

10 July 2008

Dear Mayor Smith and Councillors,

I am responding to Council regarding allegations made by Stewart Cohen, the Environmental and Turf Consultant who has been retained by Red Mountain Ventures, that I have 'misled' my colleagues and you about the hazards of pesticides. The basis of his claim is that he considers the document which I cited as my source, namely The College of Family Physicians of Ontario's Pesticide Literature Review to be 'flawed'.

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. Unlike Stewart Cohen, I have no vested interests in RMV. What I have, as a physician, is 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 admitted publicly at the June 24th 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 chemical 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. Katkof and offered this as explanation for why approval is first necessary. I would argue Mr. Katkof 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. Stuart 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.

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. In the enclosed attachments is information sent in response. Their response is self-evident. I ask that you please review this information prior to making you decision on July 14th. 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.

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 88. 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 on July 14th. 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.

Respectfully,

Dr. Cheryl Hume