

=====

To: Andrew Chell <achell@lsac.ca>  
Subject: Re: Updated ASP: Nakamun Oasis  
From: Roy Jensen <R.Jensen@consol.ca>  
Date: Mon, 05 Nov 2018 21:20:50 -0700  
Bcc: r.jensen@consol.ca

-----

Andrew

These are legitimate questions, because my interpretation is very different from Aquality's, and I want clarity.

Please provide examples of lakes/waterbody's that meet each criteria and do not meet each criteria.

1. What does it mean to be "a mapped and classified watercourse under the Provincial Code of Practice for Watercourse Crossings"?
2. What does it mean to be "a lake or other body of water directly connected to such a watercourse"?
3. What does it mean to be "directly connected to and within 2.0 km (1.24 miles) of the mouth of a watercourse or body of water identified above"?
4. What does it mean to that "there are records of fish within the body of water or within 2.0 km (1.24 miles) along the watercourse, based on records from the Provincial Fish and Wildlife Management Information System"?
5. More generally, provide me with examples of lakes in LSAC that have 'moderate' fish-bearing potential and that have 'other' fish-bearing potential.

Thank you,  
Roy Jensen

=====

To: Mike Primeau <mprimeau@lsac.ca>  
Subject: Nakamun Oasis  
From: Roy Jensen <R.Jensen@consol.ca>  
Date: Wed, 07 Nov 2018 22:32:28 -0700  
Cc: Joe Blakeman <jblakeman@lsac.ca>, Nick Gelych <ngelych@lsac.ca>  
Bcc: r.jensen@consol.ca, Darcy Paulichuk <darcy.paulichuk@shaw.ca>

-----

Attached are two files.

A - was downloaded at 2305 (11 pm) on 06 November -- the night before the Council meeting.

B - was downloaded after the 07 November council meeting. THIS was the file presented during the meeting!

Please explain why so many changes were made on the morning of 07 November.

Please explain why all the changes (additions and removals) put the Nakamun Oasis proposal in a much more negative light.

Please note that I submitted the updated ASP on 24 October, in response to a request of Ferris and Chell. I only receive the Aquality report on 29 October.

Yet the addition on B (page 3) presents it like I refused to update the ASP. I didn't have time to update the ASP again!!

Chell repeatedly stated that D&P's sole recommendation would be "to table the bylaw so that amendments could be made". This makes sense given how late Aquality's report was received. This was the recommendation on A (page 7). Please explain why this recommendation was removed in B and not presented to Council.

Please explain to me why Matthew Ferris and Andrew Chell have been so misleading of me and of Council.

I submit that Council has been so misled and misinformed by Ferris and Chell that they cannot make impartial, informed decisions.

Humbly, I do not trust Lac Ste Anne County to investigate itself. Please advise as to all the oversight bodies, with their contact information.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email.  
Please indicate when you will be responding in full.

Thank you,  
Roy Jensen

=====

To: Andrew Chell <achell@lsac.ca>  
Subject: Nakamun Oasis  
From: Roy Jensen <R.Jensen@consol.ca>  
Date: Mon, 12 Nov 2018 13:56:08 -0700  
Cc: Joe Blakeman <jblakeman@lsac.ca>, Nick Gelych <ngelych@lsac.ca>

-----

Andrew

I have reviewed our correspondence. On three separate occasions, you indicated that Council is in favor of the Nakamun Oasis campground proposal. The latest being on 05 November.

Looking at the timeline, you asked for and I provided the ASP on 24 October 2018. The ASP was updated with the information available at the time. You provided Aquality's RSMM on 29 Oct -- a week before the meeting. And yes, we were discussing the accuracy and reasonableness of the RSMM in light of all the other scientific reports indicating the opposite of Aquality's conclusion.

Also on 05 November, you stated that the Development and Planning recommendation was that the ASP be tabled to allow for revisions. This was the recommendation to Council in the Agenda the night before the meeting. Yet on the day of the meeting, the information to Council had been changed, with numerous additions and deletions that put the Nakamun Oasis proposal in a negative light. Additional recommendations were added, including defeating the bylaw.

Why all these changes?  
Why the last minute negativism?  
What can be done now?

Thank you,  
Roy Jensen

=====

To: Mike Primeau <mprimeau@lsac.ca>  
Subject: Nakamun Oasis  
From: Roy Jensen <R.Jensen@consol.ca>  
Date: Sun, 18 Nov 2018 16:00:22 -0700

-----

Mr. Primeau

You have yet to respond to my email of 07 November.

Please direct someone from Development and Planning to provide me with the Outline Plan I requested from Mr. Ferris on 09 October.

Thank you,  
Roy Jensen

=====

To: Mike Primeau <mprimeau@lsac.ca>  
Subject: Nakamun Oasis  
From: Roy Jensen <R.Jensen@consol.ca>  
Date: Tue, 20 Nov 2018 11:27:00 -0700

-----

Mr. Primeau

I have been making inquiries. No-one understands why the Area Structure Plan is being passed as a bylaw. Please direct me to the relevant section(s) of the legislation that details the authority for LSAC's procedure.

Given Chell's comments on 30 October and 05 November, the decision of Council was a shock. I would appreciate the reasons and rationale for their decision.

Also please advise on the options to appeal Council's decision.

Thank you,  
Roy Jensen