

WGS → Indata

Indata  
884226

93N/6  
93N 042, 066

**Schroeter, Tom EM:EX**

---

**From:** Schroeter, Tom EM:EX  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 25, 1998 11:03 AM  
**To:** Schmitt, Rolf EM:EX  
**Subject:** RE: Indata  
**Sensitivity:** Private

Rolf, sorry I can't join you on the speaker phone on the 2nd - I'm at the NWMA in Spokane, trying to drum up business for BC. As for the 'potential' and 'infrastructure' questions, I suggest you contact Bob Lane (I've never been on the site, believe it or not). My personal/gut feeling for this region is that it is VERY prospective for porphyry (and related) Cu +/- Au, Mo, skarn/manto and perhaps industrial minerals. Cheers, Tom.

---

**From:** Schmitt, Rolf EM:EX  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 25, 1998 10:31 AM  
**To:** Schroeter, Tom EM:EX  
**Subject:** Indata  
**Sensitivity:** Private

Tom:

Thanks for your super prompt reply to my request. The information is exactly what I needed. Although I know it is a bit early to speculate too far, I suspect the question may come up in our briefing of the Deputy on this LRMP. At this stage of the property exploration, and based on similar models what are your thoughts on the prospective size /value of this deposit in this setting?

While our regional staff were able to effectively argue for a much-adjusted proposed park boundary; I am concerned with the recent results from this years exploration that we are potentially creating an awkward situation for Wildrose; even though their current claims are intended to be save and excepted. The consensus recommendations are now proceeding to Deputies and ELUC very quickly and our degrees of freedom for any adjustments at this date are likely minimal.

Perhaps the question is, do the current mineral claims provide sufficient land position for exploraiton and mining, including infrastructure? If not, then as the park proposal is presently being put forward (decision by Cabinet, Dec. 9th - highly confidential) we could end up creating a situation where the Park Act would have to be amended in the future to allow for revised boundary and expansion of land holdings for mining.

Dec. 2nd, 2 p.m. we are briefing our Deputy and ADMs on this LRMP moving forward for decision on the 9th. Would you possibly be available to join us on a speaker phone if we get into a discussion on the Indata property?

Thanks again Tom,

Rolf

TBS → Indata

**Schroeter, Tom EM:EX**

---

**From:** Schmitt, Rolf EM:EX  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 29, 1999 10:02 AM  
**To:** Hesketh, Joan EM:EX  
**Cc:** Smyth, Ron EM:EX; Schroeter, Tom EM:EX; McLaren, Graeme EM:EX  
**Subject:** FW: Nation lake PA release

FYI. Joan, thanks for all your help in supporting the efforts to amend the boundary of this PA as it moved through the LRMP approval process. Bill Morton seems happy with the final outcome and has recently had a couple of majors up to look at the property.

**Rolf Schmitt**

**From:** Parhar, Debbie EM:EX  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 29, 1999 9:19 AM  
**To:** Schmitt, Rolf EM:EX; Swan, Carol A ELP:EX; Ferdinands, Anne LUCO:EX  
**Subject:** Nation lake PA release

Here is the final version. Sorry for the delay in sending to you. Any questions or concerns, please call.



027-Nation Lake  
PA.doc

**Debbie B. Parhar**  
Communications  
Ministry of Energy and Mines  
(250) 952-0525  
<mailto:debbie.parhar@gems2.gov.bc.ca>

For Immediate Release  
027  
June 28, 1999

Ministry of Energy and Mines  
Land Use Co-ordination Office

**FORT ST. JAMES LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN  
— Nation Lakes Protected Area Changes to Incorporate New Information —**

VICTORIA—The new southern boundary of the Nation Lake protected area will ensure continued access to an important mineral resource while considering recreational values in the Fort St. James land and resource management plan area, Energy and Mines Minister Dan Miller said today.

“This decision on the Fort St. James plan is good news for the mining industry. It reflects government’s commitment to ensure that mining values are reflected in land use decisions and to support mining activity in our province,” said Miller.

“The planning process attempts to balance environmental and economic values,” added Miller. “The new southern boundary of the Nation Lake protected area continues to protect the environment along the Nation lakes canoe route while allowing mining activity to continue.”

On March 11, the Fort St. James land use plan was announced. At that time, the planning table recommended a boundary for the Nation Lake protected area, subject to further studies on the location of a potential copper and gold deposit. New information shows the mineral resource is much more significant than originally thought. Under government direction, a team led by the land use co-ordination office with the ministries of Energy and Mines, Forests, and Environment, Lands and Parks reviewed mineral, recreational and ecosystem values before revising and finalizing the boundaries.

“I am pleased about this land use decision, which recognizes our efforts to continue to explore for a major mineral deposit in the area,” said Bill Morton, president of Wildrose Resources Ltd. “The decision will help us secure long-term investment for exploration and development activities and provides us with greater certainty.”

The Fort St. James land use plan protects more than 187,000 hectares and creates 22 protected areas. The Nation Lake protected area of about 19,000 hectares is about 100 kilometres northwest of Fort St. James. It covers the upper portion of the Nation lakes canoe route, including Tsayta and Indata lakes.

The land use planning process brings together a wide range of stakeholders in small, regional groups to work towards fair and reasonable land use decisions. The process is part of the economic strategy directed by the province’s council of economic ministers.

- 2 -

**“Land use decisions balance community, industry and environmental concerns and require participation from all interested parties,” said Miller. “Ministry staff will continue to work hard to make sure mining concerns are heard and addressed at the planning table.”**

**Land and resource management plans have now been completed for more than half the province. In addition to the Fort St. James plan, land use plans have been approved for Robson Valley, Dawson Creek, Prince George, Kamloops, Kispiox, Vanderhoof, Bulkley, Vancouver Island, Cariboo-Chilcotin, Kootenay-Boundary, Fort St. John and Fort Nelson.**

- 30 -

**Contact: Debbie Parhar  
Co-ordinator  
Communications  
Ministry of Energy and Mines  
(250) 952-0525**