

Mayor and Councillors,

14 July 2008

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to speak to you this evening regarding the proposed application for development of a golf course with our community's watershed. We are aware that you will be voting on this matter later in this meeting, and we know that you have had a great deal of information before you and so we appreciate your time and attention. We are local physicians, my name is Cheryl Hume. We echo the concerns of many of our colleagues and other health care workers in our community, as well as those of our patients and other community members.

I am a family physician who has lived and practiced in this community for the past 20 years and a large proportion of my practice involves maternal, neonatal and paediatric care. My reason for becoming involved in this matter is a concern for the health and well being of my patients, my family and my fellow residents of Rossland. As a physician, I have a very significant concern about the potential for contamination by pesticides of our drinking water supply by the proposed development and the here-to-for complete lack of study or information about what pesticides will be used and whether or not seepage into the water reservoir is a possibility.

Stewart Cohen, the Environmental and Turf Consultant, retained by Mr. Katkov and RMV has admitted publicly at the June 24<sup>th</sup> RMV open meeting that the proposed golf course will not be organic and, in fact, in his letter to you dated 2 July 2008 he states "only approximately 4.4 – 7.2% of the overall project will consist of golf course turf treated with fungicides and /or herbicides". He was quite clear about the necessity of using these chemicals in order to ensure the financial viability of larger commercial golf course concerns. He has also declined to specify which pesticides and fungicides he will recommend until after he conducts his study; which will only take place after approval of the proposal by council is received. He was very sensitive to the potential costs such a study would incur to Mr. Katkov and offered this as an explanation for why approval is first necessary. I would argue Mr. Katkov is reasonably obliged to provide this essential information prior to requesting that a community accept the placement of a golf course in their watershed and as a businessman with conscience he ought not to request approval unless he is fully confident it is safe to do so. Stewart Cohen is by training and reputation a turf consultant, and I expect he is fully aware of what the most likely pesticides and fungicides he will most likely recommend from his armamentarium of usual choices. His reluctance to be forthcoming on this matter when directly questioned about it at the public meeting was evasive.

Stewart Cohen has alleged in a letter to you that I have misled you and my colleagues regarding the potential hazards of pesticides. I have been in communication with The College of Family Physicians of Ontario and with Dr. David Suzuki regarding Stewart Cohen's assertions that their information is misleading and flawed. As you know I have forwarded the response to you so that you could review it before making a decision this evening. Their response is self-evident. I remain confident in the information I presented to you and my colleagues and I personally do not question the integrity of The College of Family Physicians of Ontario or The David Suzuki Foundation and I note the Canadian

Cancer Society, The Canadian Association of Physicians for The Environment, and Physicians for Social Responsibility are among other groups that share their concern. It is unethical to do controlled, peer-reviewed clinical trials to evaluate the potential harm to humans of pesticides. The harm we know of is from information gathered about people who were unwittingly exposed. What is misleading is the suggestion that there is no cause for concern as appropriate technological and scientific manoeuvres will be undertaken by RMV and these will be sufficient to allay our concerns and mitigate damage. This is a great leap of faith for the citizens of Rossland and I am personally not reassured by a turf consultant's offer of guardianship of the water supply and I am deeply skeptical of a monitoring process that is ultimately based in Maryland, USA.

In particular, I would like you to be aware that the U.K. agency cited by Stewart Cohen as critical of The College of Family Physicians of Ontario document was a pest control regulatory agency and that there was a minority report submitted by the non-industry members of this agency which was supportive of the physician document. You will also note in the information contained in the attachments that there is ongoing concern regarding 2-4-D and its association with cancer. There is an intellectual gap between citing Health Canada's statement that 2-4-D use is acceptable if used in accordance with manufacture's guidelines and conceiving that it is potentially safe in drinking water.

In a letter to Mr. Murray Ramsden, The CEO of The Interior Health Authority I requested that public health regulations be fully enforced regarding the safety of The City of Rossland's water supply. In response, the Public Health Officer met with me and a group of physicians to hear our concerns. From this discussion it is evident that public health regulatory measures are more reactive than proactive. They cannot investigate or enforce unless there is an approved proposal; they then become involved in a monitoring and regulatory capacity. This concerns me as I believe Council should be fully apprised of all the health regulations pertaining to pesticides and water safety in advance of making a decision to accept this proposal, as public health regulations may alone negate the proposal. To date, I am not aware that council has been presented with such information. I am further concerned that the implementation of regulations once a developer is granted approval is problematic, as we have witnessed with the violations to date by Creekside At Red. It is not acceptable for a developer to act first then ask forgiveness later in a watershed. To rescind or halt a development proposal once approved will be predictably difficult and complicated for The City of Rossland and the citizens of Rossland.

Council shoulders a heavy responsibility in making this decision. The lack of information upon which to make a carefully considered decision and the apparent rapidity of the decision making process augers against approving this proposal tonight. The universal guiding principle for physicians is "first do no harm", and it is from this perspective that I ask you to safeguard the community's drinking water supply. Health Canada's 'precautionary principle' is of paramount importance here and should be applied in making your decision. This principle asserts that "when an activity raises threats of harm to human health or the environment, precautionary measures should be taken even if some cause and effect relationships are not fully understood". You do not

know the effect of placing a golf course in a community's watershed. We must not do harm.

I have been present when a parent has been told their child has a brain tumour, I have cared for children on chemotherapy and I have cared for women who miscarry. There are never any answers to the question 'Why?', and nobody every wants to be there. Our actions, as a community, should be to ensure that we all do what we can to prevent potential harm to our most vulnerable members. There are many women in this community who are meticulous in caring for themselves and their unborn babies, and we too must protect them.

There are many people in this community who have relocated here precisely because it is a beautiful, safe, clean and healthy environment, an ideal place to raise a family. I have personally been involved in the recruitment of numerous physicians to this community, and I can attest to this being one of the most important reasons they decided to come here. There are many other people from all walks of life, who perform valuable functions and services in this community; many of which are essential to this community who also expect a quality environment and that it will be safeguarded by local authorities.

You have heard from a wide spectrum of concerned Rossland residents who are opposed to this proposal. I ask you to please listen to their voices, as well as our professional concern, and not accept this proposal as it places the water we drink at risk.