

Lillooet Lake Estates Newsletter – September 2006

For additional information check out www.lillooetlakeestates.com

LLE Vision

All around us, the Sea-to-Sky corridor is changing more rapidly than many care to admit. Fuelled by the promise of faster access from our new Olympic™ Highway, communities like Furry Creek, Porteau Cove, and Britannia Beach are blooming. Squamish is re-vitalizing its waterfront as it shifts from a resource-based economy to more tourism/Vancouver bedroom community.

Whistler wrestles with sustainability, increased tourism competition, and finding their true 'soul'. Pemberton is becoming an enclave of million-dollar gentleman's farm estates, while local First Nations expand their business and logging initiatives.

So what of our little community? Will we be a weekend warrior haven? An off-the-grid country living lifestyle? One owner even mentioned the thought of looking at what it takes to achieve the official designation of a 'Hamlet'.

That's why, in 2005, we began to create a 5-year plan – "LLE Vision 2010" - To grow into a vibrant, healthy place to live while respecting nature's life-support systems. At the same time, we expect certain amenities and infrastructure that are necessary and appropriate for a rural, recreational village.

Last year we collected a lot of input from many lot owners about what they would like to see happen in the future in terms of maintenance and amenities.

Since creating the LLE of the future is a work in progress, we thought we should share what we heard last year and offer owners a chance to further contribute thoughts and priorities.

This is what was published last year:

As you know, we are continuing to maintain and improve our existing infrastructure including:

- Drinking water
- Fire protection
- Roadways
- Snow clearing
- Emergency Management Plan

The LLE Vision 2010 plan will be an accumulation of the desires and hopes of today's LLE residents. The Board of Directors wants to hear from the LLE lot owners and will base the 5-year plan on the responses that we receive.

Here are some suggestions to consider while you contemplate the LLE of 2010:

- Secure gates – new design
- Expansion of parkland – 3 waterfront lots, 2 lots on Cataline Creek, and Lot 93 at Gate 2

- Park benches
- Picnic tables
- Interconnecting trail system to encourage walking and to provide neighbourhood security
- Footbridges as part of trail system
- Docks at the lake
- Tennis court
- Basketball court
- Playground
- Boat launch improvements
- Interpretive nature trails – Cataline Creek corridor or ?
- Garbage removal – recycling

Please add to this list. Tell us what is most important to you. Where would you add these amenities? What should be first? What is more long-term? What will make our community more liveable and sustainable?

The two items from the above list that got the most response via info@lillooetlakeestates.com were:

- 1) Interconnecting trail system to encourage walking and to provide neighbourhood security
- 2) Foot bridges as part of trail system

People wanted an alternative to having to walk along the BC Hydro road to get from one part of LLE to another. They choke on the dust and they don't feel safe with some drivers. The Gate 1 people felt cut off and wanted a footbridge over McCulloch Creek to get to the rest of LLE. The Gate 2 and Gate 6 people wanted a footbridge across Cataline Creek so they could easily visit back and forth. A trail system throughout LLE was the first priority.

We started work on this last year following the new route of the water line from Gate 1 to Gates 4 and 5 but due to other priorities, the work has not been finished. Do we need to continue this work? Is it worth investing more time and money? What of the other items on the list? Should there be some new ones? We encourage owners to think a little past their lot-lines.

It is an exciting time to be building a community in one of the most beautiful, yet rapidly changing areas in the world. We'd like to do it as right as we can. And that will take a little forethought from all of us.

Your LLE Board of Directors thrives on lot owner input, especially when it is provided in writing, either by e-mail or letter. (I don't know about the rest of the Directors, but I find after a few beers on the deck, any verbal instructions received prior to said beers are subject to intense fragmentation.)

Submitted by Lorne Craig, Section 4 Director

Lillooet Lake Estates Newsletter – September 2006

For additional information check out www.lillooetlakeestates.com

Reprinted from the July 2004 Newsletter:

Access at LLE Gates

The Lillooet Lake Estates Board of Directors has voted in favour of going to a “one key” system. The same key will open the lock at every gate. This is very important to all emergency responders – ambulance, fire truck, etc. It is also being done in recognition of the fact that we are **one village** and need to be able to move about freely within our village. The purpose of the locks on the Gates is to keep the “bad guys” out, not the residents of LLE. At the next General Meeting in August [*held in September*], we will be handing out the new gate key to lot owners.

The other important issue at each Gate is to ensure that the roadway remains wide enough and has an adequate turnaround at the end or the emergency responders may not venture into your area. In the fall, we will continue to widen the access roads and burn the debris.

Letters to the Editor

We encourage you to send your thoughts and concerns to us at either info@lillooetlakeestates.com or PO Box 116, Mount Currie, BC V0N 2K0

Editor:

Just a quick note regarding the recent fire at LLE.

From my observation of what happened last weekend the Board should be complimented for its planning and implementation of fire controls for LLE. From what I observed and have heard from others, virtually all of the fire suppression and controls the board has implemented worked. There were three hoses on the scene to fight the fire and they all worked. Local residents and neighbours responded to the alarm and there was a real effort made to control the fire from spreading to the trees. I spoke to the forestry people early in the event and they told me they originally made a call for additional equipment and manpower, but when they got to the scene and saw what was being done by LLE they were able to cancel the call for the additional assistance. The costs of the equipment are insignificant compared to the losses, which could have occurred had the fire fighting equipment not been available. That is not to say there is nothing else to do. One suggestion is to have instructions on the use of the equipment and safety features on a laminated document, which is fastened into each of the fireboxes. That way in the case of an emergency time is not lost figuring out how to hook up hoses, etc. All in all, we are all fortunate the

board has taken the steps it has to date.

Thank you
Robie Thorn

Editor:

To the directors of LLE

Firstly, I would like to apologize for my behaviour at the directors meeting on June 17 while discussing the section 5 key issue. I do not believe it benefits anyone when I lose my cool, and for this I apologize.

For various reasons I have been unable to articulate to the board of directors why many shareholders in our section are so upset with the board. I would like to try to explain the reasons for shareholders being upset with the board and to see if we can narrow the gap that currently exists.

Over the last 2 years there have been quite a few decisions made by the board that directly affect the section 5 shareholders, and we have not been included in any open discussions regarding these issues. When directors make decisions on matters that directly affect shareholders they have an obligation to seek input from the shareholders affected before they vote. I feel that this is essential to the democratic process at LLE if we are to truly feel that we are part of a village and that we can honour the board's decisions. Telling George what's happening (as on the key change) does not constitute such an open process.

Here is a list of the items that have occurred that have led to the misunderstanding that section 5 shareholders are having:

In the summer of 2004, Dave Arding said “that the road was going in behind lots 22 to 26 and directors will not be discussing it with affected lot owners because if they have to discuss every item with lot owners nothing would ever get done”

New Gate 5 lock is added, directly affecting our security level, no discussion with section 5 shareholders before directors voted on this or installed the lock.

March 2005 Newsletter states surveying will be done on the new road, no discussion with section 5 lot owners prior to writing this

June 2005 Fact Sheet 1 (regarding building new road behind lots 22-26) is sent out, directors will not discuss this letter with section 5 lot owners or answer questions that the fact sheet raises

In August 2005, Fact Sheet 2 (regarding building new road behind lots 22-26) is sent out containing untrue statements attributed to me. Directors will not discuss this letter with section 5 lot owners or answer questions that the fact sheet raises or apologize for the inaccuracies

.Section 5 road is widened for 180 feet, 6 to 8 foot rock walls are built along the length of this road without any discussion

Lillooet Lake Estates Newsletter – September 2006

For additional information check out www.lillooetlakeestates.com

with section 5 shareholders, Bill Eisenbock's parking spot is removed for the road without even a phone call to him. There was no approved budget for this, in spite of the fact that our governing documents (Amended Trust Indenture, Jan. 1, 1999, section 4.02(a) (v)) clearly state this needs budget approval. As far as the claim that it was done for the water system, this is not logical as all that was required was to change the fire hose stand

Clear cut on lot 32, pile of debris left on lot for lot owner to clean up, this was done to work on the water line, no notice was given to affected lot owner, so that lot owner could have had input and come up with something that could work for both parties. Our governing document states this needs to be done. Amended Trust Indenture, Schedule B, Paragraph I (1) (a)

March 2006 Letter to 10 affected lot owners is sent out, stating we have one week to respond or our voices would not be heard, no way to discuss this with such short notice.

March 2006 Newsletter is sent out, telling everyone to walk or drive on access road in section 5, no discussion with affected section 5 lot owners prior to printing this.

I would greatly appreciate if any of the directors could explain, without personally attacking me or the shareholders of section 5, how we are supposed to feel part of the village they envision, and honour board decisions when we are clearly not having a voice in things that directly affect us.

Ralph Steinhauser
Section 5 Director

Editor:

Fellow Gate 5'ers:

I see I am quite out of step with all of you including my family. I do not agree with Ralph's view that this is just about the key. I believe we are and will much better off to be part of a bigger LLE community. That may mean certain little compromises over keys and common lot access but it also means more affordable, water, power, governance, roadwork, and all the rest of the apparently forgotten infrastructure essential to making LLE work. With shared access for those awful Gate 2 people, god forbid, comes a degree of input from us apparently elitist exclusivists in Gate 5 for what we might feel are building standards, user standards and behaviour standards (bylaw development and enforcement) for all of LLE that do and will benefit all of us. Our Gate 5 issue is really about geographic access to the common lot and how the current road cuts through the back yard of half a dozen residents including Ralph's. Of course, these folks don't want more people cutting through their lots (especially

knowing most of us don't want or need much access anyway) so lets get the road laid out the way it should be. Ralph talks about lessening joy riding. Not sure who he refers to but I've not seen anyone joyriding motorbikes or ATVs who is not a Lot 5 owner or guest. I vote we work with the current directors on this not against them. I agree Julian has done a great job with the entrance, paid for exclusively I presume by just the owners in Gate 5.

Hugh Fisher

Editor's note: The Gate 5 improvements have been paid for exclusively by Julian in the hope that, if this issue is resolved, then the other Gate 5 lot owners will support his request for the building of the missing common roadway to allow him to access his lot. To date the Gate 5 lot owners have paid nothing for the work that Julian has done to improve the Gate 5 entrance. To date the Gate 5 lot owners have not authorized the building of the missing roadway.

Editor:

Gate 5

Coudeaus to Hugh Fisher, you are not out of step with everyone in Gate 5. We voted at the section meeting, before the AGM last spring to have one key for all of the LLE gates. It was our understanding when we bought the Lot 24 cottage in 2003, that we were shareholders in the LLE gated community with the same rights, privileges and responsibilities as all of the other shareholders, with the sense of community and co-operation being the focus. We stand with you, Hugh, we have no grievances with the board of directors and their tireless and endless commitment to build a strong community with sound and legal infrastructure to serve our growing and changing needs. We say "no" to the separatist elitist movements within gate 5. Just open the road to the common lot, close the access road through our property, then we can all live on your own lot and enjoy what we have and be thankful.

Andy & Martha Mary Cochran

Editor:

Safety vs. Security

The Waiver: It is a good idea to be concerned about the possible liability of LLE in case of fire or other emergency. I'll guess that none of us have thought of this before the events of this summer. Can LLE be held responsible for damages caused by fire either on the lot where the fire started or on adjacent lots? What if there was not enough water or pressure, no fire hoses in the kiosk, or even just that our system was judged inappropriate. Is LLE legally responsible to supply the proper fire protection?

The Land Use Contract stipulates that "the construction of firebreaks and other measures for the protection of structures and their occupants shall meet the requirements of the

Lillooet Lake Estates Newsletter – September 2006

For additional information check out www.lillooetlakeestates.com

National Fire Code and the B.C. Forest Service but in any event shall include a small pumper unit and water barrels.” Note that there is no indication on who is responsible to meet those standards. Is it us, the developer, the lot owner, or, while we at it, why not the SLRD itself?

The liability issue is way above the lock issue and gate 5. I think that the waiver concept could be a good idea for all of the community. For example, we might want to consider passing a resolution that will exonerate LLE from all liabilities arising from fire, winter road condition, water consumption, etc. Can this be legal?

To get back to Don’s suggestion, would this waiver be only for occurrences where the fact that the gate was locked played a role in the outcome? Or would it be a blanket waiver covering all possible claims arising from fire or other emergency? Would it take a signed waiver from each of the 32 owners of gate 5 before that deal could be accepted?

The Lock: I think it is important not to loose track of our principal goal because we face some resistance. What is the most prominent danger we are facing? Apart from the whole Twin peak coming crashing down on top of us, for which there is nothing we can do, a forest fire is the most serious threat I can think of. Contrarily to the mountain falling down, there is a lot we can do to prevent this or at least to minimize the damage if it occurs.

We can have all kinds of sophisticated equipment to fight the fire but the one principal element for successfully controlling a fire is, at the lake as anywhere else, the quickness of the response. That it is why it is so important that any member who is present at the time and can do something to stop the fire be able to get to it as fast as possible. A few minutes delay can mean the difference between one house gone or the entire community, especially on the hot summer days.

The fire at Nina’s lot is a strong testimony to this. Many of the people who showed up to fight the fire did drive up. What would have happened if the gate would have been locked and no one could get there quickly? Anyone who is foolish enough to think that it would not have made much difference needs to go up there [lot 127] to realise how close we got to a major disaster. Because the gate was open, there were even strangers passing by that drove up and helped.

According to Ralph, the main reason for a different lock is the security against thieves. We need to evaluate the probabilities and consequences for each threat and decide which one is the greatest. I agree that mathematically the chance of being robbed is greater if 151 persons can freely pass the gate instead of 32 but 151 is still a very small number and the chance of finding a thief is minimal (especially that it has to be a dumb thief; any smart one

know better than to steal in his own neighbourhood). And how great can the consequences be? As I doubt that any of us have a Rembrandt hanging on his wall, how much value can be stolen?

On another hand, the chance of a fire is much more real, it can happen any time but more importantly are the consequences. It could mean 100s of thousands of dollars in losses, even millions, if it is allowed to spread (not to mention the priceless, sentimental value). What do you really think is the biggest treat?

If I could be assured that only the members of gate 5 would have to assume the consequences of their action, I might be able to agree with Don [and a gate 5 waiver], but a fire doesn’t read maps and doesn’t respect human boundaries. If a fire occurs in gate 5 and it is not dealt with rapidly because of the stupid lock, it could easily spread to gate 4, Louis’ land, gate 1, and can even jump over the BC Hydro r/w if the wind blows in the wrong direction.

Therefore, I am not ready to compromise the security of my two lots that are worth about \$100,000 so that others can have a false sense that their relatively small valued belongings are safe. I say false because, let’s face it, that lock could easily be cut by someone who is intent to steal and comes prepared.

Vince Poirier
Section 6 Director

Forestry Road

The following letter was sent to the Ministry of Forests, the SLRD, and our MLA:

August 29, 2006

André Germain
Operations Manager
Squamish Forest District
Suite 101 - 42000 Loggers Lane
Squamish BC V8B 0H3

Dear Sir:

Re: Resumption of Log Truck Traffic on In-SHUCK-ck Forest Service Road

We have been advised that Lizzie Bay Logging is planning to reopen the sort yards at Twin One and Lizzie Creek as part of their plan to resume logging to the south of Lillooet Lake. We have discussed this with some of the lot owners to the south of us at Twin One. Both the Lillooet Lake Estates and Twin One lot owners have serious concerns about this. I will address each of these concerns.

1. We are concerned that we have not been formally advised and consulted. As lot owners who will be

Lillooet Lake Estates Newsletter – September 2006

For additional information check out www.lillooetlakeestates.com

directly affected, we believe that the Forest Service should be in contact with us.

2. The traffic volume on the In-SHUCK-ck Forest Service Road has grown considerably over the years. Twenty years ago it was not a big problem to operate logging trucks on this road, but that is not the case today. Has the Forest Service conducted traffic counts on the road recently? We have not been able to obtain this information.
3. Lizzie Bay Logging is planning to reactivate the sort yards at both Twin One and Lizzie Creek. Our neighbours at Twin One are understandably concerned about the noise and dust that this would create for them. They are also very concerned that reopening the Twin One sort yard may cause serious damage to their water system. They are requesting that the Twin One site not reopen and that all of the sorting happen at Lizzie Creek. We support them in this.
4. We understand that because of the proposed resumption of logging traffic that the dump area for tree cuttings where the Forest Service conducts a controlled burn in the fall at km 13 has been closed. This allowed lot owners to fire proof their lots during the summer and have a place to safely dump the cuttings. Will an alternate site be provided?
5. We believe that you are aware that the section of the road through Lillooet Lake Estates is not designated as a forest service road. In fact, it is a roadway through the middle of a subdivision. As such, pedestrians, cyclists, motorcycles, and ATV's use the roadway as a way to travel around the subdivision. We would want to see signage that indicates to logging truck operators that this is a residential area, that speed limits are in effect, and that air brakes must not be used.
6. We wish to remind you that already this year two trucks in separate incidents have rolled down the bank towards the lake because of the narrowness and loose shoulders of the road.
7. We believe that the logging trucks will cause much more wear and tear on the road surface. Is there a commitment that the road surface will be regularly graded?
8. The logging trucks stir up a tremendous amount of dust. We would insist that the section of the road through Lillooet Lake Estates be regularly treated for dust abatement.
9. You are about to turn a road that is regularly

used by many residents from the Duffey Lake Road all the way to Harrison Lake and many recreational tourists back into an industrial road. Have you considered that people haven't seen logging trucks on this road for some time? Logging trucks use all or most of the road width because of their size. This can pose a challenge for oncoming traffic since many parts of this road are only a single lane or a lane and a half at best. In addition, all of the bridges are single lane. Because of the size of the logging trucks and the speed that they are travelling, their manoeuvrability is very limited. The road lacks safe pullouts. Also, consider that some of the recreational traffic is vehicles pulling trailers and large motor homes.

10. The Sea-to-Sky corridor has been actively promoting tourism. Now if those tourists stop on the road to enjoy the views or to take pictures, they will be at risk from the logging trucks. All of the Resource Management reports and current Recreation Use Zoning has indicated that the area south of the Duffey Lake Road through Twin One and Twin Two Creeks, and from Lizzie Creek to Rogers Creek is an area that needs to be protected because of its high value for recreation. Now that the recreational use of this area is rapidly growing, it is inappropriate to add the danger of heavy logging truck traffic on the existing road.
11. We believe that it is possible to have both recreational and industrial traffic on this road but not before the road is upgraded to accommodate the traffic that will use it. Widening for safe passing, straightening to improve sight lines, and regular grading with dust abatement are all necessary prior to any resumption of heavy logging truck traffic on the road. In its present condition, the road has a history of vehicle accidents. This will become much worse when residential and recreational traffic is forced to compete with logging truck for a very limited roadway.
12. The road at km 1 – 2, where it is limited to one lane along the cliffs, must be replaced before logging traffic resumes. That section is simply not safe for the traffic volumes that use the road today. The situation will quickly become serious with heavy logging truck use.

We urge you to consider these facts before allowing new log truck traffic on the In-SHUCK-ck Forest Service Road. Unfortunately, what began as a forest service road is, in reality, now a secondary road that is well used by both residents and recreational users alike. We would like to see the Forest Service work with the Regional District to make the needed upgrades to this road happen as soon as possible.

Lillooet Lake Estates Newsletter – September 2006

For additional information check out www.lillooetlakeestates.com

Yours truly



George Henry
President
Lillooet Lake Estates Ltd.

Cc: Susie Gimse
Paul Edgington
Rod Allen
Joan MacIntyre

Arrears

As the prime rate goes up, so does the interest rate that LLE charges on the arrears. The prime rate is now at 6% and LLE adds 4% to prime. That makes the interest rate on arrears 10% now. (Reference: Amended Trust Indenture 1999, paragraph 4.02(e)(i) – available on the LLE website)

Water System

On August 21st, George Henry wrote to the Medical Health Officer in an attempt to resolve the outstanding issues between Coast Garibaldi Health and LLE. Coast Garibaldi Health has **arbitrarily cancelled our Construction Permit** for the new water system. All work has stopped. Coast Garibaldi Health wanted us to address three additional issues in the plans for our new water system.

George replied as follows:

“Regarding the three issues that you have raised:

(1) Turbidity monitoring - The equipment for monitoring has been purchased and is on site. We were preparing to install it. Once it is installed and powered by our micro-hydro generation plan, it will become operational. The monitoring was scheduled to begin by the end of 2006 in the timeline we submitted in December 2006.

(2) Monitoring kiosks - At the October meeting with your people, we were given a variety of options regarding the installation of the monitoring kiosk. The results of our testing would determine the acceptability of our choice of design. The monitoring would start in 2007 in accordance with our timeline.

(3) Filtration and UV Treatment - The original Construction Permit specified that these are subject to monitoring the water conditions. As noted earlier, the monitoring equipment is not operational yet.

When we met with your people last October, a one-year monitoring period was recommended. We have incorporated that into the timeline that we submitted to you. In the meantime, your water engineer was to supply additional information to our engineer. This was to give us an additional choice of options to consider.”

George went on to say:

“The infrastructure for our new water system is almost complete. The treatment equipment is on site and ready to be installed. The monitoring equipment is on site and ready to be installed. We have followed the engineered plans that allowed us to be issued a Construction Permit. We have invited your representatives to visit Lillooet Lake Estates for an ongoing inspection of our work. No one from Coast Garibaldi Health has been here since last October. Nevertheless, we stand by our offer to provide any of your representatives a tour of our new water system.

We have tried to comply with the original directive from the Minister of Health to work out an outcome-based solution to solve our drinking water problems. We have almost reached our goal. We were even a little ahead of the time line that we sent you.”

On August 27, Dr Paul Martiquet, Medical Health Officer, replied to George’s letter and the following is part of what he had to say:

“We have considered the issues that you have raised and are pleased that our differences seem resolvable. The differences stem from the interpretation of the conditions of the Construction Permit Issued by Don Miller. I see the solution to this as the application for a new construction permit, complete with equipment treatment works and distribution system specifications, details and drawings. My office would expedite the processing of this application. A new construction permit would also allow you to consider treatment options that may be more suitable to your site scenario.

Provided your Construction Permit application is complete, we anticipate issuance of a new permit within a couple of weeks, which will not significantly delay the project.

Please note that we have no objection to a phase-in progressive treatment approach but please include in the new construction permit application the timelines you anticipate completion. Please ensure your application addresses those items contained in Louise Egan’s letter of June 2, 2005, our meeting of October 27, 2006, and my letter of July 27, 2006.”

Remember that we don’t have the option of saying “no”. Coast Garibaldi Health regularly reminds us that we must consider the cost of saying “no”. That cost is not acceptable to any of your volunteer Board members:

Lillooet Lake Estates Newsletter – September 2006

For additional information check out www.lillooetlakeestates.com

“Convicted violators are liable to a fine of not more than \$200,000 per offence or \$200,000 per day for each day a continuing offence is continued, or imprisonment for not longer than 12 months, or both fine and imprisonment.”

The important issue is for us to have the time [a year] to operate our new water system with chlorination and do the testing that we are required to do. We cannot prejudge what those test results will be. However, some of the experts that we have consulted believe that chlorination is all the treatment that we need.

The water levies that most of us have paid included the cost of chlorination. We did this based on the conditions of our original Construction Permit. Since that permit was issued, the **provincial government** has increased the water standards for the entire province. This was not included in our original budget. Coast Garibaldi Health is insisting that we agree to these new requirements.

The Water Committee is reluctant to agree to these requirements until we have an opportunity to sample and test our water for a year. We also want an opportunity to obtain cost estimates for this additional water treatment. Then we want to present the facts to all the lot owners to give you the opportunity to decide whether you wish to pay for this or not. The Water Committee does NOT want to commit the LLE lot owners to these additional costs. Coast Garibaldi Health says that they will not issue us a new Construction Permit unless we agree to this additional water treatment.

At this time we do not know how much additional water treatment may be needed and we do not know what it may cost.

While the provincial government continues to increase water treatment standards for the entire the province, they have provided only limited funding to a few small water user groups throughout the province. The Water Committee believes that increased standards also require increased funding.

We have also seen that Gold Bridge with an estimated population of 41 received a grant of \$723,333 from the provincial government to upgrade their community water system. Meanwhile, in spite of our best efforts, we have been unable to secure any funding for our water system upgrade from any level of government. The reason given is that we are not a local government. To date the Squamish-Lillooet Regional District has been unwilling to apply on our behalf.

The Water Committee believes that it is time that the provincial government contributes to our water system upgrade. We need an opportunity to determine what the new additional water treatment that Coast Garibaldi Health is demanding is going to cost us. All the lot

owners need an opportunity to consider all the facts and have an opportunity to vote on any further expenditure on our community water system.

The Water Committee is determined to say “no” to any further expenditures on our community water system until one of two things happens:

1. The provincial government or the SLRD agree to pay for the upgrades, OR
2. The LLE lot owners tell us that we are wrong and that they are willing to pay one more water levy.

We have great water of exceptional quality from an underground aquifer. We are asking Coast Garibaldi Health to allow us the time to prove this before we are forced to spend needlessly on additional water treatment.

Fire at Strawberry Point

Recently a small fire started on the west side of Strawberry Point. The fire was probably the result of a campfire that was not properly put out. Fortunately, some residents from the four cabins to the west of Strawberry Point spotted the fire and put it out.

Once again, this forces us to focus on the danger of wildfires. We have had two fires at LLE this summer. Can we say that we have been lucky? Can we be thankful that we were prepared? Have we done enough planning? Have we made enough preparations? Is it time that we had a volunteer fire department?

The Board is investigating this. We are looking at the possibility of purchasing a decommissioned fire truck. The Board also wants to talk to the BC Forest Service about firebreaks at LLE.

What we have learned this summer is that a quick response is critical to containing a fire.

We have also learned that the danger is there and we must be prepared or face disaster.

LLE Newsletter Disclaimer

This newsletter is the loving product of unsung, unpaid volunteers whose mission is to communicate to fellow owners the news, visions, and issues of Lillooet Lake Estates, including general communications from some of the LLE Board of Directors. The occasional inaccuracy is a given. We welcome with open arms any corrections, contributions and alternate points of view from our fellow lot owners. We will disregard and immediately shred any correspondence that is accusatory, inflammatory, or rude; unless it strikes us as funny.

Lillooet Lake Estates Newsletter – September 2006

For additional information check out www.lillooetlakeestates.com

Reminders

To All Lot Owners

Be sure that you have insurance liability coverage for your own lot. Any accidents that occur on your lot are your responsibility, not LLE's. Your liability coverage is needed to protect you in case of accident on your lot. Everyone should have this insurance whether you have built on your lot or not. See your insurance agent.

As a shareholder of the company, you may not sue the company. The company does not carry liability insurance. The cost is prohibitive – somewhere between \$10,000 and \$20,000 per year. The Board would rather spend your maintenance fees where they will do some good rather than on insurance.

For New Lot Owners

A building permit will not be issued until a certified septic system is in place. This approval is the first step.

The Squamish-Lillooet Regional District requires you to submit proof that your building plans have received the approval of the Lillooet Lake Estates Board of Directors.

A copy of your class "A" share certificate for Lillooet Lake Estates Ltd. must be submitted with your building permit package, along with proof of approval from the Lillooet Lake Estates Board of Directors for your plans.

All plans must be done by a qualified designer or architect and blueprinted. In most cases, a geo-technical report for your lot will also be required.

Two sets of plans along with the permit application are required by the SLRD. One set will be returned to you showing changes, if any. This set is to be kept on site at all times.

Boil Water Advisory Continues

Lillooet Lake Estates remains under a boil water advisory that has been issued by the Coast Garibaldi Health Services. Water taken from the Lillooet Lake Estates water system should be boiled before drinking it since it doesn't meet provincial drinking water standards. Lot owners are responsible for informing their family members and guests of this fact.

Participation

Are you concerned about the road condition and the plan to put lots of logging traffic back on the road? Then tell:

André Germain
Operations Manager
Squamish Forest District
Suite 101 – 42000 Loggers Lane
Squamish BC V8B 0H3
Tel: 604- 898-2116

Susie Gimse
SLRD Director, Electoral Area "C" **
PO Box 219, 1350 Aster St
Pemberton BC V0N 2L0
Tel: 604-894-6371 Email: gimse@uniserve.com
** LLE is within the SLRD Electoral Area "C" and Susie Gimse is the Director on the SLRD Board who represents us.

Paul Edgington
SLRD Administrator
PO Box 219, 1350 Aster St
Pemberton BC V0N 2L0
Tel: 604-894-6371 or 1-800-298-7753, ext. 231

Joan MacIntyre
MLA – West Vancouver-Garibaldi
300-2232 Marine Drive
West Vancouver BC V7V1K4
Tel: 604-981-0045

Are you concerned about Coast Garibaldi Health and their determination to make LLE water the cleanest in BC at our expense? Do you think that LLE should be eligible for government grants? Do you think that LLE should have ample time to test our water and let the professionals assess the results before we commit to spending thousands of more dollars on water treatment that may be unnecessary? Then tell:

Dr. Paul Martiquet, Medical Health Officer
Coastal Health Services
Box 78, 494 South Fletcher Road
Gibsons, BC V0N 1V0
Tel: 604-886-5600 Email: paul.martiquet@cgh.bc.ca

Joan MacIntyre
MLA – West Vancouver-Garibaldi
300-2232 Marine Drive
West Vancouver BC V7V1K4
Tel: 604-981-0045

Please send LLE a copy of your correspondence.