

TO: Wolterson, Anna

DATE: 03/22/93
T : 1:58 PM

58100-50
Jumbo

CC:
SUBJECT: Jumbo development
PRIORITY:
ATTACHMENTS:

Thanks for your note on Jumbo's development. I agree totally with you and do appreciate the damage it will cause. Milt tells me that McDonald has already had considerable abuse for allowing the planned work to go on in the absence of a CORE decision and an EIS. My suggestion is that we use the proponents funds and work as effectively as possible to ensure that the development does not proceed. We often have a great deal of difficulty producing documents and proof of problems. Lets look at this as an opportunity to collect the ammo. to stop the development!

I visited the site with McDonald, Crozier and Dyck last year and I believe that EP and Water have very serious problems with this development as well. Highways also has problems with it. We need to work together with the others and we need to be sure that the systems needed (water, sewage, highways, transmission lines, gas lines, heliskiing, etc.) are all included in the analysis process. It sounds like these were discussed at your meeting, but I would like you to take all necessary initiative to ensure that they are covered.

Thanks for reminding me of your concerns. I will be passing them on when ever possible.

87-1
FROM: Demarchi, Ray
DATE: 10/06/95 16:23
TO: Gates, Bryan ENVNET/ASSESSMENT

MAR 14 1996

CC: Wilkin, Nancy

SUBJECT: Jumbo Pass, East Kootenays, British Columbia
PRIORITY: 5
ATTACHMENTS:

Hi Bryan: Sorry that I could not get back to you on such short notice re the COMMENTS ON THE APPLICATION FOR A PROJECT APPROVAL CERTIFICATE FOR THE JUMBO GALCIER ALPINE RESORT PROPOSAL. However, I did read it and generally felt that you had covered most of the bases regarding wildlife and biodiversity. More emphasis on the occurrence of Threatened and Endangered Species seems necessary, particularly since the proponent seems to have completely overlooked this aspect. The list of Red and Blue species which may occur in the area includes: Turkey vulture, Bald eagle, Bobolink, American peregrine falcon, Prairie falcon, "Mac farlane's" Western Screech Owl, Short-eared owl, Lewis' woodpecker, Golden-mantled ground squirrel, "Selkirk" Least chipmunk, Red-tailed chipmunk, "Western" wolverine; Fisher, Badger and Mountain caribou in addition of course to the much discussed and abundant Grizzly bear.

Speaking of which, grizzly bears, the experience we have suffered over the past two summers with the unsuccessful and expensive attempts at relocation and destruction of numerous grizzlies at Elkford, Sparwood, Fernie, Revelstoke, Mackenzie and Aiyansh plus black bears at Whistler is harsh evidence of the incompatibility of human settlement and bears. The Jumbo Creek Alpine Resort proposal of course has the potential of becoming the worst of these.

I am not naive enough to believe that wildlife alone, no matter how rich would be enough to prevent such a development. However, the usefulness of the area for year 'round skiing, the human safety considerations, waste water disposal, highway construction and winter maintenance costs and hazards as well as other water, forestry, fisheries, public vs private recreational values, existing licencess, First Nation's considerations etc etc should all combine with the probable negative economic situation to stop this misdirected proposal.

If you need a more thorough review of the draft document, please advise and I will seek wider Departmental input.

Thanks for your considerable effort on this so far.

RayD

PS The attached for your information.

FORWARDED FROM: Demarchi, Ray
FROM: Springholic, Brian

FROM: ~~Gates, Bryan~~

DATE: ~~95/09/07~~ 14:09

TO: ~~Barsons, David~~

MAR 17 1996

Sept 7.
65-1

: Martin, Doug
Hamilton, Tony ENVNET/FWHDEPT
McDonald, Dennis ENVNET/NELSON

SUBJECT: Jumbo Creek - Document Review Comments

PRIORITY:

ATTACHMENTS:

Some excellent analysis here from Tony Hamilton to Doug Martin. It is internal, and not to go on the Project Registry, although it may be obtained through FOI.

It seems to me that point 3 (could vs. should) is most important. If BC Environment concludes that it should say "no" to Jumbo, then some alternative form of land use or reserve decision has to be offered for the valley that will give some assurance of a viable grizzly (and other wildlife) population(s). Otherwise, we may be saying 'no ski development', only to face some other form of development proposal for the area in the future...and another battle. That raises the question of whether or not our quota of "reserve" options has been used up in the Purcells/Kootenays.

It will be up to ~~Doug and his staff~~ (with Tony's guidance) to draft this material into F&W comments. You/I could help round it out later and put into the context of our overall MELP comments. Doug's submission is due to come to you/me by tomorrow. Given the above, it could be late, creating problems for the Sept. 13 meeting in Cranbrook.

Bryan

FORWARDED FROM: Gates, Bryan
Microsoft Mail v3.0 IPM:Microsoft Mail.Note

From: Hamilton, Tony

To: Martin, Doug

Cc: Gates, Bryan

Fontana, Anna

Forbes, Bob

Sharpe, Sean T.

McLellan(Bruce N) FOR:A1

Holmes(Peter) ENV:A1

Subject: Jumbo Creek - Document Review Comments

Date: 1995-09-07 10:39

Priority:

Message ID: 13EBDC8D

51-2

To: ~~Gates, Bryan~~
Cc: Fontana, Anna
Forbes, Bob
Martin, Doug
Demarchi, Ray
Sharpe, Sean T.
McLellan(Bruce N) FOR:Al
Subject: ~~Jumbo Creek Grizzly Bears~~
Date: ~~1995-08-25 11:40~~
Priority:
Message ID: E0C023A7
Conversation ID: E0C023A7

Brian,

Ray Demarchi suggested I contact you about recent comments about grizzly bears made by someone representing the development proponent at Jumbo.

I should first let you know that our Cranbrook office brought me into a discussion about grizzly bears in Jumbo some time ago. The proponent's consultant at the time - Norecol - had purchased over \$8000 worth of bear capture, immobilization and telemetry equipment and were about to issue a contract to Rob Weilgus to begin grizzly capture.

I opposed the capture and collaring of grizzly bears in advance of a land use decision, said so in a conference call with all parties, and subsequently got copied on a letter from Umberto Oreti to a deputy minister (I can't remember which Ministry) complaining about me. Ray Demarchi told me to "wear it like a badge of courage". I never did find out about what happened to all that brand new equipment. I wanted to buy it, but didn't have funding. At that time there was considerable discussion about the quality and quantity of wildlife and habitat inventory data expected - Anna will have the details.

The comments made by the proponent's representative passed on to Sean and I by Alan Dibb (Parks Canada) are totally mistaken. For the record:

COSEWIC designated grizzly bears Canada-wide as vulnerable.

The ecosection/BEC variant combinations in Jumbo are ranked as high capability for supporting grizzly bears.

From a "Mountain Block" or what we call Bear Management Unit (in the Grizzly Strategy) standpoint Jumbo is a critically important north-south linkage. Development of this drainage will exacerbate the already nearly impossible task of maintaining linkages through the Purcells. We call the opposite of linkages "fracture zones" and if the development as now proposed matches what we were told originally - "a village the size of Banff" - you can bet that Jumbo would be a major fracture zone, and that population fragmentation would be the result.

The development of Jumbo Creek is a major grizzly bear conservation and management concern. Let me know if I can be of any assistance. Sean and I are ready to help as need be.

(10)

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

Date: 20-Dec-1995 11:16am PST
From: Hamilton, Tony
THAMILTO@FWHDEPT.env.gov.bc.ca@GEMS@VENUS
Dept:
Tel No:

TO: Gates, Bryan (BGATES@ASSESSMENT.env.gov.bc.ca@GEMS@VENUS)
TO: Martin, Doug (DMARTIN@CRANBROOK.env.gov.bc.ca@GEMS@VENUS)
TO: Demarchi, Ray (RDEMARCH@FWHDEPT.env.gov.bc.ca@GEMS@VENUS)
CC: Parsons, David (DPARSONS@ASSESSMENT.env.gov.bc.ca@GEMS@VENUS)
CC: RCROOK (RCROOK@A1)

Subject: Re: Jumbo - Project specs for bear impacts

I only needed a brief look at what Parks suggests to know that I concur (roughly) with their proposed approach with the following qualifications. Please refer to my earlier e-mail regarding habitat inventory etc.

- 1) That the Provincial Grizzly Bear Strategy and the Minister's support for it are unable to stop the development outright. There is no question in my mind that this is by far the best Ministry approach in support of the long term welfare of the grizzly bears in that mountain block. We cannot go forward with the idea that the study will look after our concerns - it will not. I will continue to push the Grizzly Strategy Implementation Committee to adopt a strong position against this development, and not to support any study at all. Again, IF AND ONLY IF THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO WAY TO STOP THE PROPOSAL, then I am sure we can work out a solid study design with Parks.
- 2) That the time frame is AT LEAST 3 years for such work, and preferably 5 years - all in advance of any development. There is no merit in attempting such an assessment in a 1-2 year time frame (Annual variance, sample and data processing time, peer review etc. and so on)

Tony

From: Gates, Bryan
To: Hamilton, Tony ENVNET/FWHDEPT; Martin, Doug
Cc: Parsons, David; Crook(Ray) EAO:A1
Subject: Jumbo - Project specs for bear impacts
Date: Tuesday, December 19, 1995 6:00PM
Priority: High

Urgent - Your thoughts, please

The attached from Alan Dibb and Susan Hall of National Parks is for your consideration. They have modified their suggested approach for Jumbo/Purcells grizzly bear assessment.

Note that:

1. Trapping/collaring has been dropped in favour of hair DNA sampling.
(This would appear to meet Tony's concerns about handling bears, but clearly would involve long-term and expensive work with perhaps unproven results? Funding presumably by the proponent).
2. An independent consultant (or team) would assemble existing information, do the necessary overlay mapping and interpretation, and advise on potential impacts of the project. (Again, presumably funded by the proponent, but we

(116)

could discuss options. Note that Tony's earlier position is that we don't need this to know the importance of Jumbo to regional/subregional GB populations).

Whatever we decide, we will have to seek concurrence of others, including First Nations who have recommended trapping/collaring and long term studies.

If there is anything here that leads us closer to an agreement, let me know.

Then I would like to be able to send at least portions of Tony's e-mail of Dec. 13 (addressed to me) to Dibb and Hall for their reaction. (Tony: Is it too early?)

Ray Crook is anxious to finalize the next draft of project report specifications for public review. He requires our position, preferably consolidated with Nat. Parks, etc.

Many Thanks,

Bryan

FORWARDED FROM: Gates, Bryan

Date: Tue, 19 Dec 1995 11:48:00 +0000 (GMT)
From: Alan Dibb <DIBBA@pkskoo.dots.doe.ca>
Subject: Jumbo - Project specs for bear impacts
: BGATES@ASSESSMENT.env.gov.bc.ca, RCROOK@galaxy.gov.bc.ca
: Perry Jacobson <JACOBSONP@pkskoo.dots.doe.ca>, Susan Hall
<HALLS@PKSMRG.dots.doe.ca>

Date: Fri, 24 Nov 1995 14:40:00 GMT
From: "SUSAN HALL"@pkskoo.mr.doe.ca
Subject: E-mail memo re: Bear project specs to Ray and Bryan

The following is our suggested approach for project specifications regarding regional grizzly bear concerns associated with the Jumbo Glacier resort proposal.

(1) Hire a team of experienced bear biologists to collate existing information at the regional, subregional and landscape levels (hierarchical approach). This is necessary to provide a context for assessing the significance of impacts from the proposed Jumbo development. This approach is/has been used

successfully in several past and ongoing assessments: Kluane National Park (impact of proposed recreational development on grizzly bears), Sunshine Village ski area in Banff National Park (effect of expansion) and the Bow Valley cumulative effects study in Banff. Dr. Stephen Herrero, bear biologist

and professor of Environmental Design at the University of Calgary has made several suggestions of bear biologists whom we may wish to consult. These biologists may also be able to provide the best available expert opinion where field data are lacking.

(2) Available information on habitat, bear densities, mortalities, and human use are mapped and overlaid to provide a context to assess regional and cumulative impacts. For example, conclusions can be reached about whether the grizzly bear population occupying the area can tolerate any increased

116
continued

117-2

mortality
and habitat loss, whether the Jumbo project area is in fact a key habitat
area,
whether mitigation (sanitization, project modification) is likely to be
successful.

117-3

(3) In addition to using existing data, supplemental information may be
gained
by DNA sampling using baits with barb wire that snags hair. Grids of bait
stations would be placed throughout Jumbo-Toby and adjacent valleys. This
should provide comparative data on number of individuals and, with repeated
sampling, some indication of movement and relative habitat use. Yearly
sampling may provide an estimate of population trends (mark - recapture
approach) that should be required for follow-up monitoring should this
project
proceed. DNA sampling from hair samples collected in bait stations is a
technique currently being developed in the West Slopes Grizzly Study of
Parks
Canada, BC Forest Service, BC Environment, Columbia Basin, and others.

- Alan

--Boundary (ID az6jCWG9te+HXOUIRQOp9g)--