

Public Comments:

- The project was advertised in the local newspaper on December 16, 2016 and December 23, 2016. 38 public responses were received, all but one opposed:
 1. s.22, Canal Flats Wilderness Club, January 5, 2017: Club's mission is to ensure long-term management of fish, wildlife & outdoor resources. they are opposed because of impacts to wildlife. High use by bighorn, grizzly, mule deer & elk. Sheep rely on alpine meadows for survival of lambs (forage is high in Selenium which blocks white muscle disease). Lower elevation forage is lacking in Selenium. The project will displace sheep. Concerned that proposed level of use (3-4 customers a few times of year) will escalate due to financial hardship. Should not be approved: negative impact.
 2. s.22, January 24, 2017: supports comment by Wildsight and Canal Flats Wilderness Club: the area is a pristine wilderness, is key habitat for species, there is no basis in the plan for the assertion that there will be no impact to native species and no archaeological resources. Should submit credible support for these assertions. Alternately, application should be denied.
 3. s.22 January 17, 2017: concerned that the area is lambing area for bighorn sheep, and habitat for mountain goats and grizzlies. Supports comment by Wildsight and Canal Flats Wilderness Club.
 4. s.22 January 18, 2017: Officially, deny application. He heard of the application via Facebook, is this how government works? The deadline to comment is in a few days. Seems like the application is being railroaded through. He wants to stop by the office to learn about the process.
 5. s.22, January 18, 2017: Officially opposed, deny application. She heard of the application via Facebook, is this how government works? The deadline to comment is in a few days. Seems like the application is being railroaded through.
 6. s.22, Summit Trail Makers Society, January 19, 2017: She belongs to local hiking trail maintenance club. If project is approved, the Gibraltar Lookout FSR will need clearing and road improvements. Waste collection / grey water disposal needs clarification. Outhouse may not be appropriate: composting toilet or barrels may be more appropriate. Access roads & trails must remain open for public use. Need to properly consult biologists. Concerned re: bighorn and grizzly bear interactions.
 7. s.22, January 19, 2017: Opposed. Preference should be given to non-profit outdoor clubs / organizations.
 8. s.22, January 19, 2017: Officially opposed, deny application. She heard of the application via Facebook, is this how government works? The deadline to comment is in a few days. Seems like the application is being railroaded through.
 9. s.22, January 19, 2017. Should not be approved. Bighorn, goat & grizzly bear impacts.

10. s.22 , January 19, 2017: Public will not benefit from this: privatize the mountain top lodge. Humans will push out wildlife (e.g. sheep, goats, bear). Environmental impact. Prefer it be left wild for recreating public.
11. s.22 , January 19, 2017: The area is too important in supporting and maintaining wildlife to be developed further for human activities.
12. s.22 , January 19, 2017: Opposed to lease or sale for commercial use. Will degrade area and make less accessible for those who don't pay. It will put public lands in control of private which he cannot condone.
13. s.22 January 19, 2017: Opposed. Puts wildlife at risk. BC government shouldn't have sold the site. Shame on government: doesn't care for wildlife.
14. s.22 , January 19, 2017: Against commercial development. Encroachment on wildlife habitat. Areas need to be set aside for wildlife.
15. s.22 January 19, 2017: This application conflicts with maintaining healthy wildlife habitat in East Kootenays. Winter range for bighorn & adjacent to lambing areas. These species are in decline & need to maintain critical habitat. Grizzly bear feeding areas. Habitat loss is directly related to increased human access. Strong consensus that this will be a detriment to wildlife.
16. s.22 East Kootenay Wildlife Association, January 17, 2017: They represent hunters / anglers. They are dedicated to protect wildlife habitat. Concerns: protection of bighorn, pre-natal / natal, human-bear conflict, displacement of grizzly, protect alpine grassland habitat, permanent commercial buildings within habitat. Area is located in summer / winter habitat for dwindling bighorn sheep. They compared the management plan to FLNRO's policy guidelines and found that the management plan does not address the protection of habitat, sensitive ecosystems, nesting / calving. There is inadequate quality & insufficient information: requests FLNRO deny. In general, the association is not in support any new lodges or structures in alpine environments. Ask FLNRO to re-evaluate policy around selling governments buildings on Crown Land.
17. s.22 , January 17, 2017: Supports! We need something in this valley, cannot discourage everything. Employment.
18. s.22 January 17, 2017: Sad to see development of the lookout. Please do not allow.
19. s.22 January 17, 2017: Sad to hear of possible sale. Impact to fragile wildlife population, needed for bighorn sheep, elk, goat, mule deer & grizzly. Forage in the alpine has Selenium which is important for lamb's muscle development. Opposed to proposal.
20. s.22 January 17, 2017: Opposed. Habitat is for critical bighorn sheep herd. Winter range. Next to lambing range. Human incursion will push them out. We should not exploit our natural resources.

21. ^{s.22} , January 17, 2017: need more information. Feels it was kept quiet to avoid public knowledge. The lookout conflicts with maintaining healthy wildlife populations in the East Kootenay. Not a good idea.
22. ^{s.22} January 17, 2017: Strongly opposes any kind of development here. Extremely detrimental to goal of maintaining healthy wildlife population in the East Kootenays. Bighorn winter range. Adjacent to lambing areas & mountain goat habitat. Grizzly bear. Will displace habitat. Habitat loss. Creeping development in backcountry. Do not allow.
23. ^{s.22} January 16, 2017: Can't view the pdf's. Please mail him the documents.
24. ^{s.22} January 16, 2017: Pdf's do not download.
25. ^{s.22} , January 16, 2017: Can't view management plan. Concerned with interference with local hunters.
26. Lake Windermere District rod & Gun Club: does not support: important mountain goat rearing & summer feedings, high elevation grass and forage with high levels of Selenium, not found in the valley, important to lamb's survival by blocking white muscle disease, remoteness: fragile plants & soil will be impacted. Past proposals of this type have failed (to the east).
27. ^{s.22} , January 16, 2017: Summer & winter range for bighorn. Active area for grizzly. Columbia Valley is already saturated with these types of operations. Opposed.
28. ^{s.22} , January 16, 2017: Against this type of business. Against re-purposing the lookout. Leave it wild.
29. ^{s.22} January 16, 2017: Against this type of business. Against re-purposing the lookout. Leave it wild.
30. ^{s.22} January 16, 2017: Opposed. Big impact on hunting community & on wildlife. The lake would not be able to sustain that much activity because too shallow. Pros do not outweigh the negative outcomes.
31. ^{s.22} , January 16, 2017: Oppose. ^{s.22}
^{s.22} This is similar to proposed Jumbo Lodge and will not be received well. Disruptive to bighorn & other species in area. Disruptive and damage to habitat (traffic, road expansion). Need to preserve disappearing wilderness. Enjoy backcountry by staying in town and driving out!
32. ^{s.22} , January 16, 2017: Opposed. Sensitive bighorn sheep, habitat loss, need to protect.
33. ^{s.22} , January 16, 2017: Negative long term impacts on wildlife, e.g. bighorn. How would impacts be mitigated?
34. ^{s.22} , January 16, 2017: Area is in prime summer & winter range for bighorn. Lodge will negatively impact. Disagrees with proposal.

35. s.22 , January 16, 2017: Need more remote areas for wildlife. Wrecking the Kootenays by bringing in city people's money. The worst will come of this.
36. s.22 , January 16, 2017: Very sensitive sheep migration area. Complete and thorough studies are needed.
37. s.22 January 6, 2017: Opposed. MoE has shown a decrease in sheep, mule deer and elk on this range. Vehicle access has been restricted to protect wildlife. Increased human will stress wildlife and have an impact on wildlife.
38. s.22 : concerned about the way they were alerted about the proposal. They have been s.22 s.22 on area for ~ s.22 and never heard anything from government. It was disturbing to hear of advertisement in newspaper. No one from government sends them notification. Concerns: there will be direct effect on sensitive habitat for sheep, grizzly and mule deer, great concerns for these species. Grizzly population is down 40%, migration route for sheep to access summer / winter range, concerned that even though the proposal is limited at this time, that nothing would stop year-round use. They could increase trail use & therefore damage very sensitive sheep breeding / winter range. This will conflict with their s.22 business at the end of August to November 30 (clients). There will be a footprint (outhouse, firewood cutting). There will be irreversible damage to the area and to wildlife.