



Sunshine Coast Conservation Association

Newsletter Issue 8

PO Box 1969, Sechelt, BC, V0N 3A0; www.thescca.ca

March/2004

Private Land Conservation Now an Option on the Sunshine Coast

by Brad Benson

Picture the many beautiful coastal properties that have served as family escapes for decades, the secluded pools and beaches, the waterfalls and forests that have been treasured as grandfather's woods or simply enjoyed as unspoiled wildlife habitat. What will become of them 20, 30 or 75 years from now?

The Sunshine Coast Conservation Association is pleased to announce that we are now authorized by both provincial and federal authorities to hold conservation covenants on private land and to receive ecological gifts. Covenants are carefully drafted instructions that reflect the landowner's specific wishes

continued on page 3

Following the Certification Trail: a New Route to Sustainability

by Maria Hunter and Daniel Bouman

The lack of formal recognition and protection of wildlife habitats in the Sunshine Coast Forest District has been an important focus for the SCCA since 1999. In March 2000 the SCCA filed a major complaint with BC's Forest Practices Board (FPB) and cited 128 improper logging approvals in rare old-growth stands, marbled murrelet nesting habitat and mountain goat winter range. Only three of Interfor's 26 Forest Development Plans in the Vancouver region were evaluated for this complaint. Despite a finding of the Forest Practices Board that many of these approvals were inappropriate, and a subsequent finding from an administrative review panel, Interfor still retains the vast majority of these approvals. Some of these blocks have even been logged.

In April 2003 the SCCA initiated a new approach to this persistent situation. A formal complaint challenging Interfor's ISO 14001 program certification and Sustainable Forestry Initiative certification was filed with KPMG, performance auditors, in Vancouver. All the documents associated with our challenge are available in detail on our website, www.thescca.ca.

Certification systems are intended to provide consumers with an independent verification of

continued on page 2



This frosty landscape near Lund is part of a property that may one day soon be protected by a private conservation covenant.

Daniel Bouman

Hotel Lake: Where's the Water?

by Dr. John Field

In the latter half of 2003 a drama was played out at Hotel Lake, near Irvine's Landing in Pender Harbour. A side battle in the larger war that has long gripped the Sunshine Coast over control of community watersheds, it involved the Sunshine Coast Regional District, local residents and two development applications. This particular skirmish took place largely out of the limelight, but the outcome will have broad implications for how drinking water is managed in the Pender Harbour area—and perhaps beyond.

continued on page 2

The SCCA Annual General Meeting

will be held Saturday, April 17, 2004
noon to 3 p.m. at the Seaside Centre
(5790 Teredo Street, Sechelt).

Please try to attend this important event!

Inside This Issue

New Forest Regulations	3
Texada Sticklebacks	4
Old Growth Update	5
Egmont Logging Photos	5
Sakinaw Lake Sockeye	6
Noteworthy News & Events	6
Executive Director's Report	7

continued from page 1

Hotel Lake: Where's the Water?

The story began when developers applied to the SCRD for permits to subdivide parcels of land for housing at Daniel Point and for a condo-hotel complex at Irvine's Landing. The SCRD's existing water licence on Hotel Lake was not adequate to supply these or other future developments in the area, so the district applied to Land and Water BC Inc for an increase in its licence from 47.7 million litres per year to 111.3 million, more than doubling the amount of water it would be able to draw from the lake. To support its application, the SCRD required the developers to commission a hydrological study to ensure there was enough water for the increase and an environmental assessment to identify and address potential impacts on wildlife.

Area residents were concerned about both the scale of the proposed developments and the effects on their small lake. They formed the Area A Quality Water Association (now an SCCA member group), and after some wrangling, obtained copies of the hydrological and environmental assessments. In August 2003, AAQWA directors Joe Harrison, Peter and Cheryl Steernberg and Joanne McClusky submitted a comprehensive analysis of the hydrological study to Land and Water BC, pointing out serious flaws in the figures used by the consultant to support the SCRD's proposed increase. With corrected figures, AAQWA concluded that the proposed increase in water usage was unsustainable. If all users, including the SCRD, withdrew water up to their licensed amounts, Hotel



Hotel Lake in more peaceful days.

June Malaka photo

Lake's surface outlet stream would cease to flow year-round, and the lake level would begin to drop steadily except in years of exceptional rainfall.

Environmental repercussions of accelerated water withdrawal from Hotel Lake were examined in AAQWA's report and in briefs prepared by SCCA directors Dr Michael Jackson and Dr John Field. We raised concerns that fluctuating lake levels would affect the lake's endemic population of

sticklebacks, and that reduced outflow would eliminate spawning habitat for lake-dwelling trout and chub. In addition, reduced availability of water to lakes and streams further down the watershed would adversely influence spawning runs of both coho salmon and the critically endangered Sakinaw Lake sockeye.

Local residents, despite their efforts, half-expected Land and Water BC to rule in favour of the increased

water licence. However, in a surprisingly enlightened decision, the agency announced in November 2003 that it had shelved the SCRD's application until a more accurate hydrological study is made. It also asked the SCRD to undertake a comprehensive water-planning study for the entire Pender Harbour area to address long-standing concerns about future availability and management of drinking water sources.

Cheryl Steernberg's reaction to the government decision was cautious yet optimistic. "We will need the input of you all," she suggested, "to come up with a plan of action to ensure that any long range water planning for our area is done in a prudent and thoughtful manner."

continued from page 1

Following the Certification Trail

environmentally sustainable management practices. In July 2003 KPMG published its finding on the SCCA challenge. KPMG did not agree that Interfor had engaged in illegal logging but did find several areas of minor non-conformance and opportunities for improvement. One area of non-conformance had previously been recognized by KPMG as a major non-conformance, namely that Interfor does not have a functioning plan for addressing the needs of federally listed threatened and endangered species. Also noted by KPMG was the fact that Interfor's environmental management system does not have a mechanism for incorporating information from "third parties," such as the FPB or administrative review panels.

The SCCA believes that the non-conformance issues identified by KPMG are major, not minor. In October 2003 the SCCA appealed the KPMG finding to the Standards Council of Canada and the Sustainable Forestry Board (SFB). In December 2003

the SCCA received notice that the SFB certification appeals subcommittee has created an ad hoc certification task force to investigate our complaint and review the KPMG finding. All these documents, again, are on the website.

The SCCA does not endorse the ISO 14001 certification program or the Sustainable Forestry Initiative. We believe that these programs do not provide high enough standards for habitat protection and lack adequate procedures for ensuring that forest companies follow through on their promises. However, in using the public complaint provisions of these systems, the SCCA does hope to secure protection for critical wildlife habitats that have been placed at risk by inappropriate and destructive logging approvals. It is our position that these issues need to be resolved by a voluntary decision from Interfor to relinquish logging approvals in old-growth deficit areas, in the nesting habitat of the marbled murrelet and in the winter ranges of the coastal mountain goat. It is also our hope that Interfor and its employees will accept the necessity of habitat protection as a fundamental obligation of professional stewardship.

Latest Forest Regulations Reinforce Pro-Corporate Bias

by Colin Campbell

On January 23, 2004, the BC Liberal government released the long awaited regulations that give force to the *Forest and Range Practices Act*. The shortest summary would state that forest protection has been considerably weakened by handing over all important management decisions to the timber corporations. Despite promising that "environmental protection would be maintained in BC's forests," the new forestry regulations have few if any enforceable standards. Instead we see intentional loopholes that allow logging companies to "opt out" and to propose their own sets of rules for virtually everything, including fish, wildlife, biodiversity, soil and water protection, and the size of cutblocks.

The regulations have clearly been designed to give real force to the government's pro-economic bias. There is a lack of commitment to good and adequate environmental science. The overarching mandate of the regulations is that environmental objectives must be met "*without unduly reducing the supply of timber from British Columbia's forests.*"

The promise of meaningful public participation in the development of these regulations was frustrated when they were generated behind closed doors by an alliance of corporate foresters, government bureaucrats and political aides. Environmental groups were not included in the consultations, and were in fact frustrated at every attempt to constructively engage in them.

Environmental lawyer and forestry specialist Mark Haddock of West Coast Environmental Law noted in a press release that "this regime could lead to a 'free for all' in which the only way agency enforcement staff or the public will be

able to know what the rules are is to consult the plans and correspondence for each individual company. Ultimately, there could be as many forest practices 'codes' as there are forest companies . . . with no guarantees any of them will provide the



Chaster Falls, Mt Elphinstone. Daniel Bouman photo

kind of environmental protections British Columbians expect for our water and wildlife."

continued from page 1

Private Land Conservation

for permanent protection, which are then registered against the property title. This means that, once established, the terms of the



This Nature Conservancy of Canada preserve protects a valuable stand of Garry oaks near Cowichan. Andrew Scott photo

covenant must be adhered to even when the property is turned over to subsequent owners. Protected properties are monitored

periodically by the covenant holder(s) for compliance with the terms of their agreement. Federally approved ecological gifts are lands that possess a high degree of biodiversity value and therefore qualify for federal income tax incentives.

By offering this service to private landowners and municipalities, we aim to further our primary purpose of protecting "the natural biodiversity of the Sunshine Coast region for the present and future benefit of humanity and all life."

Assisting landowners by protecting ecologically important habitats on their properties is, we believe, an important component in the overall preservation of our regional biodiversity. On the Sunshine Coast, significant portions of qualifying low-elevation lands are in private ownership. Our desire over time is to add meaningfully to the Sunshine Coast's inadequate level of protected low-elevation habitat.

There are several issues involved in executing covenants, and there are a number of costs to consider. Information on this subject will soon be posted to our website, www.thescca.ca.

The SCCA has already partnered with The Land Conservancy (TLC) to co-hold a covenant on the Roberts Creek co-housing project, and has committed to work on executing a proposed covenant with the Ruby Lake Lagoon Nature Reserve Society. Other properties on both the lower and upper Sunshine Coast are also being considered at this time. We still have a lot to learn about private land conservation and appreciate the assistance TLC has given us.

Texada's Stickleback Pairs are at the Leading Edge of Evolution

by Andrew Scott

Texada Island might be the last place you'd expect to find a living laboratory of evolution, but with some of the planet's newest species, it is full of surprises. There are four lakes on the island—Priest, Paxton, Emily and Balkwill—that have long



Texada's Priest Lake is one of four on the island to harbour the rare stickleback species pairs. Andrew Scott photo

fascinated biologists. They look normal from a distance, but on closer inspection visitors can see that their alkaline waters are dense with aquatic vegetation and insect life. In summer, yellow pond-lilies bloom; on their floating leaves dozens of little brown frogs warm themselves in the sun's rays.

The attraction here is a tiny fish, the threespine stickleback, which is fast becoming as famous as Darwin's finches. During the last ice age, when land levels in BC rose and fell with the advance and decline of the glaciers, this common marine species managed to insinuate itself into numerous coastal lakes and streams and settle into a freshwater existence. In these four Texada lakes, however—and in Enos Lake near Nanoose Bay on Vancouver Island—two distinct freshwater forms evolved. One type, known as benthic, preys on crustaceans and insect larvae on the lake bottom; the other, known as limnetic, catches tiny invertebrates in surface waters. The two varieties are able to interbreed but mostly don't.

From the edge of Priest Lake, located next to Texada's main road, it's possible to see the five-centimetre-long

sticklebacks clearly. In mating season the males sport bright red throats and iridescent blue eyes and flanks. They zigzag in front of the drabber, egg-swollen females and lure them to nests built from twigs and debris. The limnetic form of the fish is slender and streamlined; the benthics are larger and chunkier. These "species pairs," as scientists call them, show many other variations too, all of which have developed over a few thousand years—a mere snap of the fingers in evolutionary terms.

No one knows exactly how this fishy divergence occurred, or why it's proceeding so rapidly. One theory suggests that the lakes were invaded twice. The benthics, which are the most changed from their original shape, must have arrived first. Much later, a second wave of sticklebacks turned up to find the best hunting grounds occupied but managed to adapt and survive anyway. A different theory holds that one single population split into two, taking advantage of separate feeding niches. If so, though, why did that split only happen in these particular lakes?

Other questions abound. How, for instance, should these fish be classified? It's a taxonomist's nightmare. Is each type, in each lake, a separate species? DNA sampling is being done—plus plenty of arguing, one suspects. But this research is not mere technical hair-splitting; it can have profound effects on conservation efforts. Species-at-risk legislation may require detailed management plans to protect each type deemed separate, unique and sufficiently rare. There are also questions about whether this evolutionary process, known as adaptive radiation, includes stickleback populations in other Sunshine Coast lakes, and whether these should be protected. Dr Dolph Schluter, who is leading a stickleback research team at UBC, hopes that the species will help unravel some of evolution's fundamental mysteries over the next decade.



The famous threespine stickleback, as painted for and donated to the SCCA by famous musician Joni Mitchell (see p. 6).

Any number of dangers might wipe out these curious creatures, however. They could be devastated by logging, road-construction, mining or the release of toxins into their one and only home. An even direr scenario has, sadly, already occurred in Hadley Lake on Lasqueti Island, which also once had unique species pairs. A predatory catfish was introduced, and in a stark example of the fragility of any localized wildlife population, both varieties of the Hadley stickleback are now extinct.

(A federal Stickleback Recovery Team is now in place; the SCCA will be involved with related conservation efforts. This article is adapted from Andrew Scott's "Coastlines" column in the Georgia Straight.)

Proposed Old Growth Order Paper Fast-Tracks LU Planning

by Daniel Bouman

The BC government has given a strong signal that old growth protection through landscape unit (LU) planning is about to be put on the fast track. In the *Proposed Old Growth Order* discussion paper (December 2003), the government outlines policies and procedures for writing landscape unit plans and defines the levels of old growth protection that must be achieved in these plans. Basically, a percentage of each ecosystem type (BEC unit) in each LU will be maintained as Old Growth Management Area (OGMA). The exact percentages of protected areas will vary with the Biodiversity Emphasis Option (BEO) of the LU and the natural disturbance type (NDT) of those ecosystems. (Please have patience with all these acronyms!) In practice, this means that rarely disturbed ecosystems will enjoy more old growth protection than ecosystems that experience frequent natural disturbance. Incidentally, an LU is a land mass of about 20,000 to 40,000 hectares. The Sechelt LU, for example, is about 38,000 hectares in size and contains all of Sechelt Peninsula and Nelson Island.

The lack of old growth protection in BC has been extremely controversial for about 20 years and has been a major focus of the efforts of the SCCA. LU planning was first proposed as a part of the original Forest Practices Code in 1994 but has been consistently delayed by government because of the potential impact on timber companies. During this period of delay, logging approvals accumulated in many of the areas that were needed for old growth representation, to the extent that the minimum percentages required for LU planning are no longer achievable. This is especially true for low-elevation ecosystems in the Sunshine Coast Forest District.

What's the significance of this new initiative? As a measure of the government's commitment to the protection of biological diversity in BC's public forests, it's completely inadequate. However, as a component of a larger strategy (if such exists), it is urgently necessary and welcome. Although the measures are minimal, the numbers are impressive; about 60,000 hectares

of forested land in this district will be managed as old growth and not be available for logging. In the Vancouver Forest Region close to half a million hectares will be affected. Considering that old growth options are disappearing quickly, the SCCA supports this initiative (with reservations). You can read our Old Growth Order submission to government on the website (www.thescca.ca). The SCCA will be closely examining LU plans in this district as they become available for public review. Stay tuned!



Mt Elphinstone forest. Daniel Bouman photo

Private Logging Destroys Scenic Egmont Viewscope

Photos by Rick Jerema



Pictures-Worth-A-Thousand-Words Department: Private logging on the north side of Skookumchuk Narrows opposite Egmont continues apace. Pacific Northwoods Resources, owned by Dale Malloch, Paul Reddam and former Canucks hockey player Geoff Courtnall, is not content to ruin this small com-



munity's tourism prospects; now it's angling to buy and develop (clearcut?) beautiful Egmont Point, as well. Plans to build a deluxe resort are in total flux. Learn more about this sorry tale by visiting the excellent website maintained by the Friends of Egmont at www.ravagedegmont.com.

Recovery Team Starts Rolling for Sakinaw Lake Sockeye Salmon

by Dr. John Field

A unique race of sockeye salmon that spawns only in one place—Sakinaw Lake on the Sunshine Coast—was declared critically endangered in 2003. On November 12, 2003, Fisheries and Oceans Canada (FOC) convened the first public meeting of a fledgling Sakinaw Sockeye Recovery Team (SSRT) in expectation that the sockeye will be listed as a "species at risk" in 2004 under the newly minted federal Species At Risk Act (SARA). The team is charged with developing a recovery plan to bring the species back from the brink of extinction. SCCA executive director Dan Bouman and director Dr John Field were invited to join the team.

The Sakinaw sockeye has some well-documented characteristics that distinguish it from all other races of sockeye salmon, including small size at maturity and a habit of spawning in the lake (rather than in streams). Genetic analysis has confirmed this uniqueness.

Not so long ago, Sakinaw sockeye appeared to be a healthy population. Spawning runs into the lake averaged about 5,000 adults annually (and as many as 17,000 fish in some years) until 1987, after which numbers began to drop dramatically. By 1996 the spawning run was down to less than 200 fish a year, and by 2002 the average run was under 50. In 2003 only three fish, one male and two females, returned to Sakinaw Lake for spawning, a dramatic reminder of just how vulnerable this once strong species has become.

The causes of decline are not clear. Over the last several years there has inevitably been a certain amount of finger-pointing, and people have assigned blame to a variety of natural and human-caused factors. The SSRT will attempt to identify and assess these causes, but more importantly, it will focus its attention on finding ways to reduce or eliminate them.

Two FOC initiatives were underway even before the

recovery team was formed—one to identify critical habitats both for spawning adults and for juveniles in Sakinaw Lake and the other to begin limited hatchery supplementation and captive broodstock programs. This latter initiative, similar to what is done for endangered wildlife species in zoos, is usually undertaken as a last resort to ensure that at least some fish are kept in captivity in the unfortunate event that the wild ones are completely lost.

After several meetings of the SSRT, it is becoming clear that the SCCA has important perspectives that are not necessarily being brought forward by other members of the recovery team, most of whom are FOC staff. One of our goals, for instance, is



Westward-facing view of Sakinaw Lake taken from the summit of Mt Hallowell in the Caren Range on the Sechelt Peninsula.

John Field photo

to make sure that the broader Sakinaw ecosystem is considered when making plans for recovery activities, and that the needs of the salmon are considered in a wider environmental context. Another is to ensure that the public remains well-informed throughout the recovery process and has a viable voice in the discussions. Ultimately, it is ordinary people, including the residents and property owners of Sakinaw Lake, who must endorse and take ownership of the resulting recovery plan if it is to have a chance of successfully returning Sakinaw sockeye to healthy numbers in perpetuity.

Noteworthy News and Events

The first annual **Celebration of Conservation**, hosted by the SCCA at Sechelt's Seaside Centre last November, was a huge success (photo at right by Dale Jackson). About 150 celebrants enjoyed the **Stickleback Social**, an evening of music with the Squid Jiggers and Michael Maser, great food and a silent auction. Over \$10,000 was raised for conservation efforts on the Sunshine Coast. A big thank you to all the volunteers, and please join us for our second celebration this November, to be called the Ocean Commotion. ☺ **Joni Mitchell** painted the stickleback featured on page four especially for the SCCA fundraiser; it became a perfect surprise birthday present for a Joni Mitchell fan in England who also happens to be an art collector



Public Process, SCCA Process: The Executive Director's Report

by Daniel Bouman

Over this past winter there has been a great deal of controversy in the "movement" about how environmental groups interact with the public, government and business (especially corporations). As well, there have been a few questions asked—constructive grumblings, you might say—about how the SCCA operates. So for this issue of the newsletter, I would like to try to clarify the role of the SCCA.

Most of what the SCCA does (and, of course, there are lots of people doing lots of things here) springs from the heart of the association's mission statement: "*to protect the biodiversity of the region.*" A major

aspect of SCCA activity involves supporting the member groups in achieving goals related to biodiversity. As an umbrella organization, it's important for us to be careful not to take over the issues or agendas of member groups, or act in a way that pre-empts their options. What the SCCA has to offer largely consists of an extensive experience of involvement in public processes, an inventory of environmental information and research data, and a knowledge of

biodiversity-related law and policy. Perhaps an example will illustrate how the SCCA functions.

Last summer the Storm Bay Joint Tenants Association (SBJTA) alerted us to the fact that Interfor was planning to log inside the viewscape of Storm Bay. A visit to Storm Bay was arranged, and we met with residents and looked at some of the logging proposals. We all agreed that the proposed logging would be detrimental to the environmental, recreational and spiritual values of the residents and, in fact, of the broader

and a Piscean. The painting sold for \$3,700. ☺ An afternoon workshop on sticklebacks and their evolutionary prowess, attended by 40 people, was held at Capilano College in Sechelt the same day as the social. ☺ We're looking for **skilled and motivated volunteers** to help us with publicity, legal advice, website development and a host of other vital tasks. Please contact Dr Michael Jackson at acroloxus@dccnet.com if you're interested. ☺ SCCA members have, for some time now, been receiving email notification of SCCA events. Now we want to start an **email action list**, alerting members to conservation issues that may need your attention in the form of letters or emails. We'd like your

public. Some technical information changed hands, and we advised SBJTA on how to submit information to the forest development plan approval process. We didn't say, incidentally, that this was a "good" process; it isn't. It does, however, offer an opportunity to put information before decision makers. To make a short story of this, SBJTA did a fine job of documenting their concerns, and Interfor was flooded with well-informed letters. The Sunshine Coast Regional District met with SBJTA and also objected to this logging proposal. The last I heard, Interfor had decided to move cutting boundaries out of the bay.

In this situation, people participated in a process and got a good result. It could have ended otherwise, in which case there are avenues for appeal. The point here is that there is almost always a "process"—albeit not necessarily a fair

one—for placing well-documented information before a decision maker. This is what the SCCA endeavours to accomplish when assisting member groups or addressing issues on our own initiative. We can't always tell what effect the information will produce, but our experience of advocacy work suggests that this approach does (eventually) have positive results.

Over most of the Sunshine Coast Forest District, no other groups are

addressing urgent environmental concerns. That's why the SCCA works so hard to make knowledgeable and technically sophisticated submissions to a wide variety of public processes, such as landscape unit planning, timber supply reviews, forest development planning, stewardship planning, public reviews of proposed legislation, etc, etc. Although we are spread thin, we're very grateful that the SCCA continues to receive sufficient public support to allow us to work on biodiversity protection issues throughout the entire region.



This image of an old wooden lifeboat spending its final days on the shoreline at Storm Bay was taken with a simple pinhole camera.

Daniel Bouman photo

consent, however, to send these types of emails. Please let us know at info@thescca.ca if you agree to be on the list. ☺ Do mark June 6, **Oceans Day**, on your calendars, when the SCCA will be holding an environmental detox workshop. Look for more details in the local newspaper. We'll be kicking off a marine conservation campaign at the upcoming AGM on April 17 (see page one). ☺ A gentle reminder to all SCCA members and member groups: it's **time to renew your memberships for 2004**. There's a handy renewal form on the back page of the newsletter. (Or renew in person at the AGM.) ☺ And, finally, our gratitude and thanks to the **Vancouver Foundation** for its recent generous grant.

Contacts:

Gordon Campbell, Premier
PO Box 9041, Stn Prov Govt
Victoria, BC V8W 9E1
Tel: (250) 387-1715*
Fax: (250) 387-0087*
Email: premier@gov.bc.ca

Michael de Jong, Minister
Ministry of Forests
PO Box 9049, Stn Prov Govt
Victoria, BC V8W 9E2
Tel: (250) 387-6240*
Fax: (250) 387-1040*
Email: mike.dejong.mla@leg.bc.ca

Greg Hemphill, District Manager
Sunshine Coast Forest District
7077 Duncan Street
Powell River, BC V8A 1W1
Tel: (604) 485-0708*
Fax: (604) 485-0799* Email:
greg.hemphill@gems5.gov.bc.ca

Bill Barisoff, Minister
Ministry of Water, Land and
Air Protection
PO Box 9047, Stn Prov Govt
Victoria, BC V8W 9E2
Tel: (250) 387-1187*
Fax: (250) 387-1356* Email:
bill.barisoff.mla@leg.bc.ca

Harold Long, MLA
Room 201, Parliament Buildings
Victoria, BC V8V 1X4
Tel: (250) 356-3066*
Fax: (250) 387-9104*
Email: harold.long.mla@leg.bc.ca

* Inquiry BC: 1-800-663-7867
By calling this toll-free number
you will be connected by tele-
phone or fax to any individual or
department in the BC government.

Newsletter of the Sunshine Coast Conservation Association

Newsletter Editor: Andrew Scott
Articles & photos may be submitted by emailing them to
andrewscott@dccnet.com or faxing to 604-885-3082.
Thanks to all those who have contributed to this publication.

Executive Director:

Dan Bouman daniel_bouman@hotmail.com

Directors:

Brad Benson bjbenson@telus.net
Patricia Braithwaite p_braithwaite@dccnet.com
Dr. Colin Campbell colincam@telus.net
Dr. John Field johnfield@dccnet.com
Tish Davis tishd@telus.net
Dr. Michael Jackson acroloxus@dccnet.com
Marianne Larsen mlarsen@sd46.bc.ca
Andrew Scott andrewscott@dccnet.com
George Smith georgesmith@dccnet.com
Linda Williams linwil@sunshine.net

Member Organizations:

Alliance for Responsible Shellfish Farming
Area A Quality Water Association
BC Spaces for Nature
Canadian Parks & Wilderness Society
Carlson Point Property Owners
Eco-Care Conservancy (Powell River)
EcoTech Youth Service Program
Elphinstone Living Forest

Francis Point Marine Park Society
Friends of Caren
Friends of Homesite Creek
Gambier Island Conservancy
Gibsons Wildlife Rehabilitation Centre
Halfmoon Bay Greenways
Native Plant Society of BC (SC Chapter)
Okeover Ratepayers Association
One Straw Society
Pender Harbour & District Wildlife Society

Ruby Lake Lagoon Nature Reserve Society
Sandy Hook Community Association
Sargeant Bay Society
Storm Bay Joint Tenants Association
Sunshine Coast Botanical Garden Society
Sunshine Coast Clean Air Society
Sunshine Coast Natural History Society
Sunshine Coast Water First Society
Tetrahedron Alliance
Tuwanek Ratepayers Association

Sunshine Coast Conservation Association (SCCA)

PO Box 1969, Sechelt, BC V0N 3A0; www.thescca.ca

“PURPOSE: The purpose of the Sunshine Coast Conservation Association is to preserve the natural biodiversity of the Sunshine Coast region for the present and future benefit of humanity and all life; specifically to:

1. Conduct research to inventory and describe our remaining natural areas with the goal of identifying land and waters important for the preservation of biodiversity. All information collected will be freely available to the public.
2. Work to retain such lands and waters in a natural state and make them available for the public enjoyment where possible.
3. Raise public environmental and conservation awareness by sponsoring educational programs and workshops and by building access infrastructure for low-impact recreation.”

(Our constitution requires that membership in the SCCA is conditional upon acceptance of the purpose of the SCCA stated above.)

APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP OR RENEWAL

Name: _____

Affiliate (individual) membership (\$20)

Mailing address: _____

Affiliate (family) membership (\$30)

Group membership (\$25)

Group representative _____

Phone: _____

\$ _____ Membership Fee

Fax number: _____

\$ _____ Donation

Email address: _____

\$ _____ Total

Website: _____

Receive newsletter by email? Yes _____ No _____

I accept the purpose of the SCCA. Signature: _____ Date _____

Receipts for income tax purposes will be issued for donations. Registered charity #87322 0446 RR0001