

From: Hanchard, Jevan FLNR:EX
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2013 4:25 PM
Subject: PIR FSP Amendment #5

I would firstly like to thank you for your interest and comment on this amendment. I have now been presented with the final submission of the amendment along with your comments and the PIR responses to them and will be making a decision shortly.

Through my review of the various comments I am aware that there is still some confusion about the amendment and how it relates to the specific harvest proposal in the Quick Core Ecosystem (along with any future such considerations) and this is something I'd like to try to clear up.

There has been lengthy and on-going discussion on the status of Mountain Pine Beetle attack in the Bulkley. Some of this has been focused around the implications to our land use plan objectives. Specific conversations involving FLNRO, the Community Resources Board, and PIR have occurred over the past couple of years and have included an examination of the beetle infestation within the Quick Core Ecosystem. Our LRMP speaks specifically to the principle of flexibility, and part of the discussion has been to explore ideas and opinions of how that should be considered.

The PIR FSP amendment #5 and the CP 335 harvest proposal for MPB killed Pine within the Quick Core ecosystem presents a trial for how such considerations could be made. This proposal has been extensively reviewed by provincial staff and presented to the CRB for input and support. In addition, your comment has been carefully considered and many of the issues you have raised have been discussed in detail prior to PIRs request for the FSP amendment. Part of this process involved some guidance to PIR with respect to a potential harvest proposal in the Quick core ecosystem (CP 335) that I had provided prior to their submission of FSP amendment #5. I've attached this background for your interest as I believe it captures many of the issues raised through your comments and provides some better context to their FSP submission. In this guidance I identify to PIR that I would find a decision to support the CP 335 harvest provided that an FSP amendment is prepared and ultimately approved. Part of that FSP approval process is the public notice period you have been involved in and the consideration of the comments raised along with PIRs responses to them. I am currently reviewing that information in preparation for a decision.

I have also taken note of other non technical comments about improvements to the public process, notice and review, and the precedent setting nature of the amendment. Some of this comment has been specifically directed at the adequacy of the 10 day review and comment period. While I am provided the discretion through FRPA to consider an abbreviated (10-day) review and comment period it is not something I wish to see in the future unless exceptional circumstances exist. I will be following up with PIR on this topic and recognize that conveyance of this expectation is one of the process improvements that can be made.

To identify additional process improvements it is also my intention to have a broader discussion with the CRB prior to consideration of any further similar amendments or proposals.

As mentioned, I will be making a decision on the FSP amendment shortly and will be preparing a decision rationale upon doing so. If after reviewing this note and the attached information you have any additional questions or comments that you wish to discuss, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank-you again for your comment.

Jevan Hanchard, RPF
District Manager
Skeena-Stikine District
Ministry of Forests, Lands, and Natural Resource Operations