Yes
UK5	197.3	31.1	80.4	18.0	Hw, Ba, Cw, Fd	West-facing slope above the Kennedy River	Low	No	5.0	North side of the rock knob has some good habitat; overall very poor	4-5	Yes
UK6	325.3	80.9	119.7	66.9	Hw, Ba, Cw; age class 8	Encompasses almost the entire watershed of Canoe Creek	High in patches	No	56.4	Habitat poor overall; upper creek has higher number of platforms (area retained)	4	Yes
UK7	210.5	167.2	141.1	127.6	Hw, Ba, Cw	Back end of a west flowing tributary of the Kennedy River	Moderate	No	137.1	Good platforms on Ba	3	Yes
UK8	310.8		193.2		Hw, Cw, Yc, Fd	Back end of a west flowing tributary of the stream UK 8 is on.	Low - Moderate (S. side only)	Yes		Very broken; numerous tongues of timber; south side of creek is better	4	No
UK9	363.8	213.5	153.6	135.8	Cw, Ba, Ss	East slope above the Kennedy River	High	No	205.5	Ss area very good habitat	2	Yes

<i>Potential MaMu Area</i>	<i>Area (ha)</i>	<i>Area of Proposed Reserve (ha)</i>	<i>Amount of Important Habitat Area Assessed (ha)</i>	<i>Amount of Important Habitat within the Proposed Reserve (ha)</i>	<i>Tree Species</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Platforms</i>	<i>Fragmentation</i>	<i>Overlap with Existing Reserves</i>	<i>Other Comments</i>	<i>Overall Rank (1=very high – 6=nil)</i>	<i>Inclusion as Reserve</i>
UK10	123.4		72.2		Ba, Cw, Hm	Back end of a west flowing tributary of the Kennedy River	Low	No		Rocky area are poor; bluffs interspersed with trees	5	No
UK11	250.9		89.5		Hw, Ba, Cw	North facing slope above the back lend of the Kennedy River	Low	No		Upper parts are poor; many rock bluffs	4	No
UK12	232.3	81.6	154.0	73.0	Hw, Cw	Back end of a west flowing tributary of the Kennedy River	Low	No	43.5	Deer Winter Range	3-4	Yes
UK13						Upper Kennedy, west face, north side				Very poor; didn't include	5	No

**Appendix 1-6: Evaluation of Potential Marbled Murrelet Reserves: Sydney/Pretty Girl Planning Unit**

Total area: 20 276 ha

Area of Important Habitat: 6703.3 ha

Area of Important habitat within Existing Reserve Network: 2053.6 ha

<i>Potential MaMu Area</i>	<i>Area (ha)</i>	<i>Area of Proposed Reserve (ha)</i>	<i>Amount of Important Habitat Area Assessed (ha)</i>	<i>Amount of Important Habitat within the Proposed Reserve (ha)</i>	<i>Tree Species</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Platforms</i>	<i>Fragmentation</i>	<i>Overlap with Existing Reserves</i>	<i>Other Comments</i>	<i>Overall Rank (1=very high - 6=nil)</i>	<i>Inclusion as Reserve</i>
SPG1	54.9	54.9		50.3	Ba, Hw	West shoreline of Irving Lake	Moderate	No	25.3	West side of the lake has better habitat than east shoreline	3	Yes
SPG2	67.8	67.8		62.7	Hw, Ss, Cw	Upper Sydney watershed	High	No	29.8	Excellent nesting sites on Ss within the riparian floodplain	2	Yes
SPG3	108.3	108.3		95.4	Ss, Hw, Cw	Mid Sydney River	Very high	No	42.7	Excellent nesting sites on Ss within the riparian floodplain	1	Yes
SPG4	189.9	189.9		161.8	Ss, Hw, Cw	Lower Sydney River	High	Yes, riparian channels	121.0	Excellent nesting sites on Ss within the riparian floodplain	2	Yes
SPG5	337.6	337.6		226.1	Ss, Hw, Ba	Upper valley of a drainage flowing S. into the E end of Pretty Girl Lake	High	No	180.6	Excellent habitat along gullies and the back bowl	2	Yes
SPG6	321.3	321.3		297.5	Cw, Hw, Ba	West of Pretty Girl Lake	High	No	200.0	Good nesting habitat on Hw	3	Yes
SPG7	36.3	36.3		34.9	Hw, Ba	Northwest of Pretty Girl Cove	Moderate	No	21.6	Large Ba, Hw, steep mid slope forest	2-3	Yes

<i>Potential MaMu Area</i>	<i>Area (ha)</i>	<i>Area of Proposed Reserve (ha)</i>	<i>Amount of Important Habitat Area Assessed (ha)</i>	<i>Amount of Important Habitat within the Proposed Reserve (ha)</i>	<i>Tree Species</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Platforms</i>	<i>Fragmentation</i>	<i>Overlap with Existing Reserves</i>	<i>Other Comments</i>	<i>Overall Rank (1=very high – 6=nil)</i>	<i>Inclusion as Reserve</i>
SPG8	130.7	130.7		106.5	Cw, Hw, Ba	Between Easter lake and Ellen Lake	Moderate	No	41.4	Cw, Hw, Ba forests between the two lakes	3	Yes
SPG9	38.4	38.4		33.5	Cw, Hw, Ba	South of Cecilia Lake	High	No	12.0	Good nesting habitat in the Hw; large amount of moss; good access	3	Yes
SPG10	41.7	41.7		35.7	Cw, Ba, Fd	On the west side of lower Sydney Inlet between Stewardson Inlet and Hotsprings Cove	Moderate	No	32.1	Mid slope; steep, between 200 and 300m	3	Yes

Appendix 1-7: Evaluation of Potential Marbled Murrelet Reserves: Hesquiaht Planning Unit

Total area: 23 960 ha

Area of Important Habitat: 4456.9 ha

Area of Important habitat within Existing Reserve Network: 1835.5 ha

<i>Potential MaMu Area</i>	<i>Area (ha)</i>	<i>Area of Proposed Reserve (ha)</i>	<i>Amount of Important Habitat Area Assessed (ha)</i>	<i>Amount of Important Habitat within the Proposed Reserve (ha)</i>	<i>Tree Species</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Platforms</i>	<i>Fragmentation</i>	<i>Overlap with Existing Reserves</i>	<i>Other Comments</i>	<i>Overall Rank (1=very high – 6=nil)</i>	<i>Inclusion as Reserve</i>
HE1	241.4	241.4		151.3	Hw, Cw, Ss	West side of Hesquiaht Harbour	Moderate-high	No	157.0	Good riparian areas	3	Yes
HE2	286.3	286.3		237.5	Hw, Ba, Cw	Above Hesquiaht Lake on Hesquiaht Creek	Moderate	No	109.8		2	Yes
HE3	132.1	132.1		124.3	Hw, Cw, Ss	Lower reaches of Satchie Creek	High	No	50.7	Lower reaches excellent habitat	2	Yes
HE4	516.2	516.2		425.9	Hw, Cw, Ba	Hesquiaht Point Creek	High	No	333.3	Bowl provides good habitat	2	Yes
HE5	34.8	34.8		32.2	Hw, Ba, Cw	Above Kanim Lake	Moderate	Yes, road and slides	27.0	Area is broken with slides; good habitat in Ba	3	Yes
HE6	42.9	42.9		40.6	Hw, Ba	Above Kanim Lake	Moderate	Yes, road and slides	15.6	Ba has good nesting platforms	3	Yes
HE7	43.8	43.8		39.5	Hw, Ba	South of HE7, above the outer portion of Hesquiaht Harbour	Moderate	Yes, road and slides	10.3	Trees within gullies provide excellent nesting sites	3	Yes

**Appendix 1-8: Evaluation of Potential Marbled Murrelet Reserves: Megin Planning Unit**

Total area: 30 092.8 ha

Area of Important Habitat: 10 866.0 ha

Area of Important habitat within Existing Reserve Network: 2278.0 ha

<i>Potential MaMu Area</i>	<i>Area (ha)</i>	<i>Area of Proposed Reserve (ha)</i>	<i>Amount of Important Habitat Area Assessed (ha)</i>	<i>Amount of Important Habitat within the Proposed Reserve (ha)</i>	<i>Tree Species</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Platforms</i>	<i>Fragmentation</i>	<i>Overlap with Existing Reserves</i>	<i>Other Comments</i>	<i>Overall Rank (1=very high - 6=nil)</i>	<i>Inclusion as Reserve</i>
ME1	189.1		180.1		Cw, Hw, Ba	Situated along the riparian forests of mid-upper Talbot Creek.	Moderate	No	189.1	Abundance of Cw; better habitat in Hw and Ba; habitat in Talbot not as good as Megin	3	Yes
ME2	122.7	424.4	115.7	347.6	Hw, Ba, Cw	Includes the riparian area of the upper portion of Talbot Creek	Moderate	No	122.7	Upper portion of Talbot has better habitat	2-3	Yes
ME3	449.1		433.8			Encompasses the entire west tributary of the Megin River			449.1	Not included in the aerial assessment		Yes
ME4	435.7	424.1	398.6	388.9		Includes all the important-excellent rated habitat of the east tributary of the upper Megin River			435.7	Not included in the aerial assessment		Yes
ME5	572.7	531.8	507.4	467.3	Ss, Hw, Cw	Encompasses the entire floodplain of the lower Megin River from Megin Lake to the estuary.	High to very high	Yes, fragmented with river channels	572.7	Lower portion of the polygon has an abundance of platforms in the Ss	1-2	Yes
ME6	260.4	260.4	195.1	195.1	Hw, Cw, Ss	At the mouth of the upper Megin River	Moderate	No	260.4	Upper portion not included in the aerial assessment due to budget constraints	2-3	Yes, a small portion
ME7	248.2	733.4	232.5	476.7	Cw, hw, Ba	Situated in the back bowl of Shelter Creek that flows west into Watta Creek	Moderate to high	No	248.2	Upper portion Cw; lower portion Hw and Ba – 1 rating (many platforms)	1-2	Yes

**Appendix 1-9: Evaluation of Potential Marbled Murrelet Reserves: Moyeha Planning Unit**

Total area: 18 381.4 ha

Area of Important Habitat: 4013.4 ha

Area of Important habitat within Existing Reserve Network: 1363.6 ha

<i>Potential MaMu Area</i>	<i>Area (ha)</i>	<i>Area of Proposed Reserve (ha)</i>	<i>Amount of Important Habitat Area Assessed (ha)</i>	<i>Amount of Important Habitat within the Proposed Reserve (ha)</i>	<i>Tree Species</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Platforms</i>	<i>Fragmentation</i>	<i>Overlap with Existing Reserves</i>	<i>Other Comments</i>	<i>Overall Rank (1=very high – 6=nil)</i>	<i>Inclusion as Reserve</i>
MO1	565.9	718.0	468.6	560.3	Hw, Ba, Cw, Ss	The upper Moyeha from where it begins to turn east	Moderate to high	No	565.9	Only rated the lower portion, very good habitat in the lower portion	2	Yes
MO2		344.4		190.9	Hw, Cw, Ss	The lower Moyeha and the lower tributaries flowing southeast into the main Moyeha.	high	No		Included in the lower portion of MO4	2	Yes, a portion
MO3	162.7	383.6	145.0	277.2	Hw, Ba, Cw and some Fd	The upper portion of a tributary flowing northeast into the main Moyeha	Moderate to very high	No	162.7	Habitat is better within back bowl; where the tributary joins the Moyeha the habitat is 3	1-3	Yes
MO4	635.0	729.1	484.0	482.1	Hw, Ss	Encompasses the riparian habitat of the main Moyeha River from the mouth to where it begins to turn east	Moderate to high	No	635.0	Valley bottom; excellent habitat	1-2	Yes
MO5						Located within the upper northwest planning unit		No		Not included in the aerial assessment		No
MO6		82.0		56.0		Located within the upper northwest planning unit		No		Not included in the aerial assessment		No

Appendix 2: Marbled Murrelet Habitat Suitability Assessment Data Sheets [Sydney/Pretty Girl]

Flight Route: Sydney/Pretty Girl				Observers: Tania Trip, Dave Preikshot, Sally Leigh-Spencer				Weather: Sunny (20% overcast), calm, warm (~ 14C)				Date: February 3, 2003				
Location: Sydney/Pretty Girl											Time:					
Location					Assessment		Nesting Attributes			Stand Characteristics					Comments	
Site	Waypoint	Ecoregion	BGC		BGC Variant	Field Ranking (S/G/F/N)	Large Trees (1-4)	Species Composition (leading 3)	Large Mossy Branches (1-4)	Canopy Cover (%)	Vertical Complexity (Y/N)	Elevation (metres)	Slope Position (U/M/L/VB)	Slope Grade (S/M/G/F)		Age Class
			UTM's (Zone U09) Easting      Northing													
1	233		695832	5483501	CWHvm	N	4	Cw/Yc/Fd	4	50	Y	588	M	M	9	Poor, open site
2	234		694648	5488357	CWHvm	F	2	Cw/Ba/Hw	4	60	Y	391	M	S	9	
3	298		699139	5484168	CWHvm	N	2	Cw/Hw	4	70	Y	290	M	S	9	
4	297		699331	5483999	CWHvm	G	2	Hw/Ba	3	60	Y	300	M	S	9	
5	300		698805	5485319	CWHvm	G	1	Ba/Hw	3	80	Y	480	M	S	9	
6	301		698654	5485931	CWHvm	F	1	Ba/Hw	4	80	Y	540	M	S	9	
7	307		700116	5485607	CWHvm	G	1	CwHwBa	3	60	Y	250	M	S	9	Good moss on Hw
8	296		697410	5485670	CWHvm	F	2	Hw/Cw/Fd	4	60	Y	410	M	S	9	
9	294		697790	5486989	CWHvm	G/F	2	Cw/Hw/Ba	3	80	Y	670	VB	G	9	Low value good (3 out of 6; 1 is the best)
10	295		697413	5486627	CWHvm	F	3	Cw/Hw	4	40	Y	540	U	M	9	A low Fair
11	306		699319	5486953	CWHvm	S	1	Cw/Hw/Ba	1	60	Y	500	M	M	9	

12	303		699665	5487061	CWHvm	N	3	Cw/Ba	4	70	Y	630	M	S	9	
13	305		700449	5487276	CWHvm	G	2	Cw/Ba	2	60	Y	450	VB	M	9	High good rating (2 out of 6; 1 being the highest)
14	309		701244	5488899	CWHvm	S	1	Ss/HwBa	2	60	Y	480	U	F	9	
15	310		699883	5489116	CWHvm	G	2	Ss/HwBa	2	90	Y	520	VB	M	9	Rock patches
16						F	3	CwYcHwFd	4	50	Y	770	M	S	9	
17	277		697617	5490741	CWHvm	G	2	Ba/Hw	3	60	Y	500	U	S	9	Patches of not so good Cw
18	276		698583	5490556	CWHvm	G	2	Ba/Hw	3	60	Y	700	U	S	9	Smaller branches are a limiting factor, but a good moss layer is present
19	283		696111	5489866	CWHvm	F	1	Cw/Hw	3	80	Y	160	L	M	9	Good along the creek; Cw up the slope is fair to nil
20	284		695964	5489653	CWHvm	F	2	Cw	2	60	Y	180	VB	M	9	Better habitat along the creek; Low fair, better fair along the creek
21	236	HEL	694939	5489763	CWHvm	S	2	Ss/Ba	1	80	Y	75	M	G	9	Spruce floodplain
22	237	HEL	694960	5490442	CWHvm	F	4	Hw/Cw	4	60	Y	108	L	M	9	
23	239	HEL	693849	5490251	CWHvm	F	4	Hw/Cw/Ba	3	60	Y	338	U	M	9	
24	238	HEL	693361	5490351	CWHvm	F	3	Cw/Hw/Ba/Fd	4	70	Y	363	U	M	9	Five different ratings on model; good along the creek
24	279		697433	5491827	CWHvm	F	2	Hw/Cw	4	70	Y	410	M	S	9	
25	241		694372	5491384	CWHvm	G	2	Ss/Cw/Ba/Hw	3	60	Y	122	L	M	9	
26	291		695158	5490873	CWHvm	G	2	Cw/Hw/Ba	3	60	Y	140	M	M	9	

27	288		695268	5491226	CWHvm	F	3	Cw/Hw/Yc	4	70	Y	500	M	S	9	
28	287		695031	5491644	CWHvm	G	2	Hw/Ba/Cw	3	60	Y	500	M	M	9	The large mossy branch rating is lower due to the high percentage of Cw
30	280		698033	5491756	CWHvm	G	2	Ba/Hw	3	70	Y	400	M	S	9	
31	274		697441	5492477	CWHvm	F	4	Cw/Hw/Fd	4	60	Y	550	U	M	9	
32	273		696937	5492589	CWHvm	F	4	Cw/Yc/Hw	4	55	Y	540	L	G	9	
33	244		694191	5492040	CWHvm	S	1	Ss/Hw/Ba	1	70	Y	117	L	M	9	Patchy openings of the canopy
34	245		693906	5492568	CWHvm	S	1	Ss/Hw	3	70	Y	120	VB	M	9	Good patch of consistent habitat
35	269		696139	5493377	CWHvm	G	2	Ba/Cw/Hw	2	60	Y	500	U	S	9	Patches of balsam are superior
35	270		695794	5493355	CWHvm	G					Y				9	Ba patch of superior habitat
36	268		696049	5493519	CWHvm	F	3	Cw/Hw/Fd	4	60	Y	450	M	M	9	
37	266		694200	5493007	CWHvm	F	1	Cw/Hw/Fd/Ba	4	60	Y	280	M	M	9	
38	246		693760	5493044	CWHvm	S	1	Ss/Hw/Ba	2	60	Y	129	VB	G	9	Superior to 188 m elevation
39	247		693363	5492976	CWHvm	F	2	Cw/Hw	4	60	Y	204	M	S	9	Spiked cedar, moss only on Hw
40	248		692877	5493749	CWHvm	G	1	Cw/Yc	3	70	Y	265	M	S	9	Good platforms on yellow cedar; main drainage of Sydney looks superior
41	249		692026	5493700	CWHvm	F	3	Cw/Hw/Fd	4	80	Y	361	M	S	9	Elevation up to 522 m; more platforms by the lake

42	250		690987	5493549	CWHvm	G	3	Cw/Hw	3	60	Y	579	U	S	9	Better at the west end (upper elevation)
43	264		694936	5494930	CWHvm	N	3	Cw/Yc/Hw	4	60	Y	720	M	S	9	
44	262		694322	5495417	CWHvm	F	3	Ba/Cw/Yc/Hw	4	70	Y	450	M	S	9	
45	260		692997	5494696	CWHvm	G	2	Cw/Fd/Ba/Hw	3	60	Y	250	L	S	9	
46	251		692616	5494825	CWHvm	G	4	Cw/Ba/Yc	2	60	Y	247	U	S	9	Good platforms on balsam; some superior patches
47	252		692447	5495411	CWHvm	F	3	Fd/Cw	4	70	Y	261	M	S	9	
48	258		692409	5496052	CWHvm	G	2	Ba/Hw/Cw/Ss	2	60	Y	400	L	S	9	North of creek (lower part better habitat); lower slope is better habitat
49	254		692660	5495949	CWHvm	F	2	Hw/Cw	4	70	Y	350	L	G	9	
50	255		691688	5496820	CWHvm	G	2	Ss/Hw/Ba/Cw	2	50	Y	606	M	S	9	
51	256		692736	5497641	CWHvm	G	2	Ba/Hw	3	50	Y	737	U	S	9	
52	257		693723	5497547	CWHvm	F	3	Yc/Hw	3	60	Y	738	U	M	9	Though branches often tended to be 4, patches were good
53	261		693538	5495645	CWHvm	G	1	Ba/Hw	2	60	Y	630	U	M	9	
53	286		696873	5487988	CWHvm	G	2	Cw/Hw/Ba	3	70	Y	360	M	M	9	
54	285		697363	5488489	CWHvm	G	2	Ba/Hw/Cw	3	60	Y	540	M	S	9	Good rating in the gully (high good)
55	292		697840	5487934	CWHvm	F	2	Cw/Hw/Fd	4	60	Y	800	U	S	9	

55	293		697796	5487851	CWHvm	F					Y				9	
56	281		697842	5489172	CWHvm	N	4	Cw/Yc/Hw	4	50	Y	630	U	M	9	
57	308		702122	5485840	CWHvm	G	2	HwCwBa	3	70	Y	490	M	S	9	Hw dominant, Ba good, high F, very steep, less moss, patchy
58	311		703402	5484983	CWHvm	F	3	CwSsAlder	3	50	Y	150	M	M	9	
59	317		704333	5484831	CWHvm	F	2	CwHw	4	60	Y	430	U	S	9	
60	314		703892	5485200	CWHvm	G	1	SsHwBa	2	70	Y	170	VB	G	9	
61	315		703678	5485076	CWHvm	F(low)	3	Hw	4	80	Y	170	M	M	9	Low fair
62	275		698029	5492762	CWHvm	S	2	Ba/Hw/Ss	2	70	Y	400	M	M	9	
63	272		697820	5493887	CWHvm	N	4	Ba/Cw	4	50	Y	740	M	S	9	Balsam patches are fair at best; balsam in creek channel good but overall nil rating for the polygon
64	316		704488	5483380	CWHvm	F	3	CwHwYc	4	60	Y	700	U	S	9	Lots of Cw with few large branches
65	232	KIR	696528	5482075	CWHvm	F	4	Ba/Cw/Hw	4	70	Y	398	U	S	9	A lack of moss, smaller branches
66	229		695178	5481826	CWHvm	F	3	Cw/Hw/Ba	4	80	Y	308	M	M	9	Only moss of Ba
67	231	KIR	694710	5480082	CWHvm	G	3	Cw	3	50	Y	451	M	M	9	
68	230		694040	5479760	CWHvm	G	2	Cw/Hw/Ba	3	70	Y	639	U	S	9	Steep, good site, good thick moss
69	341		701678	5477441	CWHvm	F	2	CwHw	4	50	Y	70	L	M	9	
70	323		702831	5478684	CWHvm	F	2	CwHwBa	4	60	Y	130	M	S	9	
71	339		704593	5479002	CWHvm	F	3	CwHw Alder	4	70	Y	70	M	M	9	From lake edge up
72	338		707346	5479082	CWHvm	F	3	CwHw	4	70	Y	60	M	M	9	High in Cw, smaller trees, very few branches

73	337		708422	5479068	CWHvm	F	3	HwBaCw	4	80	Y	40	L	G	9	
74	336		707886	5480233	CWHvm	N	3	CwHw	4	70	Y	260	M	M	9	Almost fair
75	335		706197	5480485	CWHvm	F	3	CwHwBa (PwFd)	4	60	Y	150	M	S	9	
76	334		704910	5482118	CWHvm	F	1	BaHwCw	4	80	Y	700	U	S	9	
77	331		704444	5482502	CWHvm	F	4	CwHw	4	60	Y	720	U	S	9	
78	333		704136	5482242	CWHvm	F	3	CwHwYcPwFd	4	70	Y	700	U	S	9	
79	329		703558	5480920	CWHvm	G	1	CwHw	2	80	Y	280	U	S	9	
80	330		703733	5480858	CWHvm	G	2	BaHwCw	3	60	Y	240	U	S	9	
81	326		704082	5480428	CWHvm	F	2	CwHw	4	60	Y	100	L	M	9	
81	327		703901	5480520	CWHvm	F									9	Higher in elevation site
82	325		704176	5480419	CWHvm	G	2	CwHwBa	3	70	Y	80	L	M	9	
83	320		702510	5481112	CWHvm	F	3	CwHwFd	4	60	Y	150	U	S	9	
84	319		702507	5481821	CWHvm	G	2	HwBaCw	2	50	Y	140	M	S	9	
85	344		698352	5477420	CWHvm	F	1	FCwBaFd	4	70	Y	120	M	S	9	Could be a low 3 for branches
86	345		698327	5477965	CWHvm	G	1	CwFdBa	2	50	Y	250	M	S	9	Goes from 200m to 300m
86	346		698095	5478120	CWHvm						Y					
87	347		696771	5478542	CWHvm	F	3	CwHwBa Alder	4	80	Y	340	U	S	8/9	

88	340		705465	5477554	CWHvm	F	3	CwHwBa	4	70	Y	50	VB	G	9	
89	343		698297	5475911	CWHvm	G	1	CwHwBa	3	70	Y	300	U	S	9	Ba high up better
12 a	304		699840	5487052	CWHvm	G	1	Hw/Cw/Fd/Ba	2	60	Y	480	M	M	9	
2 a	235		694501	5488181	CWHvm	G	2	Ba/Hw/Fd	2	80	Y	416	M	S	9	Section was North of the creek
24 a	278		697318	5491732	CWHvm	G	1	Ba/Hw	2	60	Y	340	M	M	9	
25 a	242		694288	5491472	CWHvm	S	2	Ss/Hw	2	70	Y	129	L	M	9	
26 a	290		694957	5490161	CWHvm	S	1	Ss/Hw/Alder	1	40	Y	120	VB	G	9	
27 a	289		694903	5490712	CWHvm	G	1	Hw/Cw/Ba/Ss	2	50	Y	410	VB	G	9	
3 a	299		698978	5484320	CWHvm	G	1	Ba/Hw	3	60	Y	380	U	S	9	Upper elevation of polygon 3 = location of 3a
33 a	243		694331	5491897	CWHvm	F	3	Cw/Hw	4	70	Y	109	L	M	9	
36 a	271		695642	5493479	CWHvm	S	1	Ba/Cw	1	70	Y	400	L	M	9	
37 a	267		693748	5493208	CWHvm	S	1	Ss/Hw/Cw	1	70	Y	150	VB	G	9	Lower portion of polygon 37 = 37a
44 a	265		694785	5496058	CWHvm	G	2	Ba/Hw/Cw	2	70	Y	630	M	S	9	
47 a	253		692387	5495682	CWHvm	S	1	Ss	2	70	Y	300	VB	G	9	Small patch
48 a	259		692603	5495660	CWHvm	G	2	Cw/Hw	4	80	Y	309	L	S	9	Upper slope southern edge better habitat
56 a	282		697736	5489272	CWHvm	G	2	Ba/Hw	2	50	Y	600	M	M	9	
58 a	312		703384	5485134	CWHvm	G	1	CwHwFd	3	80	Y	170	M	S	9	
59 a	318		704791	5484523	CWHvm	G	2	CwHw	2	70	Y	500	U	S	9	Upper part of 59
6 a	302		698617	5486021	CWHvm	G	1	Ba/Hw	2	80	Y	600	U	S	9	

69 a	342		701792	5476950	CWHvm	G	1	HwBa	2	70	Y	120	U	S	9	High good
70 a	322		702719	5478785	CWHvm	N	4	CwHw	4	40	Y	80	L	M	9	Small patch not rated in polygon
70 b	324		702962	5478612	CWHvm	G	1	CwHw	2	70	Y	160	U	S	9	
77 a	332		704550	5482255	CWHvm	G	1	BaHw	2	70	Y	780	U	S	9	Upper part of 77, ridgeline
81 a	328		703643	5480697	CWHvm	F	2	CwHw	4	80	Y	220	U	S	9	
83 a	321		702252	5480774	CWHvm	N	3	CwHwPI	4	50	Y	100	M	M	9	Lower part of 83, spiked top Cwopen Cw, with some PI

Appendix 3: Marbled Murrelet Habitat Suitability Assessment Data Sheets [Hesquiaht]

Site: Kanim Lake area Sites 1A-1G																		
Observers: Sally Leigh-Spencer																		
Date: November 14, 2002																		
Location: Kanim Lake area								Ranking		Nesting Attributes			Stand Characteristics					
Site	Landscape Unit	Ecosection	BGC	Easting	Northing	BGC	Picture Number	Field Ranking (S/G/F/N)	Large Trees (1-4)	Species Composition (leading 3)	Large Mossy Branches (1-4)	Canopy Cover (%)	Vertical Complexity (Y/N)	Elevation (feet)	Slope Position (U/M/L/W/B)	Slope Grade (S/M/G/F)	Age Class	Comments
1A (upper)								F/G	4	Ba,	3	60	Y	1700				
1A (lower)								N	1	Cw, Ba, Hw	1	60	Y	1500				Smaller trees with poor branches
1A (far north side)								N	2	Cw, Hw	1	60	Y	1300				Smaller trees with poor branches
1A (far north side, slightly lower)								F	2	Cw, Hw, Ba	1	60	Y	1200				Smaller trees with poor branches
1A (lower, along creek draw)		KIR						G	4	Ba, Hw	3	60	Y	400-700				Good nesting trees along creek, good number of platforms on Hw, Ba along the creek
1B		KIR						F	3	Ba, Cw, Hw	1	80	Y	1400				Only Ba had platforms
1C								N	1	Cw, Hw, Ba	1		Y	1000				Interspersed with slide tracks
1D (upper)								F	2	Ba, Cw, Hw	1	60	Y	2000				
1D (main)								N	2	Cw, Hw	>1	60	Y	1900				
1D		HEL						F	4	Ba, Hw	1	60	Y	1700				Tall Ba, not many platforms

1E		HEL						G	3	Cw, Hw	2	80	Y	0-1000	M		
1E (lower)		HEL						G	3	Cw, Hw, Ba	2	70	Y	600	L		Lower area Cw (400 ft) not good
1F								N	1	Cw	0	50	Y				Open Cw
1G		HEL						F-G	2	Cw, Hw	2	60	Y	300			A few Hw along the lake have platforms

Sites 2A-2		Observers: Derek Drake, Sally Leigh-Spencer											Date: November 14, 2002				
Location: Hesquiaht Pt. Creek											Time: 12:55						
Location: Hesquiaht Pt. Creek							Ranking		Nesting Attributes			Stand Characteristics					Comments
Site	Landscape Unit	Ecosection	BGC	UTM's	BGC	Picture Number	Field Ranking (S/G/F/N)	Large Trees (1-4)	Species Composition (leading 3)	Large Mossy Branches (1-4)	Canopy Cover (%)	Vertical Complexity (Y/N)	Elevation (feet)	Slope Position (U/M/L/VB)	Slope Grade (S/M/G/F)	Age Class	
2A							G-S	4	Ba, Hw, Cw	4	60-70	Y	1000	M	M/G	9	Good platform in Hw and Ba
2B1							F	3	Hw, Ba (Cw)	1	60	Y	1000	M	S	9	More Cw
2B		KIR					G	4	Hw	3	70	Y	800	L	M to G	9	Hw good, gets very steep, looks good, narrow (1700ft)
2D		KIR					F-G	3	Hw, Cw	2	70	Y	2000-2250		S	9	
2E							F-G	3	Hw, Ba	1		Y	2000		S	9	
2F (lower)							F	4	Cw, Ba	1	70	Y	1200	L	M	9	Mostly Cw
2F (higher)							G-S	4	Ba, Hw	3	70	Y	1500	U	S	9	Looks good
2G		HEL					F	2	Cw, Hw	1	60-70	Y	1800			9	Some of the Hw have platforms, stand is mostly closed canopy Cw

2G1		HEL						G	3	Ba	3	50	Y	1500		M	9	Small patch of Ba (291) - looks good
2H (lower)		HEL						F-N		Cw, Hw			Y	1500	L		9	Cw on lower slopes - not good
2H (higher)		HEL						F-G	4	Ba, Hw	2	70	Y	2000	U	S	9	
2H (in bowl)								G	3	Hw, Cw	3	70	Y	2000		S	9	Looks good, steep, many platforms
2I								G	4	Ba, Hw	2-3	60	Y	2100	U	S	9	Northwest side at 200 ft more Cw - not so good
2J (face N?)								G-S	4	Hw, Ba	4	50	Y	1600	U	M	8/9	Ba, Hw - many platforms

**Flight Route: #1 Sites 1-**  
**Observers:** Derek Drake, Sally Leigh-Spencer  
**Date:** November 14, 2002

**Location:** Hesquiaht Lake  
**Time:** 2:33 pm

Location						Ranking	Nesting Attributes			Stand Characteristics							
Site	Landscape Unit	Ecosection	BGC	UTM's	BGC	Picture Number	Field Ranking (S/G/F/N)	Large Trees (1-4)	Species Composition (leading 3)	Large Mossy Branches (1-4)	Canopy Cover (%)	Vertical Complexity (Y/N)	Elevation (feet)	Slope Position (U/M/L/VB)	Slope Grade (S/M/G/F)	Age Class	Comments
3A							G-S	4	Ba, Hw, Ss	3	70	Y	300	VB	G	9	Creek running through
3B							G-S	4	Ba, Cw, less Ss	2	70	Y	400	VB	G	9	Large patches of Cw
3C		KIR					N	1	Cw, Hw	0	50	Y	1000-lower			8/9	Smaller trees primarily Cw
3D		KIR					N	2	Cw, Hw	1		y	600-900				1-2 Hw in entire area. Otherwise Cw
3F							G-S	4	Ba, Hw, Cw	3		Y	1300				
HL2	Looks good																

Flight Route: #1				Observers: Derek Drake, Sally Leigh-Spencer							Date: November 14, 2002						
Location: Hesquiaht Pt. Creek																	
Location						Ranking	Nesting Attributes			Stand Characteristics							
Site	Landscape Unit	Ecosection	BGC	UTM's	BGC	Picture Number	Field Ranking (S/G/F/N)	Large Trees (1-4)	Species Composition (leading 3)	Large Mossy Branches (1-4)	Canopy Cover (%)	Vertical Complexity (Y/N)	Elevation (feet)	Slope Position (U/M/L/VB)	Slope Grade (S/M/G/F)	Age Class	Comments
4A							G-S in southern part, N area not so good	4	Hw, Ba, Cw in bowl, southern area Ba, Hw	3		Y	2200, 2000 in bowl	U	M-S	9	
4B (face)							G	3	Hw, Ba	3	90	Y				8/9	Younger Hw mixed in with stand, southern portion better
4C		KIR					F-G	3	Hw, Ba, Cw	2		Y	2000			9	
4C1		KIR					G	4	Ba	3-4	70	Y	2000	U	S	9	
4D							G	4	Ba-Hw	2	80	Y	2300	U	S	9	Upper part of 4D looks good

Appendix 4: Summary of potential and proposed Marbled Murrelet Reserves in each planning unit.

<i>Planning Unit</i>	<i>Map Sheet</i>	<i>MaMu Polygon</i>	<i>Overall Habitat Ranking</i>	<i>Size of Area Assessed (Originally Proposed Reserve Area)</i>	<i>Size of Proposed MaMu Reserve</i>
Kennedy Lake	92F002	K1 (Park)	3	3.6	
		K2	2	148.33	84
		K3 (park)	4		
		K4	5	42.2	
	92F013	K5	3	515.39	331
		K6	2	115.9	97
		K7	2-3	204.4	90
		K8	3-4	196.4	77
	92F003	K9A	2-4	155.33	93
		K9B	4	231.7	
	K10	4	20.55		
Clayoquot River	92F023	CL1	2	213.53	206
		CL2	2	349.62	242
		CL4	3	397.29	136
		CL6	2	405.38	131
		CL6A	5	234.79	
		CL7	2		214
	92F013	CL3	4 (bottom part 2)	406.68	49
		CL5	2-3	281.27	104
Upper Kennedy	92F013	UK2	3	249.46	99
		UK3	2-3	186.68	117
		UK5	2	197.31	31
	92F023	UK1	3	269.65	208
		UK4	2-3	288.08	170
	92F014	UK6	3	325.31	81
	92F024	UK7	3		167
		UK8	4	310.75	
		UK9	2	363.77	214
		UK10	5	123.35	
		UK12	3	232.31	82
		UK13	DWR 5		
92F033	UK11	4	250.9		
Bedwell/Ursus/Bulson	92F033	B1	4	724.17	
		B1A	4	143.84	
		B4	3	392.51	
	92F032	B2		886.16	303
		B2A	3-4	13.67	84
		B3	1	522.44	482
<i>Planning Unit</i>	<i>Map Sheet</i>	<i>MaMu Polygon</i>	<i>Overall Habitat Ranking</i>	<i>Size of Area Assessed (Originally Proposed Reserve Area)</i>	<i>Size of Proposed MaMu Reserve</i>

Bedwell/Ursus/Bulson		B3A	2	195.68	
		B4	3-4		
		B5	4	327.73	71
		B6	4	195.33	
		B6A	3-4	147.54	
		B7	3	210.46	104
		B10	1-4	185.12	
		B11	2		262
		B12	2		
		92F022	B8	3	127.46
		B9	3	164.73	120
Fortune Channel	92F0F012	F1	3-4	129.46	80
		F2	2		
	92F022	F1	3-4		
		F3	3-4	52.37	44
		F4	5	43.28	
	92F023	F5	5	189.11	
	92F013	F5	5	266.09	
		F6	3		
Sydney/Pretty Girl		SPG1	3		55
		SPG2	2		68
		SPG3	1		108
		SPG4	2		190
		SPG5	2		338
		SPG6	3		321
		SPG7	2-3		36
		SPG8	3		131
		SPG9	3		38
		SPG10	3		42
Hesquiaht		HE1	3		241.4
		HE2	2		286.3
		HE3	2		132.1
		HE4	2		516.2
		HE5	3		34.8
		HE6	3		42.9
		HE7	3		43.8
Moyeha		MO1	2		566
		MO2			
		MO3	1-3		163
		MO4	1-2		635
		MO5			
<b>Planning Unit</b>	<b>Map Sheet</b>	<b>MaMu Polygon</b>	<b>Overall Habitat Ranking</b>	<b>Size of Area Assessed (Originally Proposed Reserve Area)</b>	<b>Size of Proposed MaMu Reserve</b>
Moyeha		MO6			
Megin		ME1	1-2		189

	ME2			123
	ME3			449
	ME4			436
	ME5			573
	ME6			260
	ME7			248

**Appendix 5. Comparison of habitat classification and rank between Bahn-Newsom HSI Model, air photo interpretation and low-level aerial survey assessment from Burger 2004, and CMMRT Conservation Assessment Part B (2003).**

Table 1: Equivalency table for evaluating Marbled Murrelet nesting habitat between three ranking schemes.

Bahn-Newsom HSI	CMMRT Likelihood	Burger 2004 Rank
Excellent	Most likely	1, 2
Good	Most-moderately likely	2, 3
Suboptimal	Least-moderately likely	4, 5
Unsuitable	Least likely	6

Table 2: Ranking system used by CMMRT (2003) to determine the likelihood that habitat polygons will contain a large proportion of suitable habitat, modified for West Vancouver Island.

Feature	Most likely	Moderately likely	Least likely
Distance from saltwater (km)	0.5–30	0–0.05 & 30–50	>50
Elevation (m)	0–900	900–1500	>1500
Stand age class	9 (>250 yr)	8 (140–250 yr)	<8 (<140 yr)
Site index productivity classes	Class I & II	Class III	Class IV
Tree height class	4–7 (>28.5 m)	3 (19.5–28.4 m)	<3 (<19.m)
Canopy closure	Classes 4, 5 & 6	Classes 3 & 7	Classes 2 & 8
Vertical canopy complexity	MU, NU & VNU	U	VU

Table 3: Ranking system used in the protocols for air photo interpretation and aerial surveys of Marbled Murrelet habitat (Burger 2004).

Rank	(Score)	Habitat value	General description of habitat quality and availability of key habitat features	Percentage of polygon area with habitat feature present
6	(0)	Nil	All key habitat features absent; nesting impossible (e.g., bogs, bare rock).	0%
5	(1)	Very Low	Key habitat features sparse and might not all be present; nesting highly unlikely	about 1%
4	(2)	Low	Key habitat features all evident but patchy and sparse; nesting possible but unlikely or at very low density	2–5%
3	(3)	Moderate	Key habitat features present but uncommon and patchy; nesting likely but at moderate to low densities.	6–25%
2	(4)	High	Key habitat features common and widespread; nesting likely	25–50%
1	(5)	Very High	Key habitat features present in abundance; nesting highly likely	50–100%