

From: J. Gilden
Date: 12 January, 2013 11:27:22 AM PST
To: Alan Baxter, Dave Ripmeester
Subject: Re: Logging in the Quick Core Ecosystem

Allan and Dave:

I concur with Bob Mitchell's comments appearing below. I also want to express some additional comments about the process that has been followed.

The LRMP and SRMP for the Bulkley Valley are highly valuable documents that represent a consensus derived through the work of many Valley residents occurring over a period of more than a decade. They should not be lightly disregarded. In fact, the SRMP, approved in 2006, contains a detailed protocol covering logging in Core Ecosystems in the event of beetle infestation. Thus, it can hardly be said that the SRMP did not foresee the very situation that is now the supposed rationale for the proposed amendment. So, why the need for an amendment? And, why submit an application for such an amendment with only the most minimal of public notice providing 10 days for response? We all know that there is pressure to log in protected areas due to commercial objectives. The process followed here has the appearance of trying to circumvent public scrutiny so as to to undermine the LRMP/SRMP in order to achieve such objectives.

If this amendment were to be approved, then logging could be initiated in any or all of the Core areas based on a request by PIR without any significant public input. The exception would soon swallow the rule and LRMP/SRMP protections would inevitably become meaningless. The proposed amendment disrespects the community effort and consensus represented by the LRMP/SRMP regime. It should not be approved.

In any event, the comment period must be extended and some form of public forum should be held. If there is in fact a need to reassess the Core boundaries or other applicable regulations, this matter should be subject to rigorous analysis with full public awareness. We are fortunate to have in this Valley a great depth of expertise that is available to the public to help with such a conversation. We also have several institutions that are quite appropriate for convening such a forum such as the Community Resources Board and the Bulkley Valley Research Centre. Any public conversation over these important matters should be initiated by credible independent bodies and not by those with a commercial interest in the outcome.

Those leading the discussion would have the responsibility to fully inform the public about any proposals that will affect the LRMP/SRMP and for providing a meaningful opportunity for public input.

Jay Gilden
7072 Jollymore Rd.
Smithers