

Summary of Public Input to Lillooet Area Draft Park Management Plans

BC Parks began a park planning process in May 2011 for nine parks in the Lillooet area. These included:

- South Chilcotin Mountains Park (previously named Spruce Lake Protected Area).
- Big Creek Park
- Bridge River Delta Park.
- Yalakom Park.
- Fred Antoine Park.
- French Bar Creek Park.
- Marble Canyon Park.
- Skihist Park.
- Gwyneth Lake Park.

Due to low interest in French Bar Creek Park, Marble Canyon Park and Skihist Park, development of the management plans for those parks is delayed and will not proceed until completion of the remaining management plans. Draft management plans were produced for the remaining parks based upon existing knowledge and the initial input from the public. These drafts were released for public review in February 2014 on the BC Parks website. This report is a summary of the online response and from meetings requested by various individuals and organizations.

Almost all comments received were on the draft management plan for South Chilcotin Mountains and Big Creek parks, accounting for 97.9% of all comments. Yalakom Park accounted for 1.3% of all comments. The remaining three parks were less than 1% each. A total of 394 individuals and organizations provided 2,413 comments on the draft management plans.

The following summary applies only to South Chilcotin Mountains and Big Creek parks. Comments on the other parks will be summarized at the end of this report. Similar comments were amalgamated as “Items” that were then further placed into more general “Categories.” These were further arranged into broad “Themes” as shown in the Appendix table. The number of comments were tallied into common items, and then summed for each category and theme. Throughout the remainder of this report, numbers in parentheses indicate the number of comments that apply to each theme, category or item. The weakness in this approach is that comments from organizations that responded on behalf of their members, which may number in the hundreds or thousands, would increment a category by only one, while a number of

individuals from one user group would each provide an increment. This dramatically increases the contribution of individual responses over group responses in this summary. The various themes and categories are discussed below. Themes are the major headings, with categories identified in **“Bold”** within the text; items are in normal text followed by the number of comments in parentheses. The most common comments are discussed; those items only mentioned by one or a few are not discussed – a summary table of all comments is provided as an appendix for those interested in these less frequent comments.

Mountain Biking (973)

Mountain bikers provided, by far, the overwhelming number of comments since they largely responded as individuals to the request for comments. This should be kept in mind while reviewing the results. The actual number of each user type was not tracked during this review of public input, but the non-mountain biking community likely accounted for less than 20 out of the 394 responses.

And this brings us to the first sub-category that can be characterized as **“Fairness”** (411) and the large number of respondents who felt that even mentioning that the results of the previous input of initial consultation were skewed toward mountain bikers indicated a bias against mountain biking (115) when writing the draft management plan. It didn’t!

Any report or survey summary should attempt to show any known bias or over- or under-representation in the results. The only reason that mountain bikers were mentioned as the most numerous responders was to indicate to anyone reading the report that the results largely represented the views of mountain bikers and not those of the general public. This notification was for the benefit of external readers, not the staff preparing the draft management plan. As far as influencing the content of the draft management plan the overrepresentation of mountain bikers in the public input had little impact other than being considered fantastic input from the mountain biking community.

The above goes for this report on the public input of the draft management plans as well, where responses were almost exclusively from mountain bikers, at least partially driven by an effort by the mountain biking community through various web sites to encourage input. Again, this input is valued, although the large number of comments inferring a bias against mountain bikers was somewhat of a distraction. Input from other groups was obtained elsewhere.

The other most common input assigned to the fairness heading was not to single out mountain bikers over others if any restrictions are needed (60), that bikes do no more environmental damage than others (62), that special restrictions should not be placed on mountain bikers and not other users in relation to Grizzly Bear management unless there is scientific research to

back such decisions (105), and those who pointed out that more restrictions and management attention should be aimed at horses because they cause more damage than bikes or hikers (58).

These are all valid comments and the rewrite will take this into consideration. The first draft of the management plan was not meant to single out mountain bikers in an attempt to impose undue restrictions. It was, however, recognition of mountain biking as the up and coming activity in the parks. Many commenters referred to the relative long term use of the parks by mountain bikers without any recognizable environmental affects or significant conflicts with other users as a rationale for continuing to allow this activity relatively unfettered. At the same time they stated that BC Parks “should get with it,” that mountain biking is just another way of getting around, and mountain biking should be accepted because:

- " [Mountain biking is] one of the fastest growing sports"
- "Chilcotins are perfect for this [mtn biking] and that is why you are seeing the numbers explode."
- "Demand for mountain biking is on a steep growth curve"
- "For the past fifteen years, the growth of mountain biking, both in this park, and throughout North America, has grown exponentially."
- "Massive groups each year come to visit"
- "Mountain biking is growing fast"
- "Mountain biking is rapidly growing pastime"

The above statements gave pause for thought, not because they relate to mountain biking, but because the words “fastest growing, steep growth curve, numbers explode, grown exponentially, massive groups, and rapidly growing” set off alarms regardless of the activity. Any quickly growing activity is looked at for its specific characteristics and potential impacts. Mountain biking is no exception. It was recognized that hiking and horseback riding were steady or declining, so not as much focus was placed on those activities. Knowing that mountain biking had been growing in popularity very quickly, focussed attention on mountain biking resulted in the specific management strategies in the draft management plan. This was not to intentionally single out or implement a bias against bikers. The draft management plan may have come across in this manner to some extent; the next draft will be written while considering this bias perspective and fairness to all users.

There were other mountain bikers who preferred the “**Status Quo**” (198) with the most common comments saying that mountain biking should not be restricted (70) or to continue to allow mountain biking (41). Most of these commenters were somehow under the impression that mountain biking was being severely restricted or banned from the parks. As this was not part of any proposed direction in the draft management plan, it is a question of where this

belief originated. It was an initial option (because all planning processes consider a nil option for every activity) but it was never really seriously considered and was dismissed early in the preparation of the draft plan.

Other comments objected to strategies that were suggested as examples that could be considered during future discussions with stakeholders, such as limiting riding times (49) or eliminating day-trips in favour of multi-day trips (8). This last one was really a strategy of encouraging multi-day trips over day-trips, not eliminating them altogether. Some stated that BC Parks should be encouraging the growing mountain biking industry (24) instead of considering restrictions, again associated with the belief that mountain biking was an unwelcome activity.

There were comments related to implementing some **Management** (170) requirements for mountain biking. Some comments were in favour of encouraging a shift to cross country biking and decreasing the prevalence of day-tripping (50). There was also some agreement on staying to existing trails to limit environmental damage (35) and support for not allowing technical features for bikes (32).

Some comments related to **Information** (194) and corrections to some statements in the draft management plan. The most common was that the proportion of bikes to hikers and horseback riders was way too low (87). Most of these comments referred to the public input during the initial consultation at the beginning of the planning process, where it stated that 55% of the respondents said they mountain biked, so it was questioned as to how the draft management plan can now say that mountain biking was an activity of one third of visitors. This fact was used as an indication of bias against mountain biking. It must be pointed out that the summary of public input in 2012 was not a survey of visitors, only a summary of people who responded to the request for input. In no way was it a statistical survey to derive numbers. It just so happened that most of the respondents were mountain bike enthusiasts. The only information available was the 2004 background information report where, although it too was not a statistically valid survey of users, there was at least some attempt to derive numbers for each activity. The shortcomings are recognized, as well as the dated information (it is recognized that mountain biking has become more popular over the last 10 years). In the absence of better numbers, the 2004 data was included in the draft plan. We'll try and explain that a little better in the next draft.

Other comments reminded us of the importance of biking to tourism (84), especially economic spin-offs to local communities (11). Some pointed out the fact that most bikers pedal into the parks through various access points (12) and not flying in by floatplane.

Community Engagement (101)

There were comments to **Engage Users** (49), with specific agreement on the suggestion in the draft management plan to establish a multi-stakeholder advisory group (18) to implement any management strategies, and develop the plan with the mountain biking community (12) or engage the biking community to get compliance (10).

Many comments were received that there was too much engagement and **Influence** (52) from the horse lobby (4) or from one tourism operator (48). This last point alluded to the Wilderness Stewardship Foundation (WSF) having had too much influence on the draft management plan or the belief that they were part of a board charged with developing the draft plan. This needs to be clarified. While the WSF did provide input to the planning process, and even went to the effort of preparing and submitting their own version of a proposed management plan for the parks, the WSF was not part of any board in developing the draft plan. Their input was considered equally with all other input, having no more influence than other groups or individuals. The continuing interests of all tourism operators were also considered in the draft plan.

Access (216)

Many of the comments on access related to **Floatplane support** (96) to continue providing access to the lakes within the park. Many of these comments were a result of the belief that floatplanes were to be banned from the park. The need for viability of the floatplane business (55) was cited, with reasons given split between the need to access the interior for visitors and the landowners on Spruce Lake, and recognition that the operator was responsible for maintaining many trails, so who would take over this function if they were put out of business. There were comments to not limit float plane drops for biking (15) and to reconsider the suggestion of limiting flights until after 9:00 am (10).

Aircraft limitations (63) were encouraged by a number of comments. While the value of having traditional float plane access was recognized, there were requests to limit flights in order to preserve the wilderness character of the parks. Placing a limit on float plane flights (26) was the most common, although that limit was largely left undefined. There were suggestions to restricting sight-seeing flights over the park (6), keeping the flights the same with no increase (4), and various ways of limiting flights such as days of the week (2), a flexible flight/flight-free schedule (2), agreement with a 9:00 am flight restriction (2), or control on busy weekends only (1). A few wanted no flights to Warner Lake (5) or to allow flights only to Spruce Lake (2).

Mountain bike access (19) to specific trails was mentioned, with Lick and B&F trails noted as being the most used by mountain bikers and to not close these trails to biking (15). To clarify,

closing short sections of trails was mentioned in the draft plan only as an example that could be brought forward during future consultation with users; neither of these trails would be closed to specific users unless that consultation took place and such a closure is needed.

Access for **snowmobiles** (10) included support for snowmobile usage in traditionally used areas (2), a request to clarify snowmobile area boundaries (2), or that snowmobiling should be banned (2).

Motorized vehicles (23) other than snowmobiles were not to be allowed (12), with specific mention of not allowing ATVs on High Trail (4). A few agreed with the proposed limitations on motorized access (3), while a few mentioned that motorized access was the only realistic access to remote areas (3).

Facilities (57)

The most common comment on **campgrounds** (24) was to keep the north campground on Spruce Lake in its present location (10), while a couple considered it congested and wanted it moved (2). It was suggested that camping only be allowed at designated sites (2) to stop random camping. The need for food lockers (5) was noted.

There were random comments on **commercial facilities** (25) in the parks, with none having any frequency. These included removing the outfitter cabin on Spruce Lake (4), support for keeping tourism facilities out of sight (3), banning any new commercial activities (4), and a need to improve camp appearances and cleanup of materials within the park (5).

Communications equipment (8) was not favoured within the parks (7).

Ecosystems and Wildlife (297)

Ecosystems (155) were important considerations, with 137 comments having concern for maintaining conservation values. These were expressed as support for the preservation principles (61) in the draft plan, the emphasis on ecological integrity (29) and having wildlife preservation as a key goal (47). Specific comments related to restricting access to the highest value wildlife areas (5) and having an ecosystem approach to fire (4).

Invasive species (12) comments referred to the need for management of invasive species (7), the need to link invasive species with activities (3) and to provide education (2).

Grizzly Bear (93) comments ranged from support for the emphasis on Grizzly Bear populations (44) and limiting access to their core habitat (7), that consideration needs to be given on the indirect impact of hunting (13), to the need for more research on Grizzly Bear

behaviour and habitat use before imposing restrictions on activities (16). Some expressed their concern that there was too much emphasis on Grizzly Bear over recreation (7).

Hunting (27) comments largely expressed a desire to ban hunting from the parks (24).

A few comments on the presence of **grazing in parks** (9) wanted to either phase this activity out due to damage to meadows and fish habitat (5) or to ensure there were environmental efforts to mitigate any impacts of grazing (4).

Recreation (87)

The **experience** (45) expected by park visitors was to maintain the wilderness character of the parks (30), keep the park undeveloped (7) and management that supports a remote visitor experience (5).

There were a range of comments on the **capacity** (32) of the parks, that they are now at capacity (4) and a limitation on the number of overall users (7) or on specific trails (4) is needed. Others stated that the parks are not at capacity (8) and there was room to increase visitor numbers. A call for a baseline inventory of user numbers and impacts (5) was also supported prior to making any changes.

Specific comments on **management** (8) supported coordination of recreational activities between tourism outfitters (2), dispersing visitors (2), that no preference should be given to commercial versus public grazing of horses (1) and a suggestion of a sign-in log at trailheads and tourism operators (2) to help track user numbers.

Trails (152)

Trail **management** (152) was an important aspect to many commenters. Many did not support separation of activities or twinning of trails (37), preferring to keep the multi-use concept already in place. Although that was the preference, there was consideration for having some separate trails for different users (16) in specific circumstances of overcrowding or more popular routes, while some others went a little further and suggested there should be user-specific trails as a matter of practice (12). There was a general call for an increase in trail management (10) that included brushing and trail improvements, some need for rerouting of some trails due to erosion (10), and to create trails for bikers to draw them away from Grizzly Bear habitat if that is shown to be needed (13). Some supported having good sight lines on trails (13) while others questioned the need and impact on park experience of having 3X3 metre sight lines (8).

This last point on sight lines needs a little clarification. The statement in the draft management plan of having 3X3 metre sight lines on trails was not meant as a blanket strategy. It was only to be used in specific locations where downhill speed could be expected by bikes where forward visibility of the trail was hampered (such as around a sharp corner), and where it is a known location frequented by bears. A 3X3 metre scar across the landscape along every trail was never contemplated.

Knowledge (159)

There was some agreement on the need for basic **Information** (18) such as trail signs (4), information at trailheads (3) and brochures or web information on park values, conditions and expectations for park visitors (4). There were some suggestions to provide signs and directions on the main roads leading to the park trailheads (5) in the management plan.

Education (141) efforts were supported. This ranged from a general call for undefined education (25), to providing education on trail etiquette (35), ensuring people have knowledge on bear aware strategies (18), and to make people aware that entering the parks requires visitors to be self-reliant, experienced backcountry travelers (8). A number of comments pointed out that trail conflicts amongst different users did not occur as often as indicated (14), suggesting that less effort was needed on trail etiquette or the need for separate trails. There was some agreement on the need for more ranger patrols and BC Parks presence in the parks (11). A few wanted a code of conduct for mountain bikers using the parks (6), while some pointed out that this should apply to all users (7).

Management (236)

Comments on available **Resources** (121) focussed on two topics. Many questioned BC Parks ability to fund the proposed strategies (36) in the draft management plan or to enforce restrictions and monitor conditions (15), with some calling for more detail on needed enforcement, staffing, funding, monitoring and infrastructure (6). The other topic was to use the bike and horse community to upgrade and build trails (38) and recognize the trail maintenance work already done by commercial operators (17). There was some call for charging a fee to maintain trails (8).

There were requests associated with **Gaining Knowledge** (109) for management purposes. There were largely two topics here, with the most frequent being requests to include data sources, background information and research to justify the decisions put forward in the draft plan (66). This was largely due to the belief by some that decisions were being made based upon anecdotal evidence, personal preferences or input from competing parties, and to counter the perceived bias against bikes.

The other topic under Gaining Knowledge were requests to provide Grizzly Bear numbers in the parks (33). The belief was that the numbers are overestimated, combined with observations that sightings of Grizzly Bears are rare in the parks, so why is there such an emphasis on Grizzly Bear management in the draft plan that may result in imposing unnecessary restrictions on activities and visitation to areas of the parks. To clarify, the latest (2012) Grizzly Bear population estimate for the South Chilcotin Ranges Grizzly Bear Population Unit, which covers an area of 16, 125 square kilometres, is 203 animals. Applying an average population density from this large area to South Chilcotin Mountains and Big Creek parks (1,247 square kilometres) would result in 16 Grizzly Bears within the parks. Of course, bears are not evenly distributed throughout the population unit. In fact, a 2007 project found a minimum of 26 Grizzly Bears (10 males and 16 females) within the two parks, 9 in Big Creek Park and 17 in South Chilcotin Mountains Park. This is a minimum number because it counted only the bears that left their hair behind at sampling stations; we thank those bears for contributing their DNA.

Zoning (16)

Comments on zoning questioned the need for Zone 1 as it may restrict visitation (5), more clarification of zone boundaries, including more effort for recreational zoning (4) and more effort to coordinate zoning with adjacent land management (4).

Culture (3)

These few comments agreed with the direction to enhance relationships with First Nations (2) and with the pass-through policy for Graveyard Creek (1).

Park Additions (23)

There were comments that agreed with statements in the draft management plan to add important lands to the parks should they become available in the future (15). A few comments supported park establishment (4). A couple of comments stated that the parks should not have been established to begin with (2).

General Comments (93)

There was stated **support** for the draft management plan (52), with some calling it a reasonable and balanced approach (14), the concerns were well identified (3) and that it expressed a good vision (5). There was some confusion about the vision statement, with some believing that it described the present condition of the parks instead of the intended condition at some time in the future. Some commenters considered the draft plan as comprehensive (30), but for many this was conditional on addressing concerns associated with direction on

mountain biking. Some did **not support** the draft plan (15), and this appeared to be related to expanding a dislike for the mountain biking strategies to the entire plan.

Other comments stated their support for recognizing prior uses and rights (7). There were also comments on not allowing industrial activities such as mining, logging and pipelines (17), which were associated with the recent Bill 4 and the belief that it would open the parks to industrial activities.

Other Parks

Yalakom Park: A total of 32 comments were received, with no focus on any topic. They included support for various strategies and portions of the draft plan, wanting a fairness aspect to be applied to mountain biking, and to include whitebark pine in the plan.

Fred Antoine Park: Six comments were received as shown in the Appendix.

Bridge River Delta Park: A total of 9 comments were received, largely supporting stated objectives, and to ensure impacts on other interests are fully analyzed in case of any future addition to the park.

Gwyneth Lake Park: Five comments were received, with two related to restricting boat motor sizes or types.

In Closing

Thank you to all the people who took the time to submit comments. It has taken a while to go through, with an impact on meeting time frames for these management plans, but we wanted make sure to read and understand them all. This input will be taken into consideration as the final draft is prepared and will result in changes. Foremost attention will be on providing a fair and balanced consideration for all users and activities.

Appendix: List of all comments by park (colour coded by Theme)

South Chilcotin Mountains and Big Creek Parks

<i>Theme</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Mountain biking	Fairness	411	Should not restrict bikes and not others	60
973			No off-trail use by any users	5
			Bikes do no more damage than others	62
			Bias against bikers	115
			Cyclists do not impact grizzly bears more than others; need proof	105
			Horses cause more damage than bikes and hikers	58
			Allowing recreation encourages defence of all park values	2
			Diversity of recreation	3
			Reserve Taylor and Eldorado Creeks for x-country skiing only	1
	Status quo	198	Should not restrict mountain bikes	70
			Continue to allow biking	41
			Should encourage growing biking industry	24
			Do not limit riding times (overdue riders and heat of day)	49
			Do not force biking in groups	3
			Should not stop day trips	8
			Biking should be considered a day use activity	1
			Keep Warner L. bike fly-in/bike out	1
			Want technical trail features for bikes	1
	Management	170	Proper management of mountain bikes	12
			Develop voluntary protocols for biking rather than prescribing times and routes	3
			Need proper impact assessment of biking	2
			Encourage only cross country biking	50
			All biking should be guided	1

<i>Theme</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Comments</i>
			Support no technical trail features for bikes	32
			Thanks for including bikes	8
			No mountain biking	3
			Support May closure to biking	6
			Limit riding times for biking	4
			Support listed strategies for bikes	6
			Stay to existing trails to limit environmental damage	35
			Support attention to mountain bike impacts on bears	5
			Bikes do impact wildlife	2
			Bikes are a greater threat for grizzly encounter	1
	Information	194	Bikes bring tourism and revenue	84
			Mention economic spin-offs for all communities, including Pemberton, due to high use of Hurley Road (approx. 30%)	11
			Biking proportion is greater than stated in plan	87
			Bikers primarily pedal in (Windy Pass, Spruce Lake, Taylor Creek, Relay Creek, Lick Creek, Eldorado, Cinnabar) with fewer fly-in due to expense	12
Community engagement	Engage users	49	Engage bike community to get compliance	10
101			Develop plan with mountain biking community	12
			Multi-stakeholder advisory group is good for vetting implementation of plan	18
			Broader engagement needed (bikers, communities)	6
			Need continued public input	3
	Influence	52	Plan was too influenced by horse lobby	4
			Too much influence of one tourism operator	48
Access	Floatplane support	96	Do not limit float plane flights	8
216			Need float plane viability	55
			Bias against float plane access	2
			Do not restrict plane access to Lorna and Warner lakes	5
			Rethink 9 am plane restriction, possibly need earlier flights due to wind and air temperature	10

<i>Theme</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Comments</i>
			Keep fly-in hiking	1
			Do not limit float plane drops for biking	15
	Access for disabled	1	Consider access for people with disabilities	1
	Aircraft limitations	63	Limit float plane flights	26
			Limit float plane to Spruce Lake only	2
			Do not allow float plane landings on Warner Lake	5
			Consider restrictions on both commercial and private aircraft	2
			Limit plane access by fixed days of the week (no substitutions)	2
			Use workable flight/flight-free schedule (flexibility)	2
			9 am flight restriction is reasonable	2
			Keep flights numbers the same, but no increase	4
			Limit flights only on busy weekends	1
			Use permit system to limit groups entering park (weekends)	1
			Restrict sight-seeing flights	6
			No heli-hiking or biking.	3
			Cap heli-skiing and monitor for wildlife impacts	4
			No heli-skiing	3
	Tourism	2	Do not favour commercial over public access	2
	Mountain bike access	19	Bikers make most use of Lick and B&F trail, so do not close to biking	15
			No bikes on Gun Creek or Deer Pass trails due to wet conditions	1
			Reduce float plane drops for biking	2
			No motorized bike drop-offs	1
	Snowmobiles	10	No snowmobiles in Wolverine or Taylor passes, only Slim	1
			Support no snowmobiles or flights in bighorn habitat	1
			No snowmobiling	2
			Snowmobile usage to continue in traditional area	2
			Clarify snowmobile area boundaries	2
			Clarify motorized access area	2
	Motorized vehicles	23	No ATVs on High Trail	4

<i>Theme</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Comments</i>
			Require mechanized access to mineral claim areas in MT areas (e.g., current no mechanical access in some of Taylor Creek)	1
			No motorized vehicle use in parks	12
			Allow ATVs, motorcycles and snowmobiles (only realistic access to remote areas)	3
			Limitation on motorized access	3
	Horses	1	Phase out horse use in the parks	1
	General	1	Why restrict access more in Big Creek bear habitat? (pg. 42)	1
Facilities	Campgrounds	24	Keep north campground on Spruce Lake (it's nicer, south is dark)	10
57			Move north Spruce Lake campsite (it's congested)	2
			No campground at Lorna Lake	1
			Designated camping only	2
			Consider tent platforms in sensitive alpine areas	1
			No fire rings at campgrounds, and no firewood cutting in park	1
			Share campsites with commercial operators	1
			Need outhouses accessible for people with disabilities	1
			Food lockers needed at Spruce Lake	2
			Food lockers needed at Lorna Lake	1
			Need food lockers at all campsites	2
	Commercial facilities	25	Do not move a tourism outfitter to east side of lake pg. 37	1
			Remove outfitter cabin on Spruce Lake	3
			Remove and rehabilitate tourism camp at north end of Spruce Lake	1
			Restrict commercial to rustic cabins/shelters only	
			No new commercial activities	4
			Support keeping tourism facilities out of sight	3
			Concern with commercial camp upgrades	1
			No structures in parks	1
			No docks on Warner or Lorna lakes	1
			Upgrades and new facilities should be vetted through stakeholder group	1

<i>Theme</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Comments</i>
			Provide a limit for new facility locations in Fig. 6	2
			Support removal of unused camps but want removal of inappropriately located camps as well	2
			Need cleanup by tourism operators	4
			Need to clean up landing poles	1
	Communications equipment	8	No need for radio towers (text to satellite available)	2
			Disagree to allow communication equipment	5
			Support for communication equipment	1
Ecosystems and Wildlife	Ecosystems	155	Preservation principles	61
297			Emphasis on ecological integrity	29
			Climate change provisions	1
			Wildlife preservation as a key goal	47
			Better stream crossing management	1
			Should restrict access to highest impact areas and highest wildlife values, minimize impact to users while maximizing value to wildlife (timing restrictions may be better than blanket closures)	5
			Ecosystem approach to fire is good	4
			Controlled burning needed	2
			Climate change adaptations needed (burning for habitat and modifying access to counter decreasing alpine)	1
			Ensure mule deer migration through passes is not impeded	1
			Some management recommendations are too vague	1
			Mention that whitebark pine is federally listed under SARA & needs protection	2
	Invasive species	12	Need management of invasive species	7
			Need to link horses to invasives	2
			Need to link floatplane and bikes to invasive species	1
			Education needed for invasive plants from horses	2
	Grizzly Bear	93	Support grizzly bear populations	44
			Need to coordinate bear management with adjacent agencies	3

<i>Theme</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Comments</i>
			Range Plans must focus on lowering mortality risk to grizzlies	2
			Support limiting access to core grizzly habitat	7
			Need to consider indirect hunting impacts on bears	4
			Educate hunters on not shooting grizzly when black bear hunting; proper meat handling to avoid attraction; carry pepper spray so firearms are not the only defence against close encounters	1
			Why take steps for grizzly when they are hunted elsewhere?	9
			Too much emphasis on grizzly bear over recreation	7
			Need more research on grizzly behaviour and habitat use	16
	Hunting	27	No hunting	24
			Allowing hunting inconsistent with intent to not impact wildlife through recreation	1
			Preservation of hunting	2
	Disturbance	1	Ban dogs from the park	1
	Grazing	9	Good to have environmental efforts for grazing	4
			Phase grazing out due to damage to meadows and fish habitat	5
Recreation	Experience	45	Keep park undeveloped	7
87			Support remote visitor experience	5
			Maintain wilderness character of the parks	30
			Good to seek compatible tourism use in adjacent areas	3
	Capacity	32	Parks are at capacity	4
			Put limitation on number of users, group size, esp. on weekends	7
			Parks are not at capacity	8
			Need to set a carrying capacity on trails	4
			Do baseline inventory of user numbers, campsites and impacts	5
			Need user stats for spring, fall and winter	1
			Maintain current level of recreational use	2
			Address limits relative to commercial and public users	1
	Management	8	Support coordination of itineraries between outfitters	2
			Support dispersing visitors	2

<i>Theme</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Comments</i>
			Suggest a sign-in log at trailheads and tourism operators	2
			Change 500 m camping distance from cabins to "No camping within fenced ranch cabin area."	1
			No preference should be given to commercial over public grazing	1
	General	2	Impact of moving recreation to adjacent tenure holders	1
			Mention that parks are nationally and internationally significant too (pg.13, S 2.4)	1
Trails	Management	152	Reroute some trails for erosion	10
152			Create trails for bikers to draw away from grizzly habitat	13
			Increase trail management	10
			Upgrade trail to Leckie Falls	1
			Clear map needed to indicate suitability for bikes	1
			Need parking, signage , outhouses, bear-proof garbage, camping sites at trailheads	10
			Improve access to lesser used trailheads	2
			Bridge over Taylor Creek for safer access	1
			Good to have trailheads back from park boundary	3
			Create user specific trails	12
			Some separate trails for different users	16
			Do not support separation of activities on trails or twinning	37
			No new trails	2
			Concern on "future trails", which should be discussed by stakeholder group	7
			Question need for a new Tyaughton trail for bikes (the existing 2 trails suffice)	3
			Question Windy Pass to Spruce Lake bike trail due to Grizzly Bear in area and a good bushwacking hike	2
			Close trails on a rotating basis rather than outright ban	1
			Support good sight lines on trails	13
			No to 3X3 m sight lines	8
Knowledge	Information needed	18	Trailhead signage needed dealing with key concerns	3

<i>Theme</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Comments</i>
159			Support requiring operators to hand out info on conditions	1
			Provide sufficient brochures (values, fragility, trail use, bear aware, quiet wilderness experience, penalties)	4
			Need signage and designated route to direct people to park	5
			Trail signs needed	4
			Provide a map of camps, cabins, ranch cabins, other tenures	1
	Education	141	User education needed	25
			Support education on trail etiquette	35
			Support requirement for operators to provide etiquette info.	3
			Conflicts do not occur as often as indicated	14
			Code of conduct for all users	7
			Require a declaration of responsibility from bikers using the park	6
			Encourage better behaviour from bikers	3
			Have bikers use noise makers to avoid bear encounters	2
			Support bear aware	18
			Bear aware material should be handed out by operators and at park entrances	2
			On-trail sign message reinforcement needed	3
			Support only self-reliant, experienced backcountry travelers	8
			Ensure snowmobilers clean up	1
			Education needed for No Trace Camping	1
			Mandatory hiker/biker/horse rider orientation -- online?	1
			Consider requirement for guide certification	1
			Patrols and park presence needed	11
Management	Resources	121	Resources do not exist to enforce restrictions or monitor	15
236			More detail needed on enforcement, staffing, funding, monitoring, resources, infrastructure	6
			Question BC Parks ability to fund and enforce strategies	36
			Should charge a fee to help maintain trails	8
			No parking or use fees	1

<i>Theme</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Comments</i>
			Recognize commercial operators for maintaining trails	17
			Use bike and horse community to upgrade and build trails	38
	Planning	6	Implementation and monitoring plan needed	6
	Gaining knowledge	109	Citizen science (monitoring, surveys)	1
			A place to report wildlife sightings to warn other users	3
			Public reporting and tracking system for grizzlies needed	1
			Encourage research by institutions	3
			Implement a bear interaction monitoring program for all users	2
			Justify bear number estimates	33
			Should include data sources and background and supporting research for decisions in plan	66
Zoning		16	Zonation is good	1
16			Support the 2 zones, but add Cinnabar and Eldorado Basins to Zone 1, with a connecting corridor through upper Tyaughton, including Fortress Ridge through Castle Peak to the divide with Upper Graveyard (S3.3)	1
			Include the entire area east of Spruce Lake to Eldorado Basin in Zone 1, and Upper Tyaughton and Gun Creek to Warner Creek, then to Warner Pass and Deer Pass	1
			Do not support zone 1 as it may restrict visitation	5
			Clarify boundaries of zones for park users, including more effort for recreational zoning	3
			More effort to coordinate with adjacent land management	4
			Consider aircraft and heliski impacts on Tyaughton Lake	1
Culture		3	Graveyard Creek pass through policy	1
3			First Nations relationships	2
General Comments	Support	52	Reasonable and balanced approach	14
93			Comprehensive plan	30
			Concerns well identified	3
			Good vision statement	5
	Not support	15	Do not support draft plan	15

<i>Theme</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	Other	26	Support recognizing prior uses and rights	7
			4 private inholdings, not 2	1
			Pre-existing rights and tenures should be phased out	1
			Do not allow industrial activities (mining, logging, pipelines)	17
Park additions	Enlargement	15	Support additions to park	9
23			Support acquiring inholdings	3
			Adjust boundary to Slim and Gun Creek	2
			Add some of Taseko drainage for wildlife values	1
	Park establishment	5	Support park establishment	4
			Odd looking SW corner of the park	1
	Impacts	3	Shouldn't be a park to begin with	2
			Impact on mining if mining and tourism areas added	1
				2413

Yalakom Park

<i>Category</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Adjacent land	Support minimizing impacts of adjacent activities, including keeping roads away from park boundary	1
	Clarify keeping road access from boundary, since west boundary is a road	1
General	Comprehensive plan	1
	Support vision	3
	Support discouraging increased and new activities	1
	Support zoning and activities table	1
	Support environmental protections	2
	No guide outfitting or cabin	1
	Horse damage to trails	2

	Allow biking if horse use continues, need evidence	1
	Should not treat bike access different than others	1
	Allow biking (few go there, less impact than horses)	1
	Allow biking (grandfather in)	1
Wildlife	Support conservation of bighorn	2
	Wildlife preservation	1
	No hunting	1
Ecosystem	Need statement on whitebark pine as in S. Chilcotin plan	1
	Highlight whitebark pine in plan (has some of the lowest elevation stands in BC)	1
	Total comments:	32

Fred Antoine Park

Category	Item	Comments
General	Comprehensive plan	1
	Agree with plan	1
	Support environmental protection	1
Biking	Should not restrict biking	1
Adjacent activities	Concern of "ensure habitat connectivity" impact on industrial activity	1
	Concern on impact to industrial activities on keeping roads away from boundary	1
	Total comments:	6

Bridge River Delta Park

Category	Item	Comments
General	Sensible plan	1
	Support vision statement	1
	Protect bears	1
	Support objectives and strategies	1
	Ensure mineral exploration is not unduly limited adjacent to the ark	1
	Support closure of hunting and trapping	1
	Support environmental protection	1
IPP	Should notify public and get input on upriver proposal	1
Additions	Socio-economic analysis needed; account for damage to mineral tenures	1
	Total comments:	9

Gwyneth Lake Park

Category	Item	Comments
Boating	Restrict boats to electric only or have a maximum horsepower	1
	No power boats or electric only due to amphibians and breeding birds	1
General	Support environmental protection	1
	Consider potential impact of allowing ATV access on adjacent tenure holders	1
	Error: % on page 6 should be 97.7%, not 7.7%	1
	Total comments:	5