

**From:** J. Gilden  
**Subject: Re: PIR FSP Amendment #5**  
**Date:** 5 February, 2013 11:28:46 AM PST  
**To:** "Hanchard, Jevan FLNR:EX

Jevan:

I have read your comments appearing below and the attached December 19, 2012 letter to Gord Gunson with interest. I note, that although the December 19, 2012 letter contains conclusions indicating that you had reached a decision about the amendment proposed by PIR, that correspondence pre-dates the public comment period which started on January 2, 2013. I also understand that the logging in the Quick Core has now started. I assume, therefore that your Decision approving the proposed amendment has been issued. Therefore, any additional comments about the proposal as it affects the current round of Quick Core logging are probably now over taken by events.

Notwithstanding this , I would like to obtain some additional information:

1. On page 2 of your December 19, 2013 letter you refer to a second letter concerning the local process for future amendments. Would you please provide that second letter?
2. On page 3 of your December 19, 2013 letter you refer to HLPO Objective 1.2. Would you please provide this document?
3. Would you also please provide a copy of your Decision on the CP 335 amendment and the Decision rationale.

Without regards to the merits of the current Quick Core logging, I have spoken with a number of members of the public who would like to work with you and the CRB on improving the public notice and comment process so that future proposals to log in the Cores will not be considered until there is time for ample public review and response. When meeting with Dave Ripmeester and Alan Baxter at PIR, they indicated that they believed that you would establish a public notice period of 60 days. In addition, the CRB could act as the source for distributing the public notice to interested members of the community. It could also act as the organizing body for establishing a forum for public discussion of such proposals. I believe this is certainly consistent with the comments you have made on page 8 of your December 19, 2013 letter about the CRB's role in such public discussions about proposals affecting the the LRMP and the values it represents.

To further this discussion, we would like to arrange a meeting with you and representatives from the CRB to offer our ideas about how such a public review process can be established and how it would operate. I look forward to your response and to working with you on improving the process for public discussion of these important issues.

Jay Gilden