

Watershed Update August 5th, 2007

With record of Conversation with Ed Steeves

The Local Board of Health hearings will commence on Wednesday, Aug 8th starting at 9:00am.

While it is very important we have a good turnout by residents at each day's proceedings, the main focus will be on Friday, Aug 10th, the last day of the scheduled hearings. This is when the Board will begin their deliberations, and it is important that we have as many residents attend this final hearing to deliver our community voice and request a "stop work order" against WFP

We understand that during the week, many of us are working and cannot afford the time to attend all three days of hearings. But any time that you are able to attend the hearings, this will be very much appreciated. If at all possible, try to attend on the last day (preferably the afternoon portion, if that all you can do) or better yet, the whole day.

In a previous e-mail we mentioned the role that the District of Sechelt can play in supporting the Local Board of Health and the SCRCD in any future legal attempts to gain control over the watershed. The Sechelt Community Forest is of grave concern because of the amount of acreage involved with their license in the Chapman Creek watershed.

Please find below on the web page a copy of letter sent to Ed Steeves requesting confirmation of certain possible (but not confirmed) understandings and relationships between WFP and the Sechelt Community Projects Inc (SCP).

This letter was sent to Ed Steeves by Mr. Ron Joyce, a retired Vancouver Police Sergeant, with 30 years experience on the Vancouver Police force.

Ed Steeves response via phone conversation is also copied below and there remains the unanswered question is there any relationships between SCP and WFP? It looks like we will have to wait to hear what Mr. Kevin Davies, Operations Manager for SCP has to say after speaking with Ed Steeves.

In the mean time, our focus needs to be on the Local Board of Health hearings, so once again I urge you to tell your friend and neighbours (and tell their friends and neighbours) to come out and make their presence felt at the Local Board of Health hearings this coming week. (Aug 8th-10th, 2007) This is important!

Regards

John Bebbington

=====

CONVERSATION with Ed Steeves regarding letter FROM Ron Joyce Dated Aug 3rd,2007

=====

Mr. Steeves:

This message will confirm our telephone conversation at approximately 9:30 a.m. this date.

Thank you for your prompt attention to my letter of August 3, 2007, where I asked if there were a relationship between the **Sechelt District Council ("SD")** and **Western Forest Products ("WFP")**. My question pertained to the use of an existing **Forest Service Road** (believed to be **E100**) constructed by WFP and its possible use by the SD to log the area of the **Sechelt Community Forest ("SCF")**, an extensive part of which is included within the **Chapman Creek Community Watershed Reserve ("the Watershed")**, and which is subject to

logging under an existing licence issued to the SD. I informed you during our conversation that I and others interested in the preservation of the Watershed had discovered some disconcerting circumstances that lent credence to the “rumour” I suggested to you. Those “*disconcerting circumstances*” included the fact that the existing road could be used after WFP’s withdrawal from the area by anyone wishing to gain access to the SCF. That formed the crux of my enquiry.

I am satisfied that you have answered my question concerning any possible relationship between the SD and WFP and that there is, to the best of your knowledge, no such relationship between those organizations and no intent to use or exploit any existing roads into the Watershed to facilitate any “operations” within the SCF. I am also satisfied that if such agreement existed you would **vigorously oppose it** and I sincerely hope you would **expose it to public scrutiny**.

I am further satisfied after speaking with you that the SD (that is the *present* “Council”) has no ambitions to execute logging activities within the area of the Watershed. I urge you to encourage the SD to resolve publicly that they will abandon any aspirations of ever logging in this area so that *future* Councils should feel the need to respect your resolution.

As the operations of the SCF fall within the mandate of **Sechelt Community Projects Inc. (“SCP”)**, a corporation incorporated to manage the community “projects” of interest to the District, I await your response after you speak with **Mr. Kevin Davies, the Operations Manager**, to ascertain that the SCP do not have an agreement or understanding with WFP that is unknown to you or other members of the SD with respect to the use of any roads or any other thing that may affect the Watershed. I am particularly interested in Mr. Davies’ response given that in our conversation today you were surprised to learn of the publication in ***The Local*** on August 2, 2007 (Page 17) of a **Request For Proposal Notification (RFP) – Sunshine Coast Community Forest** re possible development. I am sure you agree that this particular notification was published at a most critical and sensitive time with respect to the protests against logging within or near the Watershed. This should be of paramount concern to you and the SCRD Board as you are on record as saying, “**We are on your side**”, and any development of that area should be of grave concern to anyone interested in the preservation of our Watershed. Of course, I would be urging you to seek a similar declaration from the SCP and/or Mr. Davies that they, too, have no aspirations of logging or any other type of “industry” that may be of an environmentally-sensitive nature in or near the Watershed.

As I mentioned during our conversation, I am encouraged by the Board’s insistence that both a hydrology study and a forestry study be implemented within the Watershed and the cut blocks that affect the Watershed. It is important that they be completed prior to your making a decision that is going to affect us all for at least a century. I am disappointed, however, that you might rely on any evidence submitted by an employee, or contracted hydrologist or forester within the employ of WFP, as the “hydrologist” to which you refer **is retained** by WFP. I appreciate that you have engaged a forester from Vancouver Island who is, presumably, *not* associated to WFP, and tasked him with specific questions and issues the Board wants addressed. As I suggested, I would be more satisfied with a “*completely independent study*” that includes opposing opinions from foresters, hydrologists, and ecologists. Remember, there was a submission at the Health Board Hearing that posed the question, “***Is there such a thing as an independent forester?***”

I am including photos taken yesterday of a cut block, not within the Watershed and not, I believe, caused by WFP, but immediately next to the **Sechelt-Chapman Forest Service Road**. I include them to indicate to you the *type* of water one might expect literally “leaching out” at the lower regions of a cut block. I would not consider drinking it or even exposing it to a watershed or a stream that fed any water intake system leading **to a Water Treatment Facility**. Although the examples I give you may not directly affect the Watershed, they are certainly consistent with what I believe one might expect from the WFP cuts in or near the Watershed.

I have also attached photos of what appears to be **new signage** for the *Forest Service Road* constructed by WFP or their contractors at the 7 km post on the public **Sechelt-Chapman Forest Service Road**, where it identifies the prime contractor as **Malaspina Enterprises**. I also include a link to a website for Malaspina Ent. http://www.forestnet.com/archives/Dec_Jan_06/bc_contractor_profile.htm

If I have misunderstood any of the points of our conversation today, please advise me. Thank you,

R. J. (Ron) Joyce

Elphinstone
