

**Exhibit 2: Summary of Public Submissions (written) Regarding the *DRAFT* Stikine Country Management Plan – Sorted by Topic/Issue**

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
▪ <b>Access: Air</b>	▪ (Floatplane) “The Plan must allow for reasonable [air] access throughout the area.”
▪ <b>Access: Air</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Author is strongly opposes any regulation limiting floatplane access to lands and waters in BC Parks.</li> <li>▪ “Floatplanes are the least environmentally damaging way of rapid and trackless water access in our province.”</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Access: Air</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ P. 77 (Draft MP 1.0) – Insert: “What about air access for industrial activities that are proposed/expected?”</li> <li>▪ P. 78 – regarding phrase: “except... when [flights] have very low impacts...”, suggests, adding reference to an Impact Assessment.</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Access: Air</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Word the language (In Management Plan) for air access similar to how it is worded for motorboat access.</li> <li>▪ “To achieve [wilderness experience objectives], there needs to be a carrying capacity determined for each water body or other landing area, to access how many aircraft can land/depart in one day without undue disturbance to other users.</li> <li>▪ Helicopters should not be used, except for management/emergency purposes.</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Access: Air</b>	▪ We are... apposed to increased motorized access (floatplane) and increased motorized use (boats on lakes) as Spatsizi Wilderness Park (see Management Plan 1980) was set up as a wilderness park.”
▪ <b>Access: Air</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The author is opposed to the transfer of responsibility, of the Cold fish airstrip, to the BC aviation council.</li> <li>▪ The author implies: Helicopters should not be used for portaging canoes and rafts</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Access: Air</b>	▪ “I am seriously concerned about [the transfer of] maintenance and liability of the gravel airstrip near the Cold Fish Lake camp to the BC Aviation Council.” (Fears that it will lead to commercialization of the area)
▪ <b>Access: Air</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Word the language (In Management Plan) for air access similar to how it is worded for motorboat access.</li> <li>▪ Air access Spatsizi Plateau Wilderness Park should have the same objective as Tatlatui, namely: to manage aircraft access levels and patterns to maintain the wilderness experience of users, and pilot safety: (p. 79 MP 1.0)</li> <li>▪ Floatplane access should not be allowed on all lakes in the Stikine Country parks system.</li> <li>▪ “Helicopters should not be used, except for management purposes.”</li> </ul>

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "I am very concerned about the proposed restrictions of commercial activities within Spatsizi and Tatlatui Wilderness Parks."</li> <li>▪ "Further restrictions to wilderness Tourism will put small specialized floatplane operators like us out of business, which in turn would jeopardize the whole outfitting industry in the north."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "...The possibility of transferring maintenance and liability of the airstrip and Coldfish Lake to the BC Aviation Council [is of concern to us]. That would have to be very closely monitored so that the airstrip does not become an aeroplane thoroughfare."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "I ask that our government please reassess the decision about to be made on deny[ing] access to lakes in BC Parks."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "The principal area of concern was the prior notification requirement imposed only on private aircraft, and not on any other Park users."</li> <li>▪ "Commercial fly-out fishing impact far exceeds any pressure of resources by private pilots." - (Private aircraft less than 10% of aircraft activity)</li> <li>▪ "We strongly solicit support for this important Rights issue from all who value the freedom of access (Private Floatplanes) to our wilderness areas."</li> <li>▪ "[Three] items of immediate concern [are]: ...referring to 'authorization' rather than 'prior notification', ...specifying which lake, and exact timing... is not possible 4 – 6 months in advance ...[and] the blanket waiver for the BCFA membership... has been eliminated."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "I endorse all the suggestions put forward by the BCFA (see document 0026b) which has done an excellent job in the past by negotiating between parks and private pilots for their mutual interest."</li> <li>▪ "I have no intention of ceasing to fly into the beautiful lakes in BC... As you are a representative (Gordon Campbell) of our BC residents and taxpayers, we trust you will find a fair solution."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The author is opposed to restricting the access of floatplanes into the Stikine protected area.</li> <li>▪ "Now... the government... is now considering shutting out the most environmentally friendly way of travel (an over flying floatplane noise last 25 seconds) is very difficult to comprehend."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "The only other 'groups' in Canada requiring authorization and prior notification for destination travel are: 'criminals on parole and illegal immigrants out on bail'."</li> <li>▪ "Our group has been discriminated from normal Park access."</li> <li>▪ "We wish to have the Park Act '#27' and section 'A' repealed."</li> <li>▪ "We wish [for] a consistent standard of Park management from the 11 District Park offices in making regulations."</li> </ul>

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "I am quite concerned about the program of closing off a lot of the lakes of BC to float planes. I am handicapped [mobility]... I can no longer hike any distance and float flying is the only way that I can get into some of the wilderness areas that I used to enjoy."</li> <li>▪ "I... don't believe that restricting float planes will materially improve the environment..."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I respectfully ask that [Gordon Campbell] cause to be reviewed a singular case of apparent unfair treatment towards a specific group of outdoor enthusiasts, as well as an apparent serious compromise of the Public Review and Consultation practice, pertaining to the drafting of the Stikine Plan." (Re: Conflict between Floatplane Association and BC Parks).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "I am concerned about the requirement in the draft plan for prior written approval for private floatplane entering these areas... Surely parks staff could utilize their time more effectively [rather than enforce this policy]... During [past] consultations an agreement of understanding was reached with seems to have been significantly altered by parks in the final draft of the plan."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "I am concerned about the requirement in the draft plan for prior written approval for private float planes entering the [protected] areas... This is discriminatory, contrary to agreements reached through consultation with the BC Floatplane Association, and puts an increased regulatory workload on Parks Staff at a time of reduced budgets."</li> <li>▪ "The additional regulations proposed (prior written approval)... may seriously impair the spirit of cooperation which has fostered [past cooperative] volunteer projects in the past."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "I respectfully ask that [Joyce Murray] cause to be reviewed a singular case of discrimination and unfair treatment of a specific group of outdoor enthusiasts, as well as an apparent serious compromise of the Public Review and Consultation practice, pertaining to the Drafting of the Stikine Plan."</li> <li>▪ "BC Parks has not been negotiating in good faith: accords reached through months of consultation have been summarily discarded in the Draft Plan released Dec. 20<sup>th</sup>."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "Restricting access to [public land in BC] by float aircraft seems a regressive step. I would like to join others in asking [Gordon Campbell] to review the restrictions of access to Public Lands to all British Columbians."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "I am writing to ask that [Gordon Campbell] carefully review the proposal for the use of floatplanes in the Stikine protected areas that is currently under development."</li> <li>▪ "Please see to it that traditional floatplane use is allowed to continue unhindered."</li> <li>▪ "Our [float] plane allows us to visit areas without impacting land areas... the noise level is quite low, especially compared to ATVs, snowmobiles, and two-cycling outboard motors."</li> </ul>

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "I understand that the parks branch is moving forward with plans to restrict/deny access to park lakes by BC floatplanes. [I am opposed to this policy.]"</li> <li>▪ "I know that families of modest means..., [limited] time, and with handicapped people... [need floatplane service in order to access the far backcountry of BC]. Our planned restrictions would deny park access (floatplanes) to such people, and by default make public parks the exclusive playground of the rich, and the leisured."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "... [want] you to reconsider BC Parks plan to restrict private floatplane access to the Stikine Protected Areas and other wilderness areas of BC."</li> <li>▪ "The sound a floatplane makes is loud... [but it is of] short duration... compared with snowmobiles, boats, jetskis, [ATVs], which create sound pollution... for long periods... [and] impact the terrain. [Pilots] try to reduce [their] impact with noise abatement procedures when flying."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The author is opposed to restricting the access of private floatplanes to the Stikine.</li> <li>▪ The author feels that private floatplanes are the least environmentally damaging method of accessing the area. The author does recognize that the noise levels are an issue, but the author feels that other means are just as offensive, if not more.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "...I wish to protest plans to curtail private aircraft activities in BC Parks."</li> <li>▪ "The tiny marginal cost of the very small number of private aircraft operating in BC Parks is hugely offset by the social and economic benefits they bring." (For example: reporting fires, natural hazards, and weather phenomenon, helping with: public safety, and civil defence.)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "Common sense dictates a partnership between the BCFA and BC Parks to maintain access to lakes, encourage environmental stewardship and help monitor use of the lakes for the government."</li> <li>▪ "Compared to other means of access, aircraft are the least damaging to the environment, short term noise notwithstanding."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "I have... great concern [with] your Government's intent to ban float plane access to BC Parks."</li> <li>▪ "Banning [floatplanes] from park lakes discriminates against plane owners and does not create any environmental benefit whatsoever."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "As a private float plane pilot I read with great concern that private float planes will be restricted in the Stikine Protected Areas."</li> <li>▪ "If commercial float plane operations are to be allowed to use lakes then private floatplanes should similarly be allowed access."</li> <li>▪ "I urge you to recognize that float planes make almost no impact on parks. They do no damage to the land, and in most ways are less intrusive than power boats."</li> </ul>

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
▪ <b>Access: Air</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “I would like to request that you (Joyce Murray, MLA) withdraw support for the proposed regulation requiring permits to land in these (Atlin, Tagish, Lake Bennett) areas.”</li> <li>▪ “Please consider carefully before you enact regulations that will curtail and activity that was key to the development of... remote areas...”</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Access: Air</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The author is opposed to any restricted access of private aircraft to lakes in BC.</li> <li>▪ “Aircraft do not cause any environmental damage whatsoever and I might add that for many, many years pilots have been our eyes and ears when it comes to the BC wilderness.”</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Access: Air</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I understand that the BC Park Act... contains wording that says aircraft require prior permission before visiting many of BC’s wilderness parks.”</li> <li>▪ Restricting aircraft access will cause “some visitor spending to be lost...”</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Access: Air</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “I live in the USA and fly a floatplane for recreation. I planned on visiting your wonderful country this summer and I just cancelled my plans because of your policy toward floatplanes.”</li> <li>▪ “You (Joyce Murray, MLA) do not represent your country well, your province well, or your fellow man in pursuit of clean, non-polluting recreation. Shame on you.”</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Access: Air</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The author is opposed to floatplane restriction on lakes throughout Canada.</li> <li>▪ “If indeed float plane impact is a problem and there is legitimate objective evidence to support that conclusion (which I doubt), the best solution would be to only require a few certain lakes to have reservations or maybe ban all motorized craft on a few of them and then gather data as to efficacy of the plan.”</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Access: Air</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “I am a member of the BCFA. Please add my name to the...” list of other people who have written in opposition of restrictive regulations limiting access of floatplanes to BC Park lakes.</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Access: Air</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “I am in complete agreement with John Baker (BCFA’s Director) on this matter and with the points he has presented.”</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Access: Air</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “I do not recognize any problems with aircraft use in these areas” – Please forward any opposing information to the author for review.</li> <li>▪ “The proposed method of aircraft management is totally unnecessary but ‘most of all’ these methods are very impractical and will infringe on the rights of pilots Canada wide.”</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Access: Air</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “I was dismayed to hear that BC Parks has taken it upon themselves to propose added regulations that will affect a very responsible group of citizens that actually help enforce existing regulations and see the government money.”</li> <li>▪ “The weather is so varied and unpredictable that even 2 or 3 days notice [to land on lakes] would be doubtful.”</li> </ul>

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “As the owner and operator of a private float plant, we request the same rights as people with cars, motorcycles, motor-homes, trucks and campers, motorboats visiting these lakes and rivers. It is very unfair and unreasonable to restrict access for airplanes in this area.”</li> <li>▪ “To request access permission for any time in advance of a trip is impractical and unsafe due to weather restraints at those times.”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ (p. 76, MP 1.0): are opposed to prohibiting floatplanes from being stationed within the protected area.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “The British Columbia Aviation Council and the Canadian Owners and Pilots Association support the concept of allowing private aircraft to land on lakes in the Stikine.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding policy for prior notification: “What about delays due to bad weather?”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The author is opposed to any restriction of floatplanes on BC lakes. In addition, the author feels there is no evidence that floatplanes cause negative environmental impact.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The author is opposed to any restricted access of floatplanes into the Protected Area.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The author is opposed to any restriction of floatplanes in the Protected Area.</li> <li>▪ The author is concerned that PB Parks has ‘backed-out’ of the deal with the BCFA.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Author expressed concern that the Protected Area may not remain open to floatplanes.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Access regarding: transport, supply loads to helicopters an horses, and poor weather safety landings, “should be allowed with no prior notification and subject of course to standard safety and environmental rules of transport etc.”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The author is opposed to any restricted access of floatplanes into the Stikine.</li> <li>▪ “I will continue to fly into the Stikine, and would be willing to challenge this in court.”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The author is opposed to access restrictions regarding floatplanes in the Protected Area.</li> <li>▪ The author supports statements made by John Baker and Kenneth Armstrong regarding aircraft access.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The author is opposed to restricted access and the requirement for prior approval, of floatplanes entering the Protected Area.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The author is opposed to restricted floatplane access and the discrimination between commercial operators and private visitors in the Protected Area.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The author supports statements made by John baker, on behalf of the BC Floatplane Association, regarding floatplane access.</li> <li>▪ The Author is concerned that agreements made between the flying community and BC Parks has been ignored in the Draft Plan (1.0).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “I am writing in support of Vice President and Director of BCFA John Baker’s letter of Dec 27/02...”</li> </ul>

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "It is my feeling that private floatplane owners are being unfairly discriminated against in respect to use of waterways in our Provincial Parks."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "...I am personally [unhappy] with this decision to limit private aircraft in BC Parks."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "...I strongly support the positions taken by John Baker, Director of the BCFA and by Ken Armstrong, the Western Director of COPA."</li> <li>▪ "I am very distressed to hear that you are singling out private floatplane operators from having reasonable accessibility to the Stikine Area."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The author is opposed to access restrictions placed on private floatplane going into the Protected Area.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "Please [do not allow] a blanket exclusion of private aircraft from the Stikine Lands and a setting an unfortunate precedent for other management areas of BC and beyond."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "I am... gravely concerned over recent policy drafted by BC Parks [which] discriminates against private aircraft access to...wilderness parklands in the Stikine River area of BC."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "I am very disappointed to hear of BC Park's plan to effectively eliminate private aircraft from the Stikine."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "I am appalled at the apparent intent of some members of the bureaucracy to restrict the freedom and rights of... the flying public. I strenuously object to the revised proposal on floatplane access contained in the Dec. 22, 2002 Draft... Plan."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "I would like to add my voice, as a member of the BCFA, asking you to proceed with caution in excluding or limiting private floatplane traffic into the Stikine Protected Areas." (Opposed to restrictions)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "... am very concerned with what appears to be deliberate discrimination against the flying public relative to accessing public Lands."</li> <li>▪ The author is opposed the proposed 'prior notification requirement' in the Draft MP 1.0.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The author opposes any restricted access of floatplanes to BC Lakes.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding p. 75 &amp; 123 (MP 1.0): "The Coldfish airstrip is closed. It should be deactivated and not maintained by any organization."</li> <li>▪ Regarding p. 77 (MP 1.0): "Low level helicopter access should be limited, and requires strict controls."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding p 76 (MP 1.0): "What are unacceptable impacts."</li> <li>▪ "[Do] not allow floatplane trips for day use visits to any of the backcountry lakes."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The author feels that language used for motorboat access in the draft plan 1.0 should be applied to Air Access as well.</li> <li>▪ "Helicopters should not be used except for management."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<p>8.2.1.1 – page 76</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The language 'Prohibit low flights during the ungulate birthing and post-natal season,</li> </ul>

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
	<p>May 15 – July 15 in birthing and rearing areas.” is inadequate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There should be no reason (except for safety) for pilots to make low flights over sensitive wildlife habitat.</li> <li>▪ Parks planners should initiate the following planning steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identify core habitats for mountain ungulates, particularly birthing and post-natal areas;</li> <li>○ Set prescriptive general and seasonal standards for flights in those areas, with the understanding that those areas may shift over time;</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Prescriptive standards for the use of aircraft in identified habitats may look as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mountain Goats – 2 km from habitat at all times;</li> <li>○ Woodland Caribou - 2 km from habitat at all times; and</li> <li>○ Thinhorn Sheep - 2 km from habitat at all times.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Air</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “I feel that there is not a problem with aircraft in parks”</li> <li>▪ the Gladys Lake airstrip should be allowed to be reopened.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: General</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “I oppose suggestions to restrict access into the Stikine area.”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: General</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “Access must continue to be afforded by all reasonable means, including historical ones to those resource areas, only if necessary, via protected areas.” Including floatplanes, horses, boats, and helicopters.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: General</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding section 8.2.3.5 (MP 1.0): "Agree that ATV use is not appropriate and agree with restriction on mountain biking."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Motorboat</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “The Overall Direction should include an intent to phase out all loud motors with silent ones within a certain time frame to give some muscle to subsequent proposed actions to “encourage” use of quiet motors.</li> <li>▪ The onus should be on motorboat users to avoid conflicts with non-motorboats.</li> <li>▪ “Quiet motors should be required on Buckley Lake, as on all lakes...”</li> <li>▪ “More needs to be done that simply encouraging non-motorized users to travel when the chance of meeting motorboats is minimal.” (reference to Upper Stikine Area)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Motorboat</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ It is unreasonable to not permit motorboat use at Chapea Lake.</li> <li>▪ Regarding Potential Commercial Rec. Opportunities (p. 142, MP 1.0): “Please control the commercial motorboat use on the Stikine and consult with the Muskwa-Kechika area to determine impacts of packers and how to manage appropriately.”</li> <li>▪ Consider this policy wording: “BC parks shall not impose any further restrictions on regulations on aircraft activity in the Protected Areas, subject to BC Parks’ mandate to enact regulation to protect endangered species, unless there has been a demonstrated impact... BC Parks and the Associations will endeavour to cooperate on changes to the existing regulations...”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Motorboat</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The author is opposed to any restriction of access onto the Stikine river system.</li> </ul>



TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “The Cassiar LRMP clearly states ‘Continue to allow motorized boat use for recreation and hunting along the Stikine, Chuchkachida and Pitman rivers...”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Motorboat</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding p. 82 (MP 1.0): "Motorboat access plan should discourage increased usage."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Motorboat</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "...phase out all loud motors with silent ones."</li> <li>▪ "The objective should be to minimise the number of motorboats, not gradually increase them."</li> <li>▪ "[There are] dangers associated with encounters between motorboats and floatcraft..."</li> <li>▪ "BC Parks should set an example by providing its boat at Cold Fish Lake with a silent motor."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Motorboats</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Enforcement and monitoring of motorboat use by guide outfitters should be done to ensure lawful activities in the Park.</li> <li>▪ "I feel that motorized and jet boat should only be allowed as far as highland Post for the guide Outfitter and that residents should be allowed not much further. I suggest they not be allowed beyond Kliweguh Creek and that a pull in spot be allowed there is it is close to the trail to Cold Fish Lake." I am not opposed to the outfitters going that far either.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Motorboats</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “We want [the Stikine PA] zoned ‘Natural Environment’ so all user groups can have equal shared access to the Park...”</li> <li>▪ “The Cassiar LRMP... wanted continued motorized use for recreation and hunting in all of these areas.”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Motorboats</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "Motorized use should not increase at all."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Motorboats</b></li> </ul>	<p>8.2.1.3 – Motorboat Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Overall Direction should include an intent to phase out all loud motors and replace them with silent motors (electric or 4-stroke)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Motorized</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The author opposes motorized use at Gladys Lake ER and Spatsizi Wilderness Park.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Motorized</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “The use of ATV’s for the purpose of setting up and maintaining camps should be allowed except in the alpine.”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Access: Motorized</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I advocate the phasing “out of all loud motors with silent ones within a certain time frame to give some muscle to subsequent proposed actions to ‘encourage’ use of quiet motors.”</li> <li>▪ “The dangers associated with encounters between motorboats and floatcraft... must be recognised and managed for.”</li> <li>▪ “Any increased use must be for non-motorized and non-mechanized activities.”</li> <li>▪ BC Parks should set a positive example by using a silent motor in its boat at Cold Fish Lake.</li> </ul>

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
▪ <b>Access: Motorized</b>	▪ The author expressed deep discussed with BC Park policy restricting his/her access using off road vehicles (ORVs), floatplanes, and helicopters in Northern BC in general.
▪ <b>Access: Motorized</b>	▪ I am generally pleased with the direction of the management plan to minimized motorized access into Spatsizi Plateau Wilderness Park and to limit motorized use on lakes within the Park."
▪ <b>Access: Motorized</b>	▪ "My main concern is that all of this area is accessible to tax paying British Columbians, via snowmobile, ATV, or boat (power)... When I say accessible by snowmobile [and] ATV, I do not mean run ramped all over the country but on a trail system!"
▪ <b>Access: Motorized</b>	▪ "We would like reassurance... that the rivers that feed into the Stikine will be zoned Natural Environment... As well, we would appreciate knowing that motorized use will not be restricted anymore than it already is..."
▪ <b>Access: Motorized</b>	▪ Regarding p. 75 (MP 1.0): "Motorized access should remain the same or decrease." ▪ Regarding p 97 (MP 1.0): "No ATVs in the Stikine protected areas."
▪ <b>Access: Motorized</b>	▪ Regarding section 8.2.3.3. (MP 1.0): "Agree that winter recreation should be non-motorized. Agree with ban on heli-skiing and restriction on snowmobile use."
▪ <b>Access: Motorized</b>	▪ "The onus should... be on motorboat users to avoid conflicts with paddlers." ▪ "The special situations where winter recreation may be motorized (like the Klastline Trail) should be specified." ▪ "...more needs to be done than simply encouraging non-motorized users to travel when the chance of meeting motorboats is minimal."
▪ <b>Access: Motorized on Rivers</b>	Page 82 ▪ The objective should be to minimize the number of motorboats, not to gradually increase them – especially in view of the recognized conflict with floatcraft on rivers
▪ <b>Access: Road</b>	▪ "We particularly [support not creating] further road[ed] access into the parks, with the few exceptions for industrial development."
▪ <b>Access: Road</b>	▪ In the introduction (Management Plan), there should be reference to the road through Mt. Edziza Park stated on page 79. ▪ P. 79 – "[It] states that the proposed Omineca/Stewart resource road comes close to the eastern boundary of Tatlatui Park and to the Metsantan addition. This is not so; it would follow the Sustut."
▪ <b>Access: Road</b>	▪ In the introduction (Management Plan), there should be reference to the road through Mt. Edziza Park stated on page 79. ▪ P. 79 – "[It] states that the proposed Omineca/Stewart resource road comes close to the eastern boundary of Tatlatui Park and to the Metsantan addition. This is not so; it would follow the Sustut."
▪ <b>Access: Road</b>	▪ "Regarding Mess Creek: This addition must be allowed to provide for road access to the billion ton Shaft Creek copper deposit." ▪ "Regarding Stikine Addition: this new addition (Kehlechoa area) should be changed to

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
	allow road access..."
▪ <b>Access: Road</b>	▪ "The Chckacheeta and Pitman Rivers, if ever there was a road built would wipe out the wilderness value of what it is known for today. Not to mention the high impact it would have on the guide territory."
▪ <b>Access: Road</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The author lobbies that the proposed Mount Edziza road be mentioned in the Introduction of the MP.</li> <li>▪ "...the proposed Omincca/Stewart resource road comes close to the eastern boundary of Tatlatui Park and the Metsantan addition. This is not so; it would follow the Sustut."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Access: Roads</b>	▪ Regarding Mt Edziza (8.2.1.2, MP 1.0): The last bullet should say road will be deactivated when use associated with mining ends."
▪ <b>Air Access – Stikine Canyon</b>	<p>8.2.1.2 – page 78</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Strategy as described is weak &amp; inconsistent with conservation initiative in other jurisdictions.</li> <li>▪ Noise &amp; prop-wash are often amplified in canyons.</li> <li>▪ Red-listed Peregrine Falcons are known to nest on ledges in the Grand Canyon.</li> <li>▪ Stikine Canyon Mountain Goats – due to their interesting escape terrain adaptations – may be considered a unique eco-type.</li> <li>▪ Recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Immediately set conservative prescriptive standards (i.e.: no flights below the rim of the canyon &amp; maintain a 2 km distance from wildlife habitat.</li> <li>○ Flightseeing trips of the Grand Canyon should be curtailed immediately.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
▪ <b>Buckley Lake</b>	▪ "Why not continue to stock the lake? What are the effects on amphibians? The numbers of anglers/angling guides should be regulated."
▪ <b>Burn Objectives</b>	▪ (p. 48, MP 1.0) "4 <sup>th</sup> bullet down...need further clarification on this bullet. What is the intended management direction for burn projects: no hunting or wildlife viewing?"
▪ <b>Coldfish Lake</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "By allowing this purchase [Tommy Walker] without reference to the holding already in place the Government has neglected its judiciary responsibilities."</li> <li>▪ "Parks must give any financial opportunity that arises from the site to the Iskut Band if they wish to have any credibility at all."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Coldfish Lake</b>	▪ "[The Lake] was purchased by the (now) Nature Trust for the use of the public. It is essential that it remain affordable to the public to use it."
▪ <b>Coldfish Lake</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "I strongly support the maintenance of... [the] lake camp for its historic value and public use."</li> <li>▪ "[The Lake] was purchased by the (now) Nature Trust for the use of the public. It is essential that it remain affordable to the public to use it."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Coldfish Lake</b>	▪ I object to the proposal to transfer management of the Coldfish Lake Camp to guide outfitters. Nature Trust Purchased the camp with public funds for the future use of the public.

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
▪ <b>Coldfish Lake</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "We do not agree with the statement: 'non-commercial operation of facilities and Cold Fish Lake... this eliminates both the opportunity for the Tahltan Iskut Band and a commercial (tourism operators).'"</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Coldfish Lake</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "...The park boat at [the lake] should be one of the 'perks' that the park host gets in return for the volunteer efforts provided."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Coldfish Lake</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding p. 86 (MP 1.0): "Coldfish lake should remain non-commercial. The preferred option is user fees or 'NGO' operation."</li> <li>▪ Regarding p. 145 (MP 1.0): "Cold Lake cabin should be non-commercial."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Coldfish Lake</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding section 9.2.15 (MP 1.0): "Use of [the Coldfish Lake cabin] must remain affordable to the public".</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Coldfish Lake</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "We would only be in favour of a First Nations' partnership, no others."</li> <li>▪ "Coldfish Lake was purchased by the (now) Nature Trust for the use of the public. It is essential that it remain affordable to the public to use it."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Coldfish Lake</b>	<p>8.2.2.2 – page 86</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recognize the prior occupation of this site by FN people;</li> <li>▪ Assign a "first right of refusal" to Tahltan &amp; Iskut FN as primary developers for any further projects [at Coldfish Lake].</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Cultural Heritage Sites</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "Minimizing impacts [from recreation] is not enough."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Danahue Pass trail</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "If humans are [allowed to camp in the area] there will no longer be a rationale for claiming that the Ecological Reserve represents an undisturbed ecosystem, and hence its value for research will be obviated."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Facilities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Page 125, bullet 5 – in an effort to accommodate clients, there may be a need to construct some facilities at the far end of Tatlatui Lake for camping.</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Facilities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "Assessing proposals for increased bed capacity of existing facilities, must involve a determination of carrying capacity consistent with maintaining the wilderness character of the protected Area."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Facilities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "have concerns that lodge/camps are 'locked' in forever. This is not acceptable for the guide-outfitting and wilderness tourism industry when carrying capacities have not yet been determined."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Facilities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding new structures within guide areas: "I hope that Parks and Outfitters could sit down at the table on this issue and work out the solutions as they arrive."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Facilities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding p 86 (MP 1.0): "Severely limit the construction of new structures."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Facilities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding sections 9.2.9, 9.2.13, &amp; 9.2.17 (MP 1.0): "Agree that new structures will not be considered for this area and that helicopter landings will be allowed only for management purposes."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Facilities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "Assessing proposals for increased bed capacity of existing facilities, must involve a determination of carrying capacity consistent with maintaining the wilderness character</li> </ul>

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
	of the Protected Area."
▪ <b>Facilities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There should be no new facilities on Tatlatui Lake.</li> <li>▪ The status quo of Trygve Lake should be kept as is</li> </ul>
▪ <b>First Nation</b>	▪ "Minimizing impacts [to cultural heritage sites] is not enough."
▪ <b>First Nations</b>	▪ In file # 0065, there is a map identifying effected Territories for the Management Area.
▪ <b>First Nations Section 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ It is essential that Park managers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Recognize growing importance of FN as regional opinion leaders, investors &amp; business managers;</li> <li>○ Support FN planning participation with funding &amp; technical assistance;</li> <li>○ Develop (a.s.a.p.) a regional policy for consultation with Cassiar FN that works for those FN as well as for Parks managers; and</li> <li>○ Complete provincial policy re: FN consultation (been going on for over a year → no results)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
▪ <b>Forfur Lake</b>	▪ Regarding use of helicopter landing sites and fuel storage: The author wants "the mining company to base their operation out of the Stikine Lodge, instead of building temporary sites [at Forfur Lake]."
▪ <b>Fuel Management</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "Only allowing 5 drums of fuel per location, this will create extra air traffic and costs."</li> <li>▪ "Removal of all fuel for the winter, what about emergencies, what if I want to operated in the winter, or have the check the buildings, these are not logical operating parameters."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Fuel Storage</b>	▪ We advocate "guideline[s] on storage and handling of fuel" but you must remember we are remote by many miles and practical common sense must prevail in some cases"
▪ <b>Fuel Storage</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The proposed fuel management plans are extremely excess and very impractical. By limiting the amount of fuel that can be in one spot .... You create extra and unnecessary aircraft traffic to maintain this minimum inventory.</li> <li>▪ Not having fuel for the winter is impractical and dangerous.</li> </ul>
▪ <b>General</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Ecological Reserves Act does not allow: "recreational and commercial travel, including hiking and horses".</li> <li>▪ "We were pleased to see such a strong emphases on conservation issues in the [Management Plan 1.0]."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>General</b>	▪ The term: "limits of acceptable change (MP p. 140) "suggests an assumption that commercial use will [increase]... prior determination of carrying capacity [would be a more productive activity]"
▪ <b>General</b>	▪ The author implies: All other protected areas should be assessed for horse impacts.

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>General: Policy</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “I am supportive of your (Joyce Murray, Minister of WLAP) statements that there would be no commercialized use and that recreation within the reserve will not be encouraged.”</li> <li>▪ “I am... concerned to here that proposals for guided commercial tours in the [Ecological] Reserve are being considered.”</li> <li>▪ “When this park (Spatsizi Plateau) was created, it was zoned as ‘wilderness’... A park where people could go to enjoy a truly “wilderness experience. [Therefore,] I am generally pleased that management will plan to minimized motorized access...”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>General: Policy</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “I would [like to] humbly suggest... that the place to encourage commercial eco-tourism is on the broader land base currently designated as ‘Provincial Forest’.”</li> <li>▪ Regarding Ecological Reserves: I also urge you to pursue a policy of gradually phasing out all permits for grazing and horse access in the reserves, as domestic ungulates continue to be a source of ecological degradation throughout the Province.”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>General: Policy</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “As a Guide Outfitter, possessing a Certificate granting tenure on my area, I feel that legally my certificate should be treated differently than a licence of Permit.”</li> <li>▪ “Do not let the wishes of a few preservationists that might visit the park one or two times in their life, overrule and dictate what we have to live with everyday.”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>General: Policy</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “It is... my understanding that this plan is not the direction that our current government wants to take.”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>General: Policy</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “I would like to see some assurance that the guide outfitting industry will continue to exist as they have in the past and grow within parks in the future, instead of being phased out through expanded park boundaries with more restriction and regulation.”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>General: Policy</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “To ensure compatibility between conservation and recreation it is extremely desirable that carrying capacity objectives be established, and criteria developed for measuring carrying capacity for different activities.”</li> <li>▪ “The Statement: ‘Any increase in commercial recreation activities will incrementally so as not to exceed limits of acceptable change’ (p. 140, MP 1.0) suggests an assumption that gradual increase will change perceptions of what acceptable change looks like, so that the bar is bit by bit pushed up to allow for more commercial recreation.”</li> <li>▪ “The notion of ‘balance’ between commercial and public recreation also raises some alarm.” If this means that there will be equal numbers of tourists as local public users – this is unacceptable.</li> <li>▪ Wants the planning process to be as “transparent as possible”.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>General: Policy</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “The timeframe is not acceptable to allow time for consolation with other in the industry including NGOs, First Nations, stakeholders, and the public.”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>General: Policy</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “I would not like to see more commercial recreation in the protected areas, especially within Gladys Lake Ecological Reserve.”</li> <li>▪ “I... also prefer not to see mining occurring in the Mt. Edziza resource Management zone.”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>General: Policy</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “Having local factors discourage mineral exploration and development in northern BC</li> </ul>

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
	was not a recommendation of the LRMP.”
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>General: Policy</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "I am... happy... with the direction of the management plan... to minimize motorized access into Spatsizi Plateau Wilderness Park and... on [all other] lakes."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Gladys Lake ER</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “What is wanted... is an area of low to minimal human impact... This does not require ecological reserve status but more appropriately a no-hunting, entry by permit only zone.”</li> <li>▪ “It is unjust to withdraw the economic potential that this area has from that segment of society that needs it most.”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Gladys Lake ER</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “If commercial and recreational uses are allowed and encouraged here, other more vulnerable Ecological Reserves will suffer.”</li> <li>▪ What happens here will act as encouragement, by example, for future miss-use of other ecological reserves.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Gladys Lake ER</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “If ever any commercial enterprise is approved for the lake... we want it strictly limited in numbers of trips, adhering to ecological reserve principles, and run by the hands of Tahltan and/or Iskut operators.”</li> <li>▪ “Gladys Lake needs to remain an ecological reserve with no commercial activities.”</li> <li>▪ Recreational activities should not be encouraged in order to keep use levels low. (Including non-consumptive)</li> <li>▪ “Airplane Valley should continue to be available to day hikers.”</li> <li>▪ P. 90 (Management Plan 1.0) – “There should be no commercial use of the ecological reserve, other than limited travel specified here.”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Gladys Lake ER</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “[I is extremely disturbing] that the Ministry of WALP is even entertaining a proposal for guided educational tours, for profit, into the ecological reserve... [It] goes against the mandate of your ministry...”</li> <li>▪ Gladys Lake is one of the foremost jewels in BC’s ecological reserve system and very worthy of protection.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Gladys lake ER</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ (Using Gladys Lake as a recreation travel corridor through Danihue Pass/Eaglenest Creek, and Ice Box Canyon Trails) “I am not in opposition to this use of the reserve.”</li> <li>▪ (Allowing commercial use in Gladys Lake ER): “I am opposed to [the] shift in policy regarding ecological reserves... I believe that the educational component [in] this proposal is a front to allow commercial use of the ecological reserve.”</li> <li>▪ “Surely the province can maintain this area commercial free to protect [Stone’s Sheep] in it’s worldwide stronghold.”</li> <li>▪ The Commercial “tenures were entered into, and infrastructure constructed, with the full knowledge that the ecological reserve would be off-limits to their commercial activities.”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Gladys Lake ER</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “Allowing commercial activities of any sort (even supposedly ‘educational’ activates, which area really just a glorified tours would establish a dangerous precedent.”</li> </ul>

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Gladys Lake ER</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "I do not agree with the proposal that has been floated since this Plan was circulated to the public, that the Ecological Reserve be opened up for commercially run nature education tours."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Gladys Lake ER</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "Airplane Valley should continue to be available to day hikers."</li> <li>▪ "It is important that numbers (visitors) remain small and visitors infrequent to ensure that the values of the eco-reserve are maintained over time."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Gladys Lake ER</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I do not support commercial use in the eco-reserve.</li> <li>▪ I believe that eco-reserves are not "intended for promotion of outdoor recreation use."</li> <li>▪ I do not support the development of guided educational hiking tours.</li> <li>▪ "Why can't these educational tours be conducted in the vast expanse (696,000ha) of the surrounding park?"</li> <li>▪ "Regularly scheduled 'educational tours' through the area will disturb the wildlife, which have become accustomed to minimal disturbance since the creation of the reserve and hence are not as easily spooked. [Perhaps] the reason someone is so keen to go into the reserve is because the animals are easier to view and the reason they are easier to view there is because they are not hunted, then perhaps we should ban hunting throughout Spatsizi Park."</li> <li>▪ It is virtually impossible to get through the reserve, or even into the heart of the reserve, in one day on foot."</li> <li>▪ "I expect [extensive site impacts] will occur in this area even if regular hiking tours, and not the horse tours, are conducted."</li> <li>▪ "[The terrain found while hiking] from Danihue Pass to Gladys Lake consists of seepage slopes on both sides. Even the most careful hiker would have difficulty in keeping their feet dry. Many hikers will turn it into a mud route."</li> <li>▪ The most offensive part of this proposal (educational tours) is the idea of letting a commercial organization run tours for profit within a eco-reserve."</li> <li>▪ "Waterfall Creek is on the opposite side of the reserve to the side where the boundary was extended (1981).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Gladys Lake ER</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Strongly oppose allowing commercial activities, including hunting through the guide outfitters in ecological reserves.</li> <li>▪ "To allow any commercial activity would destroy the reserves integrity and any future scientific use."</li> <li>▪ "The ecological reserves in our province must be maintained as the unique, pristine and untouched areas they were originally established for."</li> </ul>



TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Gladys Lake ER</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Gladys Lake should remain in the Ecological Reserve designation, because it is highly valued by researchers.</li> <li>▪ “Gladys Lake was crucial as it provided the natural, un-hunted population from which we were able to obtain information crucial to successful conservation.” The current reduction of research projects in the area is because of a downturn in funds available for wildlife research in general, not the diminishment of the quality of Gladys Lake as an outdoor laboratory.</li> <li>▪ “The request to abolish the Gladys Lake Ecological Reserve is in error. It must not be agreed to.”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Gladys Lake ER</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We do not support any commercialization within Gladys Lake or the Ecological Reserve.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Gladys Lake ER</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The author was opposed to “...a new proposal... that would permit ecological tours within the ER”, because it would set a precedent for commercial use, tours will create negative environmental impacts, and there are limited resources at BC Parks to monitor and/or enforce regulations.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Gladys Lake ER</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “I wish to congratulate you and your staff (BC Parks) for your strong position with regard to maintaining the integrity of the Gladys Lake ER.”</li> <li>▪ “I am... supportive of your statements that there will be no commercialized use and that recreation within the reserve will not be encouraged.”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Gladys Lake ER</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “The major concern is the reference to the restriction of commercial use within the ER.”</li> <li>▪ “feel that non-consumptive commercial guided hiking nature tours should be permitted with the Ecological Reserve under a permit basis.”</li> <li>▪ “Recognize historic use of trails (grandfather principle).”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Gladys Lake ER</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “I do not understand the apparent policy against guided non-consumptive activities in the Ecological Reserve... I do not agree with the general direction of ‘discouraging recreation use (8.2.2.2)’ of the ecological reserve.”</li> <li>▪ “Since being established more than 25 years ago, the ecological reserve has never been used for its intended purpose (large mammal research)... I believe that the reserve visitors [(commercial)] could be recruited to provide some reasonably consistent and useful data...”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Gladys Lake ER</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "I congratulate you... for you strong position with regard to maintaining the integrity of the [ER]. I... support the statements [stating]... no commercialized use and that recreation... will not be encouraged."</li> <li>▪ Regarding Danihue Pass, Eaglenest Trail, Waterfall Trail, Ice Box Trail, Cullivan Trails, and Paramount Trail: "...We believe that [WALP] has not recognized our grandfathered rights to passage of guided horseback and hiking tours."</li> <li>▪ Regarding Guided Educational Tours: "The 'open-bid' process does not address the grandfathered principle we argue."</li> <li>▪ "We propose the Gladys Lake ER to be amended to the height of land which will eliminate the horseback trails that weave in/out of the reserve."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Gladys Lake</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding p. 90 (MP 1.0): "Gladys Lake should be labelled as a corridor via the</li> </ul>

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
ER	<p>designated routs with a statement that this should not be a destination."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding p 119 (MP 1.0): "Work to remove Gladys lake cabin. It is not in keeping with an ER."</li> </ul>
▪ Gladys Lake ER	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "No commercial use of Gladys Lake ER (other than the limited travel along the trail that has been agreed upon)..."</li> <li>▪ "The federation of BC Naturalists is opposed to opening up Gladys Lake Reserve to commercial guided tours and we believe other areas of the park are equally attractive for guided nature tours."</li> </ul>
▪ Gladys Lake ER	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "Gladys Lake needs to remain an ecological reserve with no commercial activities."</li> </ul>
▪ Gladys Lake ER	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "Airplane Valley should continue to be available to day hikers."</li> </ul>
▪ Gladys Lake ER	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The author is against any commercial activities occurring within the Gladys Lake ER.</li> </ul>
▪ Gladys Lake ER	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The boundary of the GLER should be redefined so that established trails can be utilized by not only the established users, but by all users</li> </ul>
▪ Gladys Lake ER	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Human disturbance must be minimized</li> <li>▪ Human traffic must be limited to 'unorganized walkers' with no allowance for commercial / organized tours</li> </ul>
▪ Habitat	<p>Re: Sec. 7.4.4 – page 37</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Before parks managers undertake habitat alteration to attain the requested wildlife values, they should consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reduce hunting harvest (for non-FN) in the habitat in question;</li> <li>▪ Habitat alterations and hunting reductions in areas adjacent to the park; and</li> <li>▪ Further research on the effects of habitat alteration.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>7.5.2.8 – page 48</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objectives and actions → ambiguous language regarding the uses of habitat manipulation occurs, and should be eliminated.</li> </ul> <p>7.5.4.1 – page 61</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "...the information base that guides their management should include field research that considers meta-populations of species as a context for research."</li> <li>▪ Stikine Country Parks managers should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Quickly initiate discussions with wildlife and habitat managers, northern FN &amp; conservation orgs.....that will place proposed caribou research projects within a broader or continental context;</li> <li>○ Proceed with identifying further research needs, and planning for recovery as required by the Species at Risk Act.</li> <li>○ There appears to be little or no management direction of the red-listed Peregrine Falcon and would benefit from:</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identification of nesting habitat within Stikine country and a seasonal ban on helicopter or float plane flights within 1,000 metres of identified habitat; an</li> <li>○ Increased vigilance for the theft of Peregrine Falcons from nest.</li> </ul> <p>7.7.1 – page 72</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ As the LRMP concluded, much research needs to be done.</li> <li>▪ ...partnerships are the only possible means through which research projects in the Stikine could proceed.....Potential partners include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Tahltan &amp; Iskut FN;</li> <li>○ UNBC (&amp; other schools)</li> <li>○ Conservation groups working in the north</li> <li>○ Business &amp; trade associations</li> <li>○ Federal &amp; Provincial agencies</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ An entrepreneurial approach to field research projects.....would build the knowledge base and create business opportunities....</li> <li>▪ Establish a science and technical panel to manage process and make key decisions; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identifying and ranking of research needs;</li> <li>○ Locating funding &amp; technical resources; and</li> <li>○ Reviewing proposals and publishing of results.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
▪ <b>Happy Lake</b>	▪ (p. 65, MP 1.0): "Rainbows are found in Happy Lake."
▪ <b>Hunting</b>	▪ "I... have concerns about your lack of long-term commitment to phase out hunting in Spatsizi Park." (Opposed)
▪ <b>Hunting</b>	▪ "On page 55 (MP 1.0)... percentages for the annual allowable harvest of wildlife [are listed]. These numbers should not be in the Plan... [because populations change from year to year]."
▪ <b>Hunting</b>	▪ "Our biggest disappointment with the plan is that there is not long term commitment to phase out hunting in Spatsizi Park."
▪ <b>Hunting</b>	▪ Regarding Sustenance Hunting (p. 54, MP 1.0): "Hunting is important for sustenance for First Nations and referred only as a recreation activity for BC Resident, please note that BC residents hunt for sustenance as well."
▪ <b>Hunting</b>	▪ "Hunting must not negatively impact wildlife populations... [nor] detract or deteriorate other recreational uses."
▪ <b>Hunting</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding 'population management': The author is against any 'culling' of predators.</li> <li>▪ "...Do not diminish wildlife viewing opportunities sought by non-hunters."</li> <li>▪ "There needs to be a section on hunting in the context of a recreation activity under this heading, in order to ensure that it is balanced with other recreation activities deemed to be appropriate."</li> </ul>

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Hyland Post</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “Habitat Manipulation (p. 37, MP 1.0) should be used to maintain wildlife population regardless of the type of disturbance. The Hyland Post burn project should be completed and it is not mentioned in the document.”</li> <li>▪ (p. 83, MP 1.0): Regarding the river closure on the Spatsizi above Hyland Post: “would like to see an opportunity for appropriate trail maintenance and recreational activity...”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Kakidda Lakes</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ (p. 107, MP 1.0) An opportunity for an angling guide and some type of lodge structure should be considered for this area...”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Kakiddi Lakes Area</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “Floatplanes should not be used for day trips to any water bodies where the management emphasis is on providing a wilderness experience.”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Klastline Area</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “A high quality wilderness “A high quality wilderness experience may not be achievable on the [trail] with snowmobile use.”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Management Plan 1.0</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ P. 49 – Calls for expansion of information on which animals were radio-collared by the Spatsizi Ass. Bio. Res.</li> <li>▪ P. 78 (Cold Fish Lake) – regarding phrase: “maintain the deactivated status...”, says: “Is this the responsibility of BC Parks? If deactivated how is still used by private planes?”</li> <li>▪ P. 78 (Metsantan Village) – Define Manage: “Cutback? Eliminate? Monitor?”</li> <li>▪ “...The plan is so ambitious with so much to do that it would be good to have some idea of what will / could be done in the first 2 years, the next 5, the next 10 etc.”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Management Plan 1.0</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “I generally support the Draft 1.0 for Stikine Country Protected Area... especially the emphasis on ecological integrity...”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Management Plan 1.0</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “Your final draft plan is generally very constructive. It is not all I had hoped for but overall acceptable.”</li> <li>▪ “Statements like: ‘Any increase in commercial activities will occur incrementally so as not to exceed limits of acceptable change really worry me about future developments in Spatsizi.”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Management Plan 1.0</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ P. 125, Key Considerations and Actions, bullet 2 - Please do not remove this clause. “The reason that anyone would want this removed is to [reduce the governing authority’s] power to maintain the pristine wilderness [quality of the area]</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Management Plan 1.0</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “The conservation objectives of the Plan are commendable.”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Management Plan 1.0</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “It may not contain everything that we had hoped for, but I think we can live with it.”</li> <li>▪ Statements such as: ‘Any increase in commercial activities will occur incrementally so as not to exceed limits of acceptable change’, still troubles us.” We feel that you will act against public opinion bit by bit.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Management Plan 1.0</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “I am seriously distressed by the changes which have been published in the Draft (1.0).” - Regarding floatplane access.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Management Plan 1.0</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “Section 8 starts out with ‘ A Place For People To Enjoy’. I feel if this plan is accepted as is, that these Areas will be enjoyed by only ‘The Select Few’.”</li> </ul>

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Management Plan 1.0</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “The Iskut-Stikine LRMP suggests several working committees and monitoring committees. The Management Plan needs to reflect these recommendations and establish a stakeholder working committee.”</li> <li>▪ “...Reference was made to ‘inadequate fish harvest reports, lack of big game harvest reports, lack of research/inventory etc’... The public should know what inventory is available and submitted at present.”</li> <li>▪ The author indicated that ‘wilderness tourism values’ should be included in the vision statement and on page 91 under the heading Recreation Values.</li> <li>▪ Regarding p. 55, 2<sup>nd</sup> par. (starting line 3): “This entire paragraph is [has?] loose wording are [and?] makes the hunting [in the area?] look poorly managed.”</li> <li>▪ Regarding the Wilderness Recreation Zone (p.100, MP 1.0): “Is this [zone] contradictory to habitat manipulation and predator control?”</li> <li>▪ (p. 113, MP 1.0) “Frog Lake is out of the Kehlechoa area. This needs to be looked at further to determine the boundaries.”</li> <li>▪ (p. 119, MP 1.0) Chuckichida Lake “has two separate cabins on it, not one.”</li> <li>▪ “We believe that there is no other place in Northern BC that has as much inventory and research conducted. We believe that private/First Nations and gov’t partnerships should be allowed further continue research. This should be mentioned in the report.”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Management Plan 1.0</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding ‘Introduction’, 1<sup>st</sup> par.: “...Why is the Latin name provided for coyotes, but not for any other species?”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Management Plan 1.0</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “I approve of the plan’s emphasis on conservation and the decision, in general, to not expand recreation beyond current levels.” Including: floatplane and helicopter access, and all other forms of motorized access.</li> <li>▪ “I like the options presented for the continuing operation of Coldfish Camp...”</li> <li>▪ “Regarding motorboats, I am glad to see that maintaining a wilderness experience is a priority.”</li> <li>▪ “Regarding commercial recreation... I am glad to see that the list of potential activities are mostly low impact activities that do not require facilities...”</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Management Plan 1.0</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “Although the document under consideration is billed as a ‘plan’, many of the inventory monitoring, and research activities identified are implied as being ‘subject to funding’. In that sense, the entire plan could be headed with the phrase, ‘in a perfect world, this is what we would do’.”</li> <li>▪ I would think that the implications and applications of [the Recreation Stewardship Panel] recommendations and evolving government policy to management of the Stikine Country Protected Areas need to be addressed up front in this plan.”</li> </ul>

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Management Plan 1.0</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding the 'Background Summary' (1.2): "I am please to see the original Spatsizi Park management direction... up front in this manner."</li> <li>▪ Regarding the 'Management Issues' (1.4): "How will all of those listed be addressed? Who will do them, at what cost, and where will the funding come from?"</li> <li>▪ Regarding the 'Vision Statement' (3.2): "Although highly idealistic... this statement is generally supportable at the conceptual level."</li> <li>▪ Regarding 'Managing Ecosystems' (4.2): "I don't think you have... knowledge for the Ediziza population [(caribou)]... therefore your definition of the 'Mt Ediziza Greater Ecosystem' is likely a tenuous one."</li> <li>▪ Regarding 'Managing Ecosystems... Broader Landscape' (4.3): I do not think that BC Parks is well-positions to fully carry the ball...[they will] need strong, working partnerships [to succeed with it's mandate]."</li> <li>▪ Regarding 'Human Influences' (7.4.3): "I do not see the need for the distinction between 'recreational users' and 'commercial operators'."</li> <li>▪ Regarding 'Habitat Manipulation' (7.4.4., p. 37): "This item has considerable potential for confusion and misinterpretation."</li> <li>▪ Regarding 'Wildlife' (i7.5): "...A number of statements presented as 'fact' are actually either hypotheses or opinions."</li> <li>▪ Regarding "Habitat Delineation' (7.5.5.8, p. 49): "...Observations are contained in over 1500 pages of assorted field notes and progress reports, and would require a fir amount o time and effort to extract...but they are there."</li> <li>▪ Regarding 'Population Management' (7.5.3): "Until or unless a reliable source of funding to provide for regular, full-scale population surveys is identified... managers will need to show some resourcefulness in collecting and using others kinds of information."</li> <li>▪ Regarding 'Species at Risk' (7.5.4, 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence): "...extreme interpretations for [the used term] 'undisturbed', are often used by those with non-use agendas."</li> <li>▪ Regarding 'Scientific Research and Education' (7.7): "I am pleased to see that ([BC Parks is fostering and encouraging research]) stated here."</li> <li>▪ Regarding 'Managing Recreational Opportunities, Introduction' (8.1): The 'commercial' label is more political than descriptive..." (And in the 3<sup>d</sup> par.) "The matter of 'visitor impact on other visitors' is purely subjective."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Management Plan 1.0</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "I have read the sections relevant to Tatlatui Park and didn't note anything that caused me alarm."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Management Plan 1.0</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "Page 104... the 'drop off pick up' rule would not be workable...[because someone might fly in for a week trip, then leave."</li> <li>▪ Table 5: Stikine headwaters, Hotlesklwa, Ella, Klahowya, Happy Lakes, Chukachida, Chapea Lake, and Spatsizi River should include floatplanes as an existing motorized use.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Management Plan 1.0</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "In general I support the plan as laid out. This letter reinforces my support for the conservation aspect of the plan."</li> <li>▪ Regarding p. 95: "The phrase: 'opportunities to increase' should read: 'an increase may</li> </ul>

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
	<p>be allowed'."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding p. 121: "'The phrase: 'recreational opportunities may be developed' should read 'may be allowed'."</li> <li>▪ Regarding p 109 (MP 1.0): "Define 'small and rustic'... 10 beds is small relative to a lodge. To me 2 person is small. Rustic to me is three pieces of 1/4 inch plywood on a pole frame."</li> <li>▪ Regarding p 149 (MP 1.0): "The precautionary principle. The reference to Akcakaya et al. 1997 is not given in the reference section."</li> <li>▪ Regarding p. 149 (MP 1.0): "Appell, D. 2001. The new Uncertainty principle. Scientific American, January, pp. 18-19. provides a reference back to a current version of the principle."</li> <li>▪ "On the map which shows cabins. The colours for public and guide cabins is the same. It is not possible to tell if either dominates and where they are located."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Management Plan 1.0</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding section 11.1.1 and the statement: "Any increase in commercial recreation..." (MP 1.0): The author wants to know: How will this be monitored? and feels that carrying capacities should be defined.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Management Plan 1.0</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "The draft plan generally meets our ideas of 'wilderness' for this day and area."</li> <li>▪ Regarding p 91: "Skiing... would be better qualified as 'ski-touring' so as not to imply that downhill ski facilities are appropriate."</li> <li>▪ Regarding p. 140: "The statement: 'any increase... will occur incrementally...' suggests an assumption that gradual increase will change perceptions of what acceptable change looks like, so that the bar is bet by but pushed up to allow for more commercial recreation."</li> <li>▪ Regarding p. 140: "The notion of 'balance' between commercial and public recreation... raises some alarm. If it means that the goal is to create equal numbers of [tourists]... then this reduces considerably the park's carrying capacity for public users."</li> <li>▪ Regarding p. 143: Is there anyone in WALP to monitor commercial grazing?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Metsantan</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "Regarding [this zone], this addition... should be removed in its entirety except for the old town/campsite themselves..."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Monitoring</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "Is there going to be anyone to the MOF to [monitor the grazing leases in the park areas]." (p. 143 Management Plan)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Overall</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "...this is, for the most part, an excellent draft management plan."</li> <li>▪ "...we conservationists will work [even] more closely with parks planners to secure a future for intact wilderness ecosystems."</li> <li>▪ Boundary issues are multiple and expanding.....</li> <li>▪ The notion of "balance" between commercial and public recreation raises some alarm.</li> <li>▪ An ecosystem-based approach to parks management will help us find true balance.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Overall</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "...[your Ministry] has conducted an excellent planning process for the Management Plan for Stikine Country Protected Areas,..."</li> </ul>

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
▪ <b>Planning Process</b>	▪ This process was not transparent, nor were participants given equal weight in the deliberations.
▪ <b>Planning Process</b>	▪ Felt there was lack of proper consultation regarding plane access.
▪ <b>Planning Process</b>	▪ "I was not informed of this expansion (Mess Creek addition) of the park."
▪ <b>Planning Process</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The author of letter 0021 expressed deep disapproval with the entire planning process. The author believes that BC Parks has presented a one-sided argument favouring arguments from: "...save The World Organization[s]. [BC Park's] presentation, like so many others in the past, outlines one side of the issue and is corrupt and tainted."</li> <li>▪ The author accused BC Parks of using false information as propaganda to sway a naive audience toward their political agendas. "A good example of the Parks Branch's scare tactics is your references to the Bull Trout and Dolly Varden (refer to 7.6.2 p. 67). There have been no studies on these species in northern BC."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Planning Process</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "Concern[ed] that BC Parks Management has arbitrarily overruled the consultation process and accords reached in the preparation of the Draft management Plan for the Stikine Parks and Protected Areas."</li> <li>▪ "...To delete the May 28/02 agreement in principle, form Parks considered proposal, raises serious doubts about the consultation process and about the good faith of BC Parks in that process."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Planning Process</b>	▪ "I have serious concerns about unilateral reversal at this late date, of the accords reached with eh BC Floatplane association representatives during meetings with you over the last 18 months."
▪ <b>Planning Process</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "The Protocol Agreements reached... over a period of one and a half years have been summarily ignored by BC Parks in the new Draft, and replaced with proposals containing impractical, totally inequitable and discriminatory regulations."</li> <li>▪ "We urge BC Parks to reconsider their actions and to rebuild the heretofore cooperative relationship between us."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Planning process</b>	▪ The author was concerned that BC Parks has met with opposing opinion groups and have already made management decisions regarding the Stikine without proper consultation and determination of what the "public really care[s] about."
▪ <b>Planning Process</b>	▪ "I urge you to reconsider, as a the draft plan appears to ignore most of the agreements that were developed with the BCFA. It also calls into question the consultation process, is impractical and unsafe."
▪ <b>Planning Process</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "I feel this process was not well publicized to those who really utilize these areas."</li> <li>▪ "Is there any chance of an extension for further comments..?"</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Planning Process</b>	▪ "The six week review period circumscribing the Christmas season is not must time."
▪ <b>Planning Process</b>	▪ The author feels that BC Parks has not been consulting in good faith.
▪ <b>Planning</b>	▪ The author expressed displeasure with the negotiation process between the flying



TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
<b>Process</b>	public and BC Parks.
▪ <b>Planning Process</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The author is disappointed with the negotiating process between BC Parks and the BCFA.</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Planning Process</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding Gladys Lake ER: "We are troubled that [WLAP]... consulted... [with] NGOs [such as] Friends of Ecological Reserves, BC Naturalists, and Sierra Club, regarding our proposal."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Planning Process</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding floatplanes: "I would appreciate being put on a mailing list and given the opportunity to provide input on this subject in advance of any finalization of ratification."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Planning Process</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "The Federation of BC Naturalists would like to suggest that you consider establishing an Advisory Committee, so that proposals could be vetted in a... public manner."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Recreation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "There needs to be a section on hunting in the context of a recreational activity..."</li> <li>▪ "The management plan considers hunting only in the context of 'population management', where it escapes any consideration of capability with other park use activities, such as hiking and recreation travel by watercraft. " Since hunting is not in the 'Recreation' section, will 'recreation objectives' apply to it?</li> <li>▪ "It is very important that [hunting] be managed in such a way that it does not conflict with the interests of the 'non-consumptive' backcountry park users..."</li> <li>▪ "No mountain biking ever!" Not in favour of motorized and/or mechanized travel.</li> <li>▪ P. 91 (Management Plan 1.0) - 'Skiing' needs to be called 'Ski touring' "so as not to imply that downhill ski facilities are appropriate."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Recreation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "There needs to be a section on hunting in the context of a recreational activity..."</li> <li>▪ P. 91 (Management Plan 1.0) - 'Skiing' needs to be called 'Ski touring' "so as not to imply that downhill ski facilities are appropriate."</li> <li>▪ "Mountain biking is not appropriate for these parks."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Recreation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ (p. 92, MP 1.0) The group sizes stated in the plan are too low (4-6) "...a family of 10 or 12 may want to partake in a group hike."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Recreation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "Any increased use must be for non-motorized and non-mechanized activities..."</li> <li>▪ "Mountain biking is not appropriate for these parks."</li> <li>▪ "A high quality wilderness experience may not be achievable on the Klastline Trail with snowmobile use."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Recreation</b>	<p>8.2.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There needs to be a section on hunting by non-first nation hunters, or recreational hunting – as a recreational activity</li> </ul> <p>Winter recreation – page 95</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The ban on heli-skiing is appropriate</li> </ul> <p>8.2.3.5 – other recreational uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Mountain biking is not appropriate for these parks. There are numerous non-sensitive</li> </ul>

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
	front-country sites for mountain bikers.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recreation: Angling</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding Benchmarks (p. 69, MP 1.0): "Is the intention to make several waters non-angling?"</li> <li>▪ (p. 70, 4<sup>th</sup> bullet, MP 1.0): "Why would you consider new angling guides when you have determined that our carrying capacity has reached its limit?"</li> <li>▪ Regarding the Tatlatui Area (p. 125-126, MP 1.0): "Further clarification needs to be addressed about angling zones, water bodies..."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recreation: Camping</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Disagree with following statement from Draft Plan (1.0): "Allow camping within the ecological reserve only within 100m of the Danihue pass and Eaglenest Creek Trail."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recreation: Camping</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ P. 92 (Management Plan 1.0) – "[Please] keep campsites to a minimum."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recreation: Camping</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "Keep [campsites] to a minimum."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recreation: Carrying Capacity</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "...our main concern is... the seemingling open ended invitation to increase use, without first establishing carrying capacity."</li> <li>▪ Regarding p 94 (MP 1.0): "What is carrying capacity for this wilderness paddling experience (Commercial recreation)?"</li> <li>▪ Regarding p. 142 (MP 1.0): "Disagree with proposed increased use on Stikine River system without carrying capacity being agreed on."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recreation: Carrying Capacity</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding p 94 (MP 1.0): "What is carrying capacity for this wilderness paddling experience (Commercial recreation)?"</li> <li>▪ Regarding p. 142 (MP 1.0): "Disagree with proposed increased use on Stikine River system without carrying capacity being agreed on."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recreation: Carrying Capacity</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding Air Access: "...there needs to be a carrying capacity determined for each water body or other landing area."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recreation: Commercial</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ If the guide-outfitter is still ferrying fishing clients back and forth from Laslui to Tuaton and other neighbouring lakes several times a day as was once the case, this is incompatible with a 'wilderness experience' sought by others and should be discontinued."</li> <li>▪ "It is noted (1<sup>st</sup> par., p. 139, MP 1.0) , that commercial permits have been issued for jet boating. This activity should not be encouraged."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recreation: Commercial</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "Commercial uses which claim to be 'minimum impact' should be re-evaluated, year after year, to determine whether the impacts actually occurring are acceptable."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recreation: Commercial</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding p 140, bottom of page, 1st bullet (MP 1.0): "The primary objective of this park is protection not commercialization... I suggest the follow alternative: 'Contribute to the sound and sustainable economic growth of the region through the management of the direct contribution to the economy from appropriate (approved?) commercial recreational services and indirectly through the attraction of residents and non-commercial tourists to this area in particular and BC in general'."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recreation: Commercial</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding p. 139, section 11.1 (MP 1.0): "Disagree with issuing commercial permits for</li> </ul>

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
	jet boating."
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recreation: Commercial</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "In is noted... that commercial permits have been issued for jet boating. This activity should not be encouraged."</li> <li>▪ "Before there is any increase in tenures, BC Parks must have a determination of carrying capacity."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recreation: commercial</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regarding the river corridor from the Upper Stikine to highway 37: "I have... major concerns for... [the] expansion of commercial outfits, motorized or not." - the author is worried about crowding for public versus commercial users.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recreation: Commercial</b></li> </ul>	<p>Section 11.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ It is appropriate that the draft management plan support the LRMP in setting the highest priority on finding economic opportunities for regionally-based entrepreneurs.</li> </ul> <p>11.1.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The GMD here makes an assumption that "incremental increase" is acceptable. Perhaps re-word the GMD to read:</li> </ul> <p>"Any increase in commercial recreation activities will occur incrementally, to enable adaptive management strategies such as studies and moratoria, and thus, not allow commercial recreation activities to exceed limits of acceptable change".</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recreation: Horse</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "[Please] maintain the ban on non-equine pack animals."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recreation: Horse</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "Horses should continue to be regulated by the regional range offices on the amount of forage available... using a [reliable] source"</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recreation: Horse</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "It is important to maintain the ban on non-equine pack animals, i.e. llamas."</li> <li>▪ "Horse riding through the reserve must not be allowed, with the exception of the trails already sanctioned for transit with horses."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recreation: Horse</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ On page 96 (MP 1.0), "please mention, 'provide high quality guided horse trips'".</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recreation: Horse Use</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "It is important to maintain the ban on non-equine pack animals - i.e. llamas..."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recreation: Winter</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "There is no reason why dog-sledding should be considered incompatible. It is non-mechanized and low impact."</li> <li>▪ The special situations where winter recreation may be motorized (like the Klastline Trail) should be specified."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recreation: Winter</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "A high quality wilderness experience may not be achievable on the Klastline Trail, with snowmobile use."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recreation: Winter</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "Dogsledding was a historic means of travel for First Nation People. An opportunity for front and backcountry dog sledding tours should be considered subject to an impact assessment study and further research."</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recreation: Winter</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "I see no reason that certain areas of the Stikine Country could not be set aside for snowmobiling. Of course this would have to be areas where there is no impact on wildlife."</li> </ul>

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
▪ <b>Recreation: Winter</b>	▪ Regarding p. 84 (MP 1.0): "No increase in snowmobile access at all."
▪ <b>Recreation: Winter</b>	▪ "There is no reason why dog-sledding should be considered incompatible."
▪ <b>Spiritual Values</b>	▪ "These values include the rights of an animals, trees, ecosystems, etcetera to exist in and for themselves."
▪ <b>Spiritual Values</b>	▪ It is appropriate to recognise that spiritual values are important to many people, and to respect them. However, spiritual values are very personal, and I doubt that BC Parks should try and list spiritual values (bullet #1, p. 99) as this might have the result of trivialising something that is intangible and immeasurable."
▪ <b>Spiritual Values</b>	▪ "This is a potentially thorny issue because it relates to very individual and personal feelings about things."
▪ <b>Spiritual Values</b>	▪ "These values include the rights of an animals, trees, ecosystems, etcetera to exist in and for themselves."
▪ <b>Stikine Grand Canyon</b>	▪ Will it be necessary to build trails through the special management zone to access viewing opportunities?
▪ <b>Stikine Grand Canyon</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A requirement for an [access] permit would allow BC Parks to assess the competence and experience for the applicant."</li> <li>▪ Will it be necessary to build trails through the Special Feature zone to access viewing opportunities?</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Stikine Grand Canyon</b>	▪ "...will it... be necessary to construct trails through the Special Feature Zone?"
▪ <b>Tatlatui Park</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "I strongly support the present position taken in the Draft which does not allow for new Structures if this is taken to mean camps or substantive increase in bed capacity."</li> <li>▪ "To remain competitive in a world market we must have the opportunity to, from time to time, upgrade facilities at sites which are already alienated."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Trails</b>	▪ "[The] impacts of the horse trails between Bug Lake and Cold Fish Lake and along the shore of Cold Fish Lake [are] unacceptable."
▪ <b>Trails</b>	▪ "[The] impacts of the horse trails between Bug Lake and Cold Fish Lake and along the shore of Cold Fish Lake [are] unacceptable."
▪ <b>Trails</b>	▪ "The trails in the PA are considered Class IV & V... Are they not intended for horse use as well?"
▪ <b>Trails</b>	▪ Regarding (8.2.2.3, MP 1.0): What about the Kluachon-McEwen Creek Trail accessing Spatsizi from Iskut?
▪ <b>Trails, routes &amp; campsites</b>	<p>8.2.2.3 – page 90</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Airplane Valley should continue to be available to day hikers</li> <li>▪ There should be no commercial use of the ecological reserve, other than the limited travel specified here</li> </ul>

TOPIC / ISSUE	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
▪ <b>Wildlife</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "... have deep concerns of the overall direction of this plan regarding wildlife harvest and management."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Wildlife</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I advocate predator control and feel that it is a recognized way of maintaining game herds for the purpose of hunting.</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Wildlife</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "Don't try to disguise predator control as "wildlife enhancement"! Predators are wildlife too, and are not enhanced by having their numbers reduced!"</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Wildlife</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "We believe the estimated caribou population of 2500 does not reflect the [actual] number... it should be at least 3000... on the research and... counts."</li> <li>▪ Regarding Stone's Sheep (p. 45, MP 1.0): "Some small bands of Sheep are found south of the Spatsizi Rivers west of the Dawson Range and another small herd is located east of the Ross River."</li> <li>▪ Regarding Medium to Large Predators (p. 47, MP 1.0): "Please refer to trapper records and First Nations people to clarify the statement that these mammals are found and yes, they have been recorded."</li> <li>▪ (p. 52, MP 1.0) "Please note that the Marion Creek/Hyland Post sheep herd decreased from 125 to 63 sheep due to heavy wolf predation."</li> <li>▪ Regarding Predator Management (p. 56 MP 1.0): "What is the term 'artificial enhancement' mean?"</li> <li>▪ (p. 59, MP 1.0): "Please note that northern caribou herds are not considered a blue-listed species."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Wildlife</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "...In Section 7.5.2.6 (MP 1.0), the Latin names for otter, marten and muskrat are incorrect (should be <i>Lontra Canadensis</i>, <i>Martes Americana</i>, and <i>Ondatra zibethicus</i>, respectively. Also, the pika should be identified as <i>Ochotona sp.</i>, [not <i>princeps</i>, rather] <i>collaris</i> or an as yet unidentified species."</li> <li>▪ "I was not aware that northern caribou were blue-listed, but have not seen any recent lists."</li> <li>▪ Regarding 'Wildlife/Human Interactions' (7.5.6, MP 1.0): "It is desirable to avoid certain kinds of encounters in certain seasons, and that is best managed by education and perhaps in some cases by local zoning. Note that the situation is more controllable in the case of guided recreational users than among those that are not."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Wildlife</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "I am... concerned about impacts on wildlife... [I feel that there should be policy] limiting the number of large commercial groups..."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Wildlife:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "We have the only intact large mammal predator-prey system in BC. We would like to keep that for posterity, by not allowing the "culling" of predators [which] is about to happen in other areas of the province."</li> </ul>
▪ <b>Zoning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 'The Bulkley Valley Rod &amp; Gun Club would like to see the Stikine river and tributaries zoned 'Natural Environment' to protect motorized access."</li> </ul>