

**A PRELIMINARY TRANSCRIPT
OF THE SEPTEMBER 10, 2008
METRO VANCOUVER WATER COMMITTEE MEETING,
REGARDING THE DISCUSSION OF FOUR LETTERS
INCLUDED IN THE WATER COMMITTEE AGENDA
IN SUPPORT OF WILL KOOP'S CONTINUED ACCESS
INTO THE GREATER VANCOUVER WATERSHEDS**

Introduction

On Wednesday morning, September 10, 2008, I (Will Koop) attended the meeting of Metro Vancouver's Water Committee, and audio taped the majority of the period of discussion that dealt with the four letters attached in the Agenda package. The letters from the Western Canada Wilderness Committee, the David Suzuki Foundation, the Burke Mountain Naturalists, and the Friends of the Watersheds requested that the Water Committee make a resolution to the Board for Will Koop's continued access into the Greater Vancouver watersheds (see Appendix A below).

The reason for the letters of support was because on two previous occasions as delegations before the Water Committee (November 2007, and May 2008) I had requested the Committee approve my re-access into the Greater Vancouver watersheds (see Appendix B below). On both occasions, Water Committee members did not make a resolution to the Board for decision, but referred my request to administrative staff for comment. On both occasions staff stated that it was the Board's policy to refuse such access, that Mr. Koop had no business in the watersheds (see Appendix C). At the May 2008 meeting, I countered Tom Heath's claim (Mr. Heath is the Water District's administrative manager of Operations and Maintenance), by stating that I was seeking continued business in the watersheds, that it was the "public's business".

In the transcript below, readers will discover in a footnote during Johnny Carline's address to the Water Committee (Mr. Carline is Metro Vancouver's CEO, and Commissioner of Metro Vancouver's Water District) that he misled the Committee, which resulted in three Committee members making strong comments of disapproval, resulting in the Committee only accepting the four letters for consideration, and then sending a letter of rebuke to each, and not making a motion to the Board as the letters requested. What Mr. Carline stated was that in early November 2006, when I had permission from administrative staff, under staff accompaniment, to enter the Capilano watershed, I had brought along a Television Network camera crew, which resulted in the television station making false and emotional claims to the public on the origins of why the public's drinking water was so turbid. In truth, I had taken digital camera and video shots myself while on my trip into the Capilano watershed, and later released that information to two television networks, after carefully describing the events and my understanding of the reasons on the origins of the turbidity events. The reason I released my video tape to the two networks is that they had contacted me prior to my trip into the

watersheds, because they were anxious to learn the possible reasons why Greater Vancouver's drinking water was so murky.

On the afternoon of September 10, 2008, I made a telephone call to Metro Vancouver's Corporate Secretary's office, to ask if the Water Committee meeting had been audio taped. It was. I then asked for clarification on the correct wording from a sentence in Mr. Carline's address to the Committee. I was later informed that to do so I would have to conduct a Freedom of Information request. At the present time, I have submitted an FOI request for a copy of the audio tape, and is why this transcript is called a "preliminary" transcript. The transcript begins about two minutes into the discussion concerning the four letters.

Sincerely, Will Koop,
September 11, 2008.

WATER COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT (including abbreviations of transcript members)

TS – Director, and Chair, Tim Stevenson, Vancouver City Councillor
DC – Director Derek Corrigan, vice chair, City of Burnaby Mayor
BS – Director Barbara Steele, City of Surrey Councillor
MR – Director Mae Reid, City of Coquitlam Councillor
LB – Linda Barnes, City of Richmond Councillor
JH – Janice Harris, City of North Vancouver Councillor
Mike Clay, City of Port Moody Councillor
Director Michael Wright, City of Port Coquitlam Councillor

WATER COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT

Hal Weinberg, Mayor of Anmore
Calvin Donnelly, City of New Westminster Councillor

PRELIMINARY TRANSCRIPT, SEPTEMBER 10, 2008

TS – This has been a policy of the Board that has been pretty firm, but as you say ...

Another director – Expertise.

TS – ... Expertise. However, you also open yourself up to all sorts of other people with expertise. Mr. Carline, do you want to address this at all? I see you have moved into position.

JC – This has got a long history, it goes back to the 1990s, and the intense debates that were going on in the 1990s over the contribution of logging to turbidity. The Board in 1999 put an end to those discussions ¹ by basically focusing on quality of water and ecological management of the watersheds. And, so peace came back to the valley.

As part of that process – and I was the new Commissioner at that time – I went out of my way to accommodate Mr. Koop in terms of his access to information, to ensure that that transition was successfully in place. The Board has had a policy, as Mr. Stevenson outlined, that prevents access to the watershed and therefore makes exceptions only by Board request. Mr. Koop is still eligible to go into the watershed on that basis. But, as part of that late 1990s resolution, administration staff gave Mr. Koop extra special treatment and took, one, permission to go in as a sort of serial permission, to allow him to go in and accommodate him on several occasions.

Just recently in the very big turbidity event that occurred a couple of winters ago, Mr. Koop went into the watershed without the Board permission, but with administrative staff permission, and brought a television crew with him from Global Television, and an interview appeared on the evening news which suggested that the turbidity events of that winter were in fact consequences of the Board's policies of the 1980s and 1990s to do with the logging in the watersheds. ² This was very difficult for staff to handle. We had a major public confidence issue to deal with in terms of the health of the water. Remember, we had a boil water situation. We were trying to manage the public confidence and public

¹ The decision to do so occurred on November 10, 1999, after a special two hour meeting.

² Mr. Carline misinformed the Water Committee about my entering the Capilano watershed with a camera crew. I was alone, accompanied by watershed staff member Ken Juvik, who escorted me to several sites, before being called out because of another pending rainstorm. I took video footage of the extremely turbid Sisters Creek at the confluence of the Capilano River, and higher up of the source tributary into Sisters Creek. I also took footage of turbid waters from Eastcap Creek, just above its confluence with the Capilano River. Why Mr. Carline would suggest that I entered the watershed with the camera crew is unknown, and is perhaps a result of staff misinforming him. Mr. Carline's comment would later incite great criticism against myself in the transcript below. After Mr. Carline returned to the audience seating area, I asked him to come over to speak with me, where I described to him that he had misinformed the Water Committee. I instructed him to immediately return to the delegation microphone and convey the same to the Committee, in that I did not bring in a television station camera and crew. Mr. Carline then informed the Committee of my comments, but the damage was already done, and nothing was done by the Committee to discuss the correction of this matter in the context of the meeting beforehand. That portion of the proceedings with Mr. Carline's correction to the Committee is not included at the end of this transcript.

health with the health authorities. This one television station, despite the fact that we were able to eventually show them that all of these allegations were totally untrue, we couldn't get them up in a helicopter to show them until three or four days afterwards because of the weather situation. So, we were put in a very difficult situation because of that. I don't mind situations where we finished giving a television station exclusive access, which we normally don't do. At that point in time administration staff realized that they perhaps made an error here, and should go back to the situation where anybody – not just Mr. Koop, this applies to everybody – if they want to go into the watershed, it should be for a specific purpose, for specific circumstances, and under those considerations, or under those situations we will certainly give Mr. Koop, who I know well, and I get along with Mr. Koop, we give him all kinds of appropriate consideration. That particular circumstance which was potentially dangerous and extremely delicate, that was a mistake, to diverting staff into that kind of activity, in those circumstances. So, I think that is why administrative staff have gone back to the situation of saying that everybody, not just Mr. Koop, everybody should go back to getting special permission for the Board so that particular circumstances can be evaluated as to why people go into the watershed, and that no one should be allowed into the watershed on a permanent access basis, if you like, to be allowed to go in.

MR – Thank you. I think he abused his privilege.

TS – Mr. Carline. Can you answer why the David Suzuki Foundation would be sending such a letter, and so ... I guess, I just find that strange to be coming on board.

JC – I think it's a hangover. I know Councillor Harris will recall, and I think Director Corrigan was around at the time, although maybe not actually on the Board, but the actual conflict over the logging in the watershed was absolutely intense. We were spending loads and loads of money on trying to prove on one side, scientifically, that logging didn't contribute to turbidity, or on the other side, that it did. It went beyond rationality. It went into incredible emotion on both sides. Incredible irritation. Loads of energy – political energy, staff energy, community energy – spent on that. And for those people who are convinced that logging was a very deleterious activity in the watershed, Mr. Koop and others were one of their leading figures and leading heroes in bringing about a change in that policy. And, so I think there is a sort of legacy of that that people want to support Mr. Koop in keeping an eye on us, and see that we are doing the right thing. And, certainly, periodic visits to the watershed for Mr. Koop, or Mrs. Golds, who I also know and get along with, I mean, those are entirely appropriate. What we are talking about here is not that. I think their sort of impression is that Mr. Koop has been banned from the watersheds. That's not true. What is of issue here is that anybody should have untrammelled access to the watershed, or whether they should go through the normal route of coming to this committee and saying we want to go and have a look at what you are doing. Under those circumstances I would support visits and through an appropriate process.

TS – Thankyou. Councillor Barnes.

LB – I think my question was to staff is if indeed we did decide to have a trip through the watershed, would that be open to the public?

TS – To come with us you mean? That would be a mess, wouldn't it?

JC – Mr. Chairman. Again. Back in those circumstances in the late 1990s, and the first part of this century. We did run trips into the watershed for committee. And, if there were two or three extra spaces on the bus we made a point of inviting people, like Mr. Koop, or Mr. Hundal, and the activists who were there, to accompany us, to show that we were being open and transparent, and to listen to their feedback. And, I would certainly have no objection that, if that it was not open to the public so that we have a wagon train going through the watershed. But, if there is a vehicle with some seats left over then accommodating Mr. Koop, or someone else, we have certainly no objection to that.

LB – Thank you for that, because that is what I was getting at.

TS – I think that is a great idea. But I am just wondering whether we can pull it off with this committee, or whether we have to put it off into the watersheds. We are short on time now, and we are moving into elections.

Tom Heath – If I may, Mr. Chair. I think that's a very practical suggestion. It's really best done in the summer time. We can count on better weather, and when we are actively working on that road deactivation.

TS – Mr. Corrigan.

DC – I don't know ... I think probably some of the cities may not have the same difficulty the larger cities have with self-appointed experts, but we certainly have our share in the city of Burnaby, and I suspect that others might have theirs. If you are not big enough to have self-appointed experts, then just wait, because there are certain people who believe they know more than our staff, more than our politicians, and that they are the true experts on what is happening on any of our individual facilities or parks or anywhere else, and they want access into those facilities. So, everyone of us when we are making these decisions have to consider not only do we support the person, but also a precedent that is set, and how you apply policies that are applied universally, as opposed to one-off individuals sort of situations.

There is a considerable degree of paranoia that went on. And I was here for the discussions that went on in discussions on logging in the watershed. And there was a considerable degree of paranoia, that we were liars and cheats, and that – and it wasn't true. We were dealing actively with the reports that we had available. We were bringing in the right experts. And we were providing information, on both sides. Yet, there was disbelief throughout, that somehow we were making Soy lent Green³ in the watershed.

³ The science fiction movie, Soy lent Green, was released in 1973. The intrigue or plot about the movie was how the leading figure in the movie discovered that the government at that time in the future was secretly processing the dead into products for human consumption.

You know, there is paranoia out there, and particularly in this element of the population. Paranoia runs rampant. So, you know, I'm not surprised that they all believe there is a conspiracy in the watershed, because, I mean, you ask, how does the Suzuki Foundation support this? How do they support the provincial Carbon Tax? I mean, who knows what goes on in the head of David Suzuki. But, they are certainly supportive of having Koop go in there. And he's isolated this big movements people as somehow a self-appointed and self-acknowledged expert on our watershed. You know, I deeply resent the comments in there that somehow that he's the person they trust to deal with this issue because sitting around this table are a bunch of people who were elected by the population to deal with this issue. It's our responsibility to ensure that the watershed is properly looked after. And it's the responsibility of our staff and a fiduciary duty to the Water District. And it's Mr. Carline's fiduciary duty to look after the watershed and the quality of our water. So, I resent, or anybody else, suggesting that we are not doing our job, and Mr. Koop can do it better, or that somehow we are secretly doing things behind Mr. Koop's back, and the David Suzuki Foundation's back, to destroy the quality of our water. It's ludicrous, it's paranoid, and it really doesn't represent the best of what environmental groups should be doing in regard to making an effort to improve our society and our environment. So, I'm certainly not supportive of this. And I think Mr. Carline is being more reasonable than I might be in this situation. Of course, I'm not a CEO. But, I think we are being more than reasonable to say that if there is an issue, there is more than one way to look at it. Then we can deal with it, and we are happy to deal with it. If we want to, if there is anyone around this table who feels that our watershed is not being appropriately being looked after then let's have an external audit of the watershed, and call in professionals to have a look at it. But we have no reason to do that. If we believe that somehow our staff is not doing the proper job, let's call the professionals in and have a look at it, and decide what we are going to do. But that is our job as politicians. It's not our job to have some self-appointed experts to go in and look over our staff's shoulders and tell us whether or not we are doing a good job. Very strongly, I disagree with the position that is being taken, and I don't want to set a precedent with us doing this in this situation. We will live to regret it, and have other situations where there is other self-appointed experts want access to our facilities.

TS – Thankyou Director Corrigan. Director Steele.

BS – Thankyou. Well, I agree with Director Corrigan. In the case of Surrey, we have an awful lot of self-appointed experts. In fact, so many that we simply⁴ And, once word of this becomes even more public you are going to have, I can guarantee you, probably about 30 or 40 people from Surrey that are going to want exactly the same access. And, you know, typically these people are experts in their very narrow field. But it doesn't go to the extent we happen to have here. And I just think we are opening up a can of worms. I think that Mr. Carline has been more than generous, he's been more than generous with Mr. Koop. I mean, I shudder at the fact that he had taken a television crew, or what groups of people they may take in. I mean, who knows what could be dumped in a creek. I mean, what's our liability if somebody breaks their back or something when they are up

⁴ The audio recording is faint. The rest of the sentence sounds like "refuse to acknowledge them, and you know, we don't have any."

there. Mr. Koop has shown ... I don't know. I just think the principle of this is to open that can of worms and let one person in. It's just ludicrous.

TS – Thank you. Oh. I'm sorry. Director Harris. Yes.

JH – I'm just going to ask about the policy for individuals from the public to request special permission into our watersheds. That is, we still have that as an option for Mr. Koop and others. So, does that go directly to the Board, or does that come to our committee first? I think we should refresh our memory on that. We are not saying that over-viewing cannot take place. I think the residue from the battle to ban logging from our watersheds, you know, was intense, and was radioactive, and tough. But I think what Mr. Koop's interest revolves around, no doubt, would be to the mopping up job of that successful effort of the citizenry, and the over-viewing some of the logging roads, and the deactivation of some of those roads, and how we are handling that. On our tours we don't necessarily go that deep into that part of our operation. I had one opportunity in a helicopter tour to overview a deactivated logging road. But it wasn't easy to get to. But if that is the request, if that's the interest, then Mr. Koop can go through the process as it currently exists and we can keep it on a fair and equitable basis, and manage from that point of view. And, I trust our staff will, and the Board, will review it fairly. And, I think we should move it forward...

TS – Yes.

MR – My comment then, I thank you Mr. Carline. That was really useful information. Because, when you read through this, as I do, as a newer member of the Board, but also as the general public would, if they looked at this, it sounds like we are some dastardly group that is not letting this poor young sole ...

Comment from a male Director – Older.

MR – Sorry, older, to simply walk through the watershed.

A male Director – (some quiet comment)

MR – Well, whatever. I just that all these letters from all these organizations, who are very well respected, are giving the wrong impression to the general public if they started to read them. I would suggest that the committee write back to these organizations and advise them of the process for entry into the watershed area, and that it is used for the protection of the general public. Not to mention that I think he abused any privilege that was extended to him by, what, bringing in the TV camera. I think that is despicable.

TS – Normally we would just receive these [the four letters in the Water Committee Agenda], but if you want to make a motion to it might just keep it going.

DC – I second it. I think we should aggressively go back. I think Director Reid is entirely right. We should go back and respond to these letters and make it clear that we are

looking after every watershed, thank you very much. We have a job to do on this committee, and Burke Mountain and David Suzuki and the rest of them should be aware that we are doing our best.

TS – Maybe, Director Reid, if you

MR – I would make a motion that we write a very firm and forceful letter back to these people advising them of their rights and the process by which they may enter the watershed.

TS – And also to receive the letters.

MR – Pardon?

TS – And also to receive the letters.

DC – I'll second the motion.

BS – Question.

TS – Director Steele.

BS – I just wondered if this letter is going to come under staff signature, or that the Board is making this specific ...

TS – Letters are to the Board and the Chair so ...

BS – Thank you.

MR – But I'm sure Director Corrigan can write it, as the last one was pretty good.

DC – Much more reasonable and conciliatory. That was a trial work.

TS – All those in favour. Carried.

APPENDICES BELOW

APPENDIX A – THE FOUR LETTERS TO THE WATER COMMITTEE, AGENDA PACKAGE FOR SEPTEMBER 10, 2008

Letter No. 1

From: Joe Foy [mailto:dublusee2@yahoo.ca]
Sent: Thursday, August 28, 2008 8:45 AM
To: GVRDSEC
Subject:

August 28, 2008

To: Metro Vancouver Water Committee
Sent via email to: gvrldsec@metrovancouver.org

From: Joe Foy, National Campaign Director, Wilderness Committee, 227, Abbott Street, Vancouver, BC V6B 2K7 Tel (604) 683-8220 - (letter sent from home email address)

Item for inclusion in September, 2008 Water Committee meeting.

Attention: Director and Chair, Metro Vancouver Water Committee, Tim Stevenson, Committee Directors.

Re: Support for Mr. Will Koop's request for continued access into Metro Vancouver's three drinking watershed sources.

Chair & Directors,

The Wilderness Committee is Canada's largest membership based, wilderness preservation organization. We currently have 30,000 members from coast to coast, with the largest portion in BC. We have long advocated a policy of protecting drinking water by placing a ban on commercial logging within water supply catchment areas. Metro Vancouver, since 1999 has imposed a logging ban in its water supply areas.

Although in its early years Metro Vancouver did have a ban on logging in the watersheds, logging was allowed in the 60s, 70s, 80s and 90s. It took the work of many citizen activists to get the destructive practice of watershed logging stopped in 1999.

One of the activists key in this watershed protection work was Mr. Will Koop.

Mr. Koop served a valuable role throughout the 1990s to re-protect our watersheds, during which time he wrote numerous reports and letters of correspondence, and made numerous appearances and presentations to Water Committee and Board meetings. In 1999, the Wilderness Committee honoured Mr. Koop with its annual Eugene Rogers Environmental Award, for his work to protect Metro Vancouver's Drinking Watersheds.

After the watersheds were re-protected in November, 1999, he was provided access into the watersheds by Metro Vancouver politicians and administration staff, primarily to monitor the state of logging roads and former clear-cutting operations.

The Wilderness Committee is aware of Mr. Koop's two delegations before the Water Committee (November 2007 and May 2008) specifically with regard to his request for continued access into Metro Vancouver's watersheds. We understand from information provided on the B.C. Tap Water Alliance website that his request was referred back to staff for comment by the Water Committee after each delegation, and that Watershed Operations administration staff repeatedly recommended Mr. Koop's former access be discontinued.

We support Mr. Koop's critical function as an informative, independent public representative to monitor the state of our drinking watersheds.

We request that the elected representatives on the Metro Vancouver Water Committee also support Mr. Koop's request for continued access by way of a Committee resolution during its September 2008 meeting, and refer the resolution to the next Metro Vancouver Water District Administration Board meeting for approval in late September, 2008.

Sincerely, Joe Foy,
Wilderness Committee

Letter No. 2

David Suzuki Foundation

2211 West 4th Avenue 604 732 4228 tel
Suit 219 604 732 0752 fax
Vancouver BC www.davidsuzuki.org
Canada V6K 4S2

August 28, 2008

Attn: Director and Chair, Metro Vancouver Water Committee, Tim Stevenson,
Committee Directors.

Re: Support for Mr. Will Koop's request for continued access into Metro Vancouver's three drinking watershed sources.

Chair & Directors,

I am writing in support of Mr. Will Koop's request for continued access into Metro Vancouver's three drinking watershed sources. The David Suzuki Foundation has long

been a supporter of measures that ensure the health of Canadians and their natural resources.

The David Suzuki Foundation recognizes the significant accomplishments of Mr. Koop throughout the 1990s when he was deeply involved in achieving a recommitment to BC's watershed protection. In November of 1999, Mr. Koop was provided access into the watersheds by Metro Vancouver politicians and administration staff. He acted as an informative, independent public representative who monitored the state of our drinking watersheds.

The David Suzuki Foundation is aware of Mr. Koop's two previous appearances before the Water Committee (November 2007 and May 2008) where he requested the reinstatement of his access into Metro Vancouver's watersheds. We understand that after each successive delegation, his request was referred back to staff for comment and the Watershed Operations administration staff declined to grant him access on both occasions.

We are supportive of the important role served by Mr. Koop as an informative, independent public representative to monitor the state of our drinking watersheds.

The David Suzuki Foundation requests that the elected representatives on the Metro Vancouver Water Committee also support Mr. Koop's request for continued access by way of a Committee resolution during its September 2008 meeting, and refer the resolution to the next Metro Vancouver Water District Administration Board meeting for approval in late September, 2008.

Sincerely, Jay Ritchlin
Director, Marine & Freshwater Conservation

Letter No. 3

August 28, 2008

To: Metro Vancouver Water Committee
Sent via email to: gvrldsec@metrovancover.org
From: Ross Muirhead, Co-Founder Friends of the Watersheds. 3096 Paisley Rd. North
Vancouver, BC V7R 1C9

Item for inclusion in the September 2008 Water Committee meeting.

Attention: Director and Chair, Metro Vancouver Water Committee, Tim Stevenson, Committee Directors.

Re: Support for Will Koop's request for continued access into Metro Vancouver's three drinking watershed sources for citizen monitoring

Chair & Directors,

Friends of the Watersheds (FOW) is a North Shore based conservation group that has advocated for the protection of the 3 watersheds – Capilano, Seymour and Coquitlam from logging and roadbuilding. The ban on logging in the watershed areas in 1999 was a victory for us and many other groups working towards this goal.

To get this ban, took hundreds of volunteer hours by critiquing GVRD staff reports that attempted to rationale logging as a 'forest management tool', and roadbuilding as a means access the valleys for fire fighting crews, and for getting access to its cutblocks. All of these management tools has since been shown to be based on false assumptions.

We still have concerns on the state of the roadbuilding operations and lack of re-activation of former logging roads that need to be monitored and independently critiqued.

One of the leading critics of the watershed forestry department in the early 1990's was Mr. Will Koop. From his extensive knowledge in watershed ecology, hydrology and old-growth forest dynamics he made report after report on how to better manage our watersheds.

After the watersheds were 're-protected' in November, 1999, Koop was provided access into the watersheds by Metro Vancouver politicians and administration staff, primarily to monitor the state of logging roads and former clear-cutting operations. Some of his findings went against Staff's opinion which lead to a healthy debate for the Water Committee to consider.

FOW is aware of Mr. Koop's two delegations before the Water Committee (November 2007 and May 2008) specifically with regard to his request for continued access into Metro Vancouver's watersheds. We understand from information provided on the B.C. Tap Water Alliance website that his request was referred back to staff for comment by the Water Committee after each delegation, and that Watershed Operations administration staff repeatedly recommended Mr. Koop's former access be discontinued for reasons not clearly articulated.

We support Mr. Koop's critical function as an informative, independent citizen representative to monitor the state of our drinking watersheds.

FOW requests that the elected representatives on the Metro Vancouver Water Committee support Mr. Koop's request for continued access by way of a Committee resolution during its September 2008 meeting, and refer the resolution to the next Metro Vancouver Water District Administration Board meeting for approval in late September, 2008.

Best Regards,
Ross Muirhead
Friends of the Watersheds

Letter No. 4

August 28, 2008

Chair Tim Stevenson and Members
Metro Vancouver Water Committee
4330 Kingsway
Burnaby, BC V5H 4G8

Transmitted by fax (2 pages): 604-451-6686

Dear Chair Stevenson and Members of the Water Committee:

**Re: September 10 Water Committee Meeting
Continued Support for Citizen Access into Public Drinking Watersheds**

Throughout the 1990s, our Society participated in the extensive public consultation over drinking watershed management. We also submitted many letters and attended most Water Committee meetings, provided detailed analyses of a number of reports and appeared as a delegation to many Water Committee meetings and GVRD Board meetings. Our interest lay in seeing drinking watershed management shift towards policies based on sound scientific principles in conjunction with a cessation of logging, especially of old growth forests, in these watersheds. We were very supportive of the resolution passed by the GVRD Board in 1999 which enshrines these objectives and calls for open and transparent decisions regarding management in our three public drinking watersheds. I also served for several years as a member and Vice Chair of the now-disbanded Regional Water Advisory Committee (RWAC).

Residents of Metro Vancouver owe a great deal to Will Koop for his extreme diligence in reporting on activities in the watersheds over many years and the prominent role he played in having the 1999 policies adopted. Although Will was never appointed as an official member of RWAC (a significant oversight on the part of GVRD, in my view), he attended all their meetings and made many significant contributions to the work of this Committee. Once the 1999 policies were adopted, Will maintained a cordial relationship with watershed staff and made several (accompanied) trips into the watershed to continue to monitor watershed management programs such as road-deactivation. Following these watershed tours, Will did an outstanding job of reporting back to RWAC and as well as to interested NGOs and members of the public. In addition, he published detailed reports and continues to maintain the BC Tap Water Alliance website which provides information on the GVRD Watersheds. To my mind, Will continues to play a key role as a “public watchdog”. Ongoing public confidence in the manner in which our watersheds are managed lies, in large part, on Will’s reports. It is essential that Will continue to have access to the MV drinking watersheds so that he can continue to report on watershed management activities and watershed conditions. This is all the more critical now that RWAC has been disbanded and regular detailed MV staff reports on watershed management have been essentially curtailed.

We were dismayed to learn that Will is now experiencing difficulty in gaining access to the watersheds. No one wants to return to the fractious days of the 1990s when the debate over drinking watershed management became polarized, very public and the subject of frequent articles in the press. The public will only continue to have confidence in how our drinking watersheds are managed if some public access is allowed. **After all, how can the decision-making process be truly transparent and accountable to the public unless members of the public can view the condition of the watersheds from time to time?**

We can think of no one who would do a better job of being our public watchdog on this issue than Will Koop. Thus, we urge you to support Will's request for access to the watersheds and forward, without delay, a resolution to the next meeting of the Metro Vancouver Board.

Sincerely yours
Elaine Golds, Ph.D.
Conservation Chair
604-937-3483 or egolds@sfu.ca

APPENDIX B – Two Delegation Excerpts to Metro Vancouver's Water Committee

1. A Segment from Will Koop's Four-Page Written Presentation to Metro Vancouver Water District's Water Committee, Regarding: Public Comments Related to the Drinking Water Management Plan Progress Report, November 14, 2007

November 2006 Storm and Turbidity Events

There is no report information in the Progress Report on last year's significant rainstorm events responsible for overloading the Water District's distribution system with turbid waters, and the closure of the Capilano Reservoir. During these rainstorm events, I was provided with a tour of the Capilano watershed. I should clarify to members of this Committee that after the watersheds were protected by the Board in November 1999, in 2000 I was extended an invitation by Metro Vancouver staff to become an honorary member of the Regional Water Advisory Committee, which I accepted. During this time, I helped form a sub-committee devoted to the inspection of the road deactivation program in the watersheds. And, it was during this time that arrangements were made for me to enter the watershed with Operations staff to inspect the roads and related matters upon my request. I, and occasionally members of RWAC, did so, respectfully, and presentations were made to RWAC about the deactivation program. The reason for my access was related to the olive branch extended to me and my function as an independent representative of the public, to provide the public with a measure of accountability. For those who may be unfamiliar with the previous history of watershed management, this type of representation was sadly absent before 1999.

When the turbidity events occurred in November 2006, I was contacted by members of the public and some media on what was occurring and if I could provide them with information. I therefore arranged for a tour of the Capilano watershed, which was provided for almost immediately by staff. However, when I provided details of some of the information I video recorded and photographed to the media, I was informed that someone in Operations had officially suspended me from re-entering the watersheds with staff.

I want to say on record, that at no time did I provide the media, or the public, with errant information. I did my interpretive homework on the logging history in the area above Sisters

Creek (old aerial photos, maps, etc.) which I have much information about, and carefully stated the facts to everyone.

What I was very curious about at the time were the numerous details and incidents observed and collected by Operations staff about all the related landslide and erosion events in all three watersheds. On November 15th, I accompanied Ross Muirhead on a visit he arranged with a staff member to examine detailed map information staff had pinpointing the location of the numerous types of erosion and landslide events. When I asked if I could take a photo of this map, I was told that I couldn't, that I would have to make a written request to do so. I reluctantly agreed, and then later emailed the staff member requesting this information – I was never provided a response to my request. I'm not here to make a scene (perhaps the staff member never received the email), but to inform you that this information should have been provided to me at the time. I don't know what happened to the map information. If the information is still available, I would ask the Committee to have someone kindly make it available to me for my records.

I would also ask this Committee to consider reinstating my previous arrangement to access the watersheds with staff from time to time. This is very important, and will provide the public with confidence that they have at least someone to represent them to inspect what is occurring in the watersheds, to occasionally observe what might be otherwise unavailable for their knowledge on the sources of their drinking water. The public has a right to know, and everything should be done to freely accommodate such an opportunity.

2. Presentation to Metro Vancouver Water Committee, May 14, 2008, by Will Koop, Coordinator, B.C. Tap Water Alliance. (website: www.alternatives.com/bctwa)

Continued access to the Metro Vancouver Watersheds

At the end of my presentation on November 14, 2007, a Water Committee member asked staff about the concerns I raised regarding continued access to the watersheds. Tom Heath, Manager of Operations and Maintenance, simply replied that it was against Metro Vancouver Board policy to do so. I am concerned he has not fully imparted to the Water Committee my previous open access to the watersheds (in the company of staff).

I am concerned because it appears that the open and transparent policy (last point in the five part resolution adopted as part of the special two-hour long Metro Vancouver Water Board meeting on November 10, 1999) may no longer be being followed.

In order to provide a brief history of public access to the watersheds, let me provide you with this summary.

Sixteen years ago in 1992, I requested access to the watersheds to monitor the logging road and former logging activities. Initially, former watershed operations manager Ed Hamaguchi provided me with such a schedule beginning in October 1992, when I was given a tour of the Coquitlam watershed. However, by May 1993, following Mr. Hamaguchi's sudden departure, in a private meeting with the new operations manager

Bob Cavill he immediately cancelled my access schedule from continuing, and such opportunities were lost over the next 6 years.

Subsequently, following numerous requests, staff continued to advise Metro Vancouver Directors against my access, citing, as did Tom Heath and Stan Woods, that I have “no business” in the watersheds and “access permission is not consistent with Board policy”. These statements were typically made when members of the public inquired about road failures and landslide events that staff failed to properly document to the Water Committee and the public. In response, staff continued to state that there was no relationship between logging activities and water quality, statements questioned by many members of the public.

After many years, following a March 1999 Water Committee delegation, Water Committee members finally overruled staff and provided me with a three-month watershed visitation schedule, which the Metro Vancouver Board also agreed to at the March 1999 monthly meeting.

During the following two to three months, staff provided me with a tour of each watershed over some seven visitations. During these field trips from April to June, I regularly documented the road network and clearcutting practices and repercussions with both still and video cameras. On one of the visits to the Daniels Creek drainage in the Capilano watershed, we witnessed multiple and severe erosion events that occurred over the winter to the steeply sloped logging road, which included a number of landslides into Daniels Creek. This information was then made public. The point about this episode, and others like it, is that at the time forestry and engineering staff were not reporting such matters to the public and public confidence in the manner in which their drinking watersheds were being managed diminished considerably.

A half a year later, at the November 10, 1999 Metro Vancouver Water Board meeting, I presented the Board with a slide show accompanying a lengthy report, *Silty Sources*. In the executive summary were three future planning recommendations, the first of which called for logging road deactivation:

Road deactivation is an important consideration for the future management of the watersheds, a subject which is strangely lacking in the ecological inventory reports. The Scientific Review Panel also acknowledges this in their latest October 1999 report, where “roads receive inadequate attention”. They go on to state that “analysis might reveal that a significant portion of the road system is no longer needed, making a deactivation schedule, balancing maintenance and deactivation costs, an important element in the management plan” (page 12).

On this particular topic, we suggest that the GVRD consider forming a public Greater Vancouver Watersheds Road Committee to identify the problems with the existing road structures and to come up with an immediate and long term road deactivation program. The City of Seattle, for example, is developing a long term

road deactivation plan for its Cedar River watershed, and has already set aside funds for this project.

What followed in the year 2000 during a meeting of the Regional Water Advisory Committee was an invitation extended by Metro Vancouver staff for me to participate on the Committee. That occasion began a new period of cooperation, a symbol of peace-making. As a result, I helped form a logging roads sub-committee, where members of RWAC made recommendations to the Water Committee following tours of logging roads before and during their being decommissioned.

I was also told by staff that whenever I wanted to enter the watersheds I would simply have to contact staff, and a suitable time for staff to accompany me would be arranged. This was all part of the new peace arrangement and readjustment period, where relations were very amicable and enjoyable. This is what continued to occur until November 2006 when I was provided with a tour of the Capilano watershed following the heavy rainstorm events. Following the broadcast of video footage by the media from my trip, I was told that a senior administrator had temporarily suspended my visitation privileges.

Metro-Vancouver senior staff is saying, as they did in the 1990s, that I no longer have “Metro-Vancouver business” to conduct informational visitations of the watersheds. I would suggest to the Water Committee and to the Metro Vancouver Water Board that, as much as I had in the past, I do continue to qualify as having “business” in the public’s watersheds, and that I represent the concerned public in so doing.

Continued access to the watersheds is part of the necessary “transparency” of information as stated and agreed to in point number five of the five-point Greater Vancouver Watersheds Declaration of November 10, 1999.

APPENDIX C – EXCERPTS FROM TWO WATER COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDAS, WITH PREVIOUS MINUTES AND REPORTS, REGARDING STAFF’S COMMENTS AGAINST WILL KOOP’S FURTHER ACCESS INTO THE WATERSHEDS

1. Water Committee Meeting Date: February 13, 2008

To: Water Committee
From: Stan Woods, Senior Engineer
Policy and Planning Department

Date: February 1, 2008

Subject: **Public Comment on the Progress Report for the Drinking Water Management Plan**

Recommendation: That the Board receive for information the report dated February 1, 2008, titled “Public Comment on the Progress Report for the Drinking Water Management Plan.”

Mr. Koop asked for permission to access the watersheds.

Staff response: Board policy limits access to the watersheds to those involved in Metro Vancouver business. Mr. Koop is not involved in Metro Vancouver business, so granting him access permission is not consistent with Board policy.

2. Water Committee Meeting Date: July 9, 2008

To: Water Committee
From: Toivo Allas, Manager
Policy and Planning Department, and
Tom Heath, Manager
Operations and Maintenance Department

Date: June 27, 2008

Subject: **Managers’ Report**

c) *“Continued access to Metro Vancouver Watersheds”.*

The February 13 Water Committee report also addressed this issue. By policy, only those involved in Metro Vancouver business are permitted into the watersheds. Given the proximity of the watersheds to the adjacent urban area there are numerous requests for access into the watersheds for a variety of reasons – staff believes that this long standing policy continues to serve the organization well.