

## Stirling, Debbie EAO:EX

---

**From:** Heyman.MLA, George <George.Heyman.MLA@leg.bc.ca>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 26, 2017 3:33 PM  
**To:** Minister, ENV ENV:EX  
**Subject:** Fw: Kinder Morgan Pipeline, and Site C Dam

**Categories:** EAO

---

s.22

**Sent:** Saturday, July 22, 2017 9:57 PM

**To:** Premier John Horgan; Andrew Weaver

**Cc:** James.MLA, Carole; Ralston.MLA, Bruce; Heyman.MLA, George; Michelle Mungall; Trevena.MLA, Claire; Bains.MLA, Harry; Popham.MLA, Lana; Beare.MLA, Lisa; Fraser.MLA, Scott; Robinson.MLA, Selina; Donaldson.MLA, Doug; Chow.MLA, George

**Subject:** Kinder Morgan Pipeline, and Site C Dam

Dear Premier Horgan and Green Party Leader Andrew Weaver,

Once again, my congratulations to both you and your parties. Your platform was socially and environmentally comprehensive and covered very well the range of failings by the Liberals. The hard part to explain, why Christy Clark did so well? The next time around, you and your magnificent teams need to hold the line and increase your ranks, which means continuing to recruit new excellent talent in the most likely convertible ridings.

I am writing to tell you that I support your decision to use all the techniques in your toolbox to stop the Kinder Morgan Pipeline. Polls suggest that there is a majority of the BC population that supports this. The realization of this project will impact not only our land, freshwaters, Salish Sea, and relations with First Nations, but also the rest of the world that will receive this dirty bitumen to refine and burn, adding to the emissions impacting the atmosphere and oceans. Oil spills, especially into the Salish Sea, would be potentially very damaging to sea life, and would tend to discourage other activities like tourism and fishing. We people of the earth must demand decreasing GHG emissions to level off increasing global temperatures. For the health and stability of the planet and humankind we cannot afford to allow increasing emissions of methane and carbon dioxide.

I also want you to know I still stand firmly against the Site C dam, and urge you to very soon set up the BCUC review process for the second sober look at the reasoning for this undertaking. I have previously (January 2017) sent you reasons for halting the Site C; the project is not needed, unaffordable, destructive, and unjust to First Nations and farmers. (There are numerous recent articles and reports in the last two years and more dealing with this, and I would be happy to send a more complete set of these from my files, if you think they could be useful.) The Peace River Valley is a treasure of possibilities, and should not be assigned to a one-purpose use that does not make reasonable sense. With its high quality soils, long summer growing season, and diversity of landscapes and ecosystems, The section of the Peace River Valley to be flooded offers exceptional opportunities to manage a variety of resources and activities sustainably--vegetables and fruits and berries, forestry, water, soil management, hunting and fishing, First Nations cultural uses, tourism, etc.

The construction of this dam and reservoir will very likely have a larger carbon footprint than is generally assumed, although it is difficult to give precise information without further research. (There is considerable published research available on this subject.) Big dam reservoirs flood vegetation and soils containing stored organic matter, which under the anoxic conditions gives rise to methane which in turn bubbles to the surface or is released at the turbines and outfalls. Manufacture of cement, which will be required in large quantities for the dam, entails release of much carbon dioxide. Instead of adding more methane to the atmosphere, methyl mercury to contaminate fish, and CO2 from cement production and soil organic matter decomposition, we should be saving and managing the natural ecosystems, and the modified ecosystems in the farmed and ranched parts, in such a way that CO2 is sequestered in forests or lower vegetation, and in organic matter in the soil by 'regenerative agriculture'. There is much interest amongst farmers and

ranchers, in BC and Canada and elsewhere, to employ Carbon Capture and Storage by the natural mechanisms of photosynthesis and storage as stable organic matter in the soil via roots.

There are many areas of economic and infrastructure activities that could serve to promote green, sustainable jobs, without continuing to promote fossil fuel extraction, and GHG emissions (e.g., Pollin et al. 2009; Lee and Card 2012; Ivanova 2014). Building more renewable energies; energy-efficient new housing and refurbishments; mass transit and transportation options; electric and hydrogen fueled vehicles and ships; and sustainable, diversified forestry and agriculture--all present good possibilities for a diversified, thriving, and sustainable economy, which is also environmentally friendly. I hope you will not delay re-instituting the previous government's Climate Leadership Panel, including a mix of experts that are committed to climate action, and who can give positive direction and advice to your government on how to reduce GHG emissions and promote sustainable economic activity and green jobs.

Some references

Pollin, R., J. Wicks-Lim, H. Garrett-Peltier. 2009. Green prosperity: How clean-energy policies can fight poverty and raise living standards in the United States. Policy Econ. Res. Inst., Univ. Mass., Amherst.

Lee, M. and A. Card. 2012. A Green Industrial Revolution\_Climate Justice, Green Jobs and Sustainable Production in Canada--Can. Centre Policy Alternatives 12June2012.

Ivanova, I. 2014. BC Jobs Plan Reality Check\_The First Two Years-Can. Centre Policy Alternatives 09Jan 2014

Google 'Green Jobs BC'; see <http://www.greenjobsbc.org/resources>. 1055 W Georgia St, 26th Floor, Vancouver, BC V6E 3R5

s.22

## Stirling, Debbie EAO:EX

---

**From:** Braun, Nathan EAO:EX  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 20, 2017 8:44 AM  
**To:** Moore, Sean EAO:EX; Samath, Mayura EAO:EX; Morrison, Alli EAO:EX  
**Subject:** FW: Official Complaint re: BCEAO EA of Aurora LNG

FYI and for file

---

**From:** Jardine, Kevin EAO:EX  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 20, 2017 8:41 AM  
**To:** 'Sarah Brown'; Rice.MLA, Jennifer LASS:EX; nathan.cullen.a1@parl.gc.ca; Catherine.McKenna@parl.gc.ca; Horgan.MLA, John LASS:EX; Weaver.MLA, Andrew LASS:EX; elizabeth.may@parl.gc.ca; Heyman.MLA, George LASS:EX; Dix.MLA, Adrian LASS:EX; s.22  
**Cc:** Braun, Nathan EAO:EX; Bailey, Scott EAO:EX  
**Subject:** RE: Official Complaint re: BCEAO EA of Aurora LNG

Thank-you for your correspondence <sup>s.22</sup>. Please be assured that I take your criticism seriously and look forward to providing you with a more fulsome response in due course.

In the meantime, I wish to emphasize that the EAO is committed to administering a robust and comprehensive environmental assessment of the proposed Aurora LNG project and will take whatever time is necessary to meet this commitment.

As you may also be aware, in addition to the two previous public houses and comment periods, a third public comment period on the draft Assessment Report and draft Environmental Certificate Conditions is also planned for this project. I trust that this will give you an additional opportunity to inform the environmental assessment and ensuring your voice is reflected to ministers when they eventually turn their minds to considering this application on referral.

With very best regards,  
K.

**Kevin Jardine**  
Associate Deputy Minister  
Environmental Assessment Office  
Ministry of Environment  
Government of British Columbia  
TEL: 250-356-7478  
MOB & TXT: 250-361-6753



This e-mail is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed (the "addressee") and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use that a person other than the addressee makes of this communication is prohibited and any reliance or decisions made based on it, are the responsibility of such person. We accept no responsibility for any loss or damages suffered by any person other than the addressee as a result of decisions made or actions taken based on this communication or otherwise. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of this e-mail.

---

**From:** s.22  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 19, 2017 7:50 PM  
**To:** Jardine, Kevin EAO:EX; Rice.MLA, Jennifer LASS:EX; nathan.cullen.a1@parl.gc.ca; Catherine.McKenna@parl.gc.ca; Horgan.MLA, John LASS:EX; Weaver.MLA, Andrew LASS:EX; elizabeth.may@parl.gc.ca; Heyman.MLA, George LASS:EX;

Dix.MLA, Adrian LASS:EX; s.22

**Subject:** Official Complaint re: BCEAO EA of Aurora LNG

Sarah C. Brown  
PO Box 1054  
Prince Rupert, B.C.  
V8J 4H6

July 19<sup>th</sup>, 2017

Kevin Jardine, ADM, Environmental Assessment Office, Victoria, BC

sent by e-mail to [Kevin.Jardine@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Kevin.Jardine@gov.bc.ca)

Dear Mr. Jardine:

This is an official complaint about the way the EAO is failing the public in the assessment of the Aurora LNG plant proposal on Digby Island. I contend that EAO is not meeting its commitment to the public outlined in the Substitution Agreement.

#### THE SUBSTITUTION AGREEMENT

Under Requirements for a Substituted Environmental Assessment Section 4b)ii one reads BC has committed to “**give the public an opportunity to participate in the environmental assessment process** and provide access to records in relation to the assessment, to enable the meaningful participation of **the public**”.

As a long-term resident<sup>s.22</sup>, with concerns over the human health impacts that the Aurora LNG project would bring to s.22 due to proximity, I would say that I have studied more information, accessed the BCEAO website, and read the posted documents much more than the average individual.

Even as well-informed as I have attempted to be, there have been and are still many deterring factors that I have noticed during this EA review. The website has been extremely difficult to navigate and to access information from, even not working many times. Information on the website has often not been able to be shared with anyone else, denying a pathway for the public to share the documents and review them easily.

The public has not been kept informed of timeline changes, was poorly notified of the suspension of the review, and of the lifting of the suspension. Also, it is unacceptable that the affected communities and other interested public parties are denied timeline extensions to review the information being put forward and are kept on strict dates (in which there is no possible way all the relevant material could be reviewed) yet CNOOC-Nexen can have extensions whenever they wish to.

The commenting public is ignored. As someone who has put forth comments, I have been dismayed at the lack of response from CNOOC-Nexen. It has taken much time to research both the project and the possible human health impacts, and then to have insipid responses from the proponent such as:  
“Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.”

How can a response such as this even be accepted by the BCEAO as a resolution to a valid concern? This response has been used widely by CNOOC-Nexen, and it shows clearly the lack of respect that both the EA review process and CNOOC-Nexen have for the commenting public.

And, finally the “Working Group” review process was secret and being hidden from the public, until June 13. The Working Group Round 1 comments and responses posted with other additional information were published online only AFTER a formal complaint was publicly made by Josette Weir regarding the EA review and substitution process.

Now when I look to see if ROUND 2 is available yet for the public to see, it is NOT! Yet the Round 2 Working Group submissions were finalized by June 30. It seems to be a large time lag between most information and when it is posted on the BCEAO website. This time lag is unacceptable. How is the public to stay informed if the release of information has lengthy delays? How is the public to know if CNOOC-Nexen responded on the date they were supposed to?

**As CNOOC-NEXEN has missed providing information at crucial dates at many different times, I am unclear as to why the EA review is still going forward.**

This runaround has been part of the entire process - and it is beyond frustrating that the information is not being made available in a timely manner, in an easily accessible manner, and it is ludicrous that these games are being played by the proponent, and allowed and accepted by the BCEAO.

A fair evaluation of the Aurora LNG project has not happened, and will not happen with the EA review being biased and skewed to helping CNOOC-Nexen “fly under the radar”. The public has been denied access to information and adequate response time as part of the Substitution Agreement.

Many of the areas highlighted by Josette Weir, and requests to enhance transparency, have not been met. I would like to see those requests met.

Why should members of the public have to monitor and ensure that the BCEAO is following up on the commitments made in the substitution process?

I would like to see the Round 2 Working Group comments posted online, and I would like to see CNOOC-Nexen’s responses to those comments (of which they were to reply by July 17).

I look forward to your reply to my letter and to the concerns I have set forth here.  
The EA review for the CNOOC-Nexen Aurora LNG project should not be going forward.

Concerned Canadian Citizen <sup>s.22</sup>  
s.22

## Stirling, Debbie EAO:EX

---

**From:** Moore, Sean EAO:EX  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 19, 2017 9:12 PM  
**To:** Braun, Nathan EAO:EX  
**Cc:** Samath, Mayura EAO:EX; Morrison, Alli EAO:EX; Walton, Lindsay EAO:EX  
**Subject:** Re: Official Complaint re: BCEAO EA of Aurora LNG

Thanks Nathan. <sup>s.22</sup> has been highly engaged in this process and has provided some thoughtful comments.

Importantly, I still want to ensure we set up another community workshop in DC to walk through our draft conclusions and next steps when the timing is optimal. We are currently a black box to the public and I want to be able to tell our EA story in person. It will be a difficult conversation. Prefer to do this around the time we send out the draft referral package for review... we can chat about timing.

Cheers,  
Sean

On Jul 19, 2017, at 8:27 PM, Braun, Nathan EAO:EX <[Nathan.Braun@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Nathan.Braun@gov.bc.ca)> wrote:

For file and response.

Note that Kevin is requesting a general briefing next week. I will ensure you three are included.

**From:** Jardine, Kevin EAO:EX  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 19, 2017 8:06 PM  
**To:** Braun, Nathan EAO:EX  
**Cc:** Bailey, Scott EAO:EX; Christie, Karen L EAO:EX; Neilson, Kirsten EAO:EX  
**Subject:** Fwd: Official Complaint re: BCEAO EA of Aurora LNG  
FYI...Please review, Nathan, and have the team draft a response for my consideration.  
In light of your earlier email, I'll ask here that Kirsten please schedule a briefing; most likely early next week.

Rgds,  
K.

250-361-6753

**\*\*Please note:** This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain legally privileged information. Any unauthorized use, disclosure or reproduction is strictly prohibited.\*\*

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** <sup>s.22</sup>  
**Date:** July 19, 2017 at 7:49:33 PM PDT  
**To:** "<[Kevin.Jardine@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Kevin.Jardine@gov.bc.ca)>" <[Kevin.Jardine@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Kevin.Jardine@gov.bc.ca)>, "Rice.MLA, Jennifer" <[jennifer.rice.mla@leg.bc.ca](mailto:jennifer.rice.mla@leg.bc.ca)>, "<[nathan.cullen.a1@parl.gc.ca](mailto:nathan.cullen.a1@parl.gc.ca)>" <[nathan.cullen.a1@parl.gc.ca](mailto:nathan.cullen.a1@parl.gc.ca)>, "<[Catherine.McKenna@parl.gc.ca](mailto:Catherine.McKenna@parl.gc.ca)>" <[Catherine.McKenna@parl.gc.ca](mailto:Catherine.McKenna@parl.gc.ca)>, "<[john.horgan.mla@leg.bc.ca](mailto:john.horgan.mla@leg.bc.ca)>"

<john.horgan.mla@leg.bc.ca>, "andrew.weaver.mla@leg.bc.ca"  
<andrew.weaver.mla@leg.bc.ca>, "elizabeth.may@parl.gc.ca"  
<elizabeth.may@parl.gc.ca>, "george.heyman.mla@leg.bc.ca"  
<george.heyman.mla@leg.bc.ca>, "adrian.dix.mla@leg.bc.ca"  
<adrian.dix.mla@leg.bc.ca>, s.22  
s.22

**Subject: Official Complaint re: BCEAO EA of Aurora LNG**

s.22

July 19<sup>th</sup>, 2017

Kevin Jardine, ADM, Environmental Assessment Office, Victoria, BC

sent by e-mail to [Kevin.Jardine@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Kevin.Jardine@gov.bc.ca)

Dear Mr. Jardine:

This is an official complaint about the way the EAO is failing the public in the assessment of the Aurora LNG plant proposal on Digby Island. I contend that EAO is not meeting its commitment to the public outlined in the Substitution Agreement.

#### THE SUBSTITUTION AGREEMENT

Under Requirements for a Substituted Environmental Assessment Section 4b)ii one reads BC has committed to “*give the public an opportunity to participate in the environmental assessment process* and provide access to records in relation to the assessment, to enable the meaningful participation of *the public*”.

As a long-term resident <sup>s.22</sup>, with concerns over the human health impacts that the Aurora LNG project would bring <sup>s.22</sup>  
<sup>s.22</sup> due to proximity, I would say that I have studied more information, accessed the BCEAO website, and read the posted documents much more than the average individual.

Even as well-informed as I have attempted to be, there have been and are still many deterring factors that I have noticed during this EA review. The website has been extremely difficult to navigate and to access information from, even not working many times. Information on the website has often not been able to be shared with anyone else, denying a pathway for the public to share the documents and review them easily.

The public has not been kept informed of timeline changes, was poorly notified of the suspension of the review, and of the lifting of the suspension. Also, it is unacceptable that the affected communities and other interested public parties are denied timeline extensions to review the information being put forward and are kept on strict dates (in which there is no possible way all the relevant material could be reviewed) yet CNOOC-Nexen can have extensions whenever they wish to.

The commenting public is ignored. As someone who has put forth comments, I have been dismayed at the lack of response from CNOOC-Nexen. It has taken much time to research both the project and the possible human health impacts, and then to have insipid responses from the proponent such as:

“Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.”

How can a response such as this even be accepted by the BCEAO as a resolution to a valid concern? This response has been used widely by CNOOC-Nexen, and it shows clearly the lack of respect that both the EA review process and CNOOC-Nexen have for the commenting public.

And, finally the “Working Group” review process was secret and being hidden from the public, until June 13. The Working Group Round 1 comments and responses posted with other additional information were published online only AFTER a formal complaint was publicly made by Josette Weir regarding the EA review and substitution process.

Now when I look to see if ROUND 2 is available yet for the public to see, it is NOT! Yet the Round 2 Working Group submissions were finalized by June 30. It seems to be a large time lag between most information and when it is posted on the BCEAO website. This time lag is unacceptable. How is the public to stay informed if the release of information has lengthy delays? How is the public to know if CNOOC-Nexen responded on the date they were supposed to?

**As CNOOC-NEXEN has missed providing information at crucial dates at many different times, I am unclear as to why the EA review is still going forward.**

This runaround has been part of the entire process - and it is beyond frustrating that the information is not being made available in a timely manner, in an easily accessible manner, and it is ludicrous that these games are being played by the proponent, and allowed and accepted by the BCEAO.

A fair evaluation of the Aurora LNG project has not happened, and will not happen with the EA review being biased and skewed to helping CNOOC-Nexen “fly under the radar”. The public has been denied access to information and adequate response time as part of the Substitution Agreement.

Many of the areas highlighted by Josette Weir, and requests to enhance transparency, have not been met. I would like to see those requests met.

Why should members of the public have to monitor and ensure that the BCEAO is following up on the commitments made in the substitution process?

I would like to see the Round 2 Working Group comments posted online, and I would like to see CNOOC-Nexen’s responses to those comments (of which they were to reply by July 17).

I look forward to your reply to my letter and to the concerns I have set forth here. The EA review for the CNOOC-Nexen Aurora LNG project should not be going forward.

Concerned Canadian Citizen s.22

s.22



July 19<sup>th</sup>, 2017

Kevin Jardine, ADM, Environmental Assessment Office, Victoria, BC

sent by e-mail to Kevin.Jardine@gov.bc.ca

Dear Mr. Jardine:

This is an official complaint about the way the EAO is failing the public in the assessment of the Aurora LNG plant proposal on Digby Island. I contend that EAO is not meeting its commitment to the public outlined in the Substitution Agreement.

#### THE SUBSTITUTION AGREEMENT

Under Requirements for a Substituted Environmental Assessment Section 4b)ii one reads BC has committed to “**give the public an opportunity to participate in the environmental assessment process** and provide access to records in relation to the assessment, to enable the meaningful participation of **the public**”.

As a long-term resident <sup>s.22</sup> with concerns over the human health impacts that the Aurora LNG project would bring <sup>s.22</sup> due to proximity, I would say that I have studied more information, accessed the BCEAO website, and read the posted documents much more than the average individual.

Even as well-informed as I have attempted to be, there have been and are still many deterring factors that I have noticed during this EA review. The website has been extremely difficult to navigate and to access information from, even not working many times. Information on the website has often not been able to be shared with anyone else, denying a pathway for the public to share the documents and review them easily.

The public has not been kept informed of timeline changes, was poorly notified of the suspension of the review, and of the lifting of the suspension. Also, it is unacceptable that the affected communities and other interested public parties are

denied timeline extensions to review the information being put forward and are kept on strict dates (in which there is no possible way all the relevant material could be reviewed) yet CNOOC-Nexen can have extensions whenever they wish to.

The commenting public is ignored. As someone who has put forth comments, I have been dismayed at the lack of response from CNOOC-Nexen. It has taken much time to research both the project and the possible human health impacts, and then to have insipid responses from the proponent such as:

“Aurora LNG appreciates and acknowledges your concerns. Aurora LNG is undergoing a thorough, independent environmental assessment process, led by the BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) and involving both provincial and federal regulators, to examine all potentially adverse effects of the project and determine ways to avoid or lessen potential effects.”

How can a response such as this even be accepted by the BCEAO as a resolution to a valid concern? This response has been used widely by CNOOC-Nexen, and it shows clearly the lack of respect that both the EA review process and CNOOC-Nexen have for the commenting public.

And, finally the “Working Group” review process was secret and being hidden from the public, until June 13. The Working Group Round 1 comments and responses posted with other additional information were published online only AFTER a formal complaint was publicly made by Josette Weir regarding the EA review and substitution process.

Now when I look to see if ROUND 2 is available yet for the public to see, it is NOT! Yet the Round 2 Working Group submissions were finalized by June 30. It seems to be a large time lag between most information and when it is posted on the BCEAO website. This time lag is unacceptable. How is the public to stay informed if the release of information has lengthy delays? How is the public to know if CNOOC-Nexen responded on the date they were supposed to?

**As CNOOC-NEXEN has missed providing information at crucial dates at many different times, I am unclear as to why the EA review is still going forward.**

This runaround has been part of the entire process - and it is beyond frustrating that the information is not being made available in a timely manner, in an easily

accessible manner, and it is ludicrous that these games are being played by the proponent, and allowed and accepted by the BCEAO.

A fair evaluation of the Aurora LNG project has not happened, and will not happen with the EA review being biased and skewed to helping CNOOC-Nexen “fly under the radar”. The public has been denied access to information and adequate response time as part of the Substitution Agreement.

Many of the areas highlighted by Josette Weir, and requests to enhance transparency, have not been met. I would like to see those requests met.

Why should members of the public have to monitor and ensure that the BCEAO is following up on the commitments made in the substitution process?

I would like to see the Round 2 Working Group comments posted online, and I would like to see CNOOC-Nexen’s responses to those comments (of which they were to reply by July 17).

I look forward to your reply to my letter and to the concerns I have set forth here.

The EA review for the CNOOC-Nexen Aurora LNG project should not be going forward.

Concerned Canadian Citizen s.22

s.22

**From:** [Heyman.MLA, George](#)  
**To:** [Minister, ENV ENV:EX](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: Our Actual Future--a Crucial Subject (Written in Rich Text)  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 26, 2017 3:32:45 PM

---

---

**From:** s.22

**Sent:** Sunday, July 23, 2017 8:27 PM

**To:** Horgan.MLA, John; Weaver.MLA, Andrew; Clark.MLA, Christy

**Cc:** Mungall.MLA, Michelle; Heyman.MLA, George; James.MLA, Carole; Donaldson.MLA, Doug; Fraser.MLA, Scott; Ralston.MLA, Bruce; Chow.MLA, George; Bains.MLA, Harry

**Subject:** Our Actual Future--a Crucial Subject (Written in Rich Text)

Dear Premier Horgan and Members of the Legislative Assembly:

First of all, congratulations to our new government; I hope we will all be able to work together towards a very good future!

The following is a copy of an email and letter I sent to Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, with appropriate cc's and bcc's. If you have received this email, please be assured that it is for your eyes, as those under cc. have been selected because of your ministries, which you will be able to see as you read. If you would like to forward this to anyone else, of course I would be very happy...! I just ask that you would please follow the request I have asked of Mr. Trudeau and allow me the grace and favour to read it all. Thank you very much.

s.22

---

Dear Prime Minister Trudeau,

With all that is going on in the world today there is no good time to send this letter--but it must be sent. It has taken me a great deal of time and effort to write, and I know that you have System Overload, but I would like to ask for the grace and favour to be extended to read all that I have said--and if you get multiple copies, please read at least one. And please don't read it quickly. I'm sorry, but--alas--it *is* rather lengthy.

I would like to address the issue of the Kinder Morgan Pipeline Expansion Project, but it is over and above that. I will not address all the very real problems brought forth by all parties who will be negatively affected, including indigenous peoples, cities, municipalities, etc., whose positions I wholeheartedly support, as they've done many very thorough and mindful presentations--although their concerns seemingly have fallen upon deaf ears; I will also not address the other proposed pipelines, as those affected will needfully be having to fight their own battles; neither climate

change--a very complex subject--as I am not a scientist; nor any other puzzling questions that could be raised. I have also read and support with admiration the presentation to the Trans Mountain Ministerial Review Panel by my own Member of Parliament, Mr. Terry Beech. However, I had been very disappointed with his subsequent acceptance of the government's approval of this project, and was therefore wondering what pressures or persuasions may have been brought to bear. However, I understand that recently he voted *against* this very hated pipeline! What I want to do now is to challenge those who make the decisions to *really think*, including in ways possibly "outside the box," although not everything of what I will raise is new. I do not fit into the usual category of 'environmentalist,' and often cringe at many of the tactics, but I do love the best things about our planet and want it and all of its life to be preserved and thrive. I am also non-partisan, and will support what is right no matter *who* does it.

My first statement is this: *at this time in our history that we need to be cutting back, **this is no time--at all--for expansion!*** I know this government has supposedly made the commitment to deal more responsibly with the world we all live in (for which I applaud you), and much is being made about it on the world stage, but the approval of any, and in particular this, pipeline is totally counter-productive to that end. Lest you think this is too radical a statement, please do hear what I want to say. Some of my statements *will* appear to be radical, and possibly even a bit harsh, but they need to be said by someone, so why not me. And I believe I will speak for a vast number of people. If only you could see them all, our local newspapers are almost always full of mind-opening articles and comments that would certainly give pause for much more considered and appropriate thought.

I have often referred to various entities as "the tail wagging the dog," such as (previously) China and all entrenched oil companies, both world-wide and Canadian. As for China, I am continually being amazed by the information coming forth about their new awakening, such as "Green China Rising," and more. I actually heard it stated within this month that they are becoming the world leader in green technology. Who knew...? However, they're not there yet, and we shouldn't be helping with any more destructive practices. Almost every day--*actually* every day now--I am hearing about new, amazing developments in technology that are taking us further and further into pollution-free energy sources. (The CBC is particularly good with its coverage.) In fact, there is a flood of information coming out (e.g., just one among many I have noted--Electrovaya). As for automobiles, pundits are now saying that, even within ten years, most cars will be electric and possibly driverless. With all the brilliant minds that we do have in Canada we can take giant leaps in this field--providing they get funding and support. It would be good to see more money going into this area rather than subsidies for oil companies...no matter what their bleating... And, if we are to persist in continuing this folly, the very least we can do is produce our own products for our own consumption, which is ultimately somewhat less polluting. Canada should be a *leader* in this field, not a joiner in continuing environmental folly.

***Canada, we can do this!!!***

As for the old chestnut, "How did you arrive here? By car...?": as for me personally, I am not against the car. When I was a young woman my first car gave me the ease and freedom that I craved. I would dearly love to have an expensive hybrid or electric vehicle, but my husband is not in favour of spending *any* money for *any* reason, and I can just see what it would be like around here if I went ahead and bought an expensive, new vehicle. In 2011 we had to practically pry his hands off the

steering wheel of our 1989 run-down Suzuki Swift (very energy-efficient) to buy a new(er) car; he's been complaining about it ever since. People should remember the saying, "...walk a mile in another's shoes..." before judging anyone else. We were born into a system that has been set up for us, and it will take years to turn it around--if there's a will. As for transit, well... Oh, what a deep hole we have dug for ourselves; let's not make it any deeper.

(Insert: News Flash! I've heard the news about Volvo. Way to go!)

As for the above-mentioned hazards, the worst being spills, which have every possibility of happening in spite of what I call the "brainwashing commercials" by the proponent oil companies and the Port of Vancouver (!) as a diversion from the real issues (can I call it "greenwashing"?), which I came to turn off in disgust every time they ran (some of the messages being totally and mind-numbingly irrelevant, although often presented by some sincere, quite innocent and no doubt exploited people): could you please repeat after me "human error" (no matter how many precautions are taken); and "catastrophic natural events"--storms, earthquakes, tsunamis, etc.--over which no one has control and to which B.C. is somewhat prone. You think I exaggerate? They've already happened in other places with similar risk. It is just a matter of time... And these are not the only hazards. Do we want *any* of it? And do we really think all the response systems being frenetically put together will *ever* be adequate? The answer is \_\_\_\_? And it really *cannot* be too late--in spite of contracts. Even legal action and fines *would* be preferable to this continuing insult to intelligence.

Also, now the spectre has been raised that, "If we can't have the pipeline, we will send it by rail." What part of "no" do the oil companies et al not understand? We are *as* opposed, if not more, to the increased tanker traffic on every part of our coast as to the pipeline. Period. Someone has also raised the bluff that no province is to oppose the transport of any goods across its land; however, I would assume that that does not mean products that will potentially harm, pollute, trample on rights and trespass massively via forceful expropriation of others' properties. Or *is* that the intent...? (Even *if* we were to send it by rail, from what I have heard there are different types of bitumen that are relatively safe to transport as opposed to dil-bit or other types of product, but if we insist despite all indications to the contrary to export our resources, the only acceptable solution is to refine here and ship value-added, safer products. The form of product in the Lac Megantic disaster should never have been sent by rail.) Either way, I'm sure history would look back on us as every kind of fool: when we had the opportunity to change things we pushed ahead with a great deal of obtuse resolution. Let this not be just a crass "money-grab" by those wanting to get the most out of all this while it lasts!

As for the loss of oil-related jobs, I am not an "end justifies the means" kind of person. It should not be "jobs" at any cost. Quite often you hear in relation to political priorities, "It's the economy, stupid." From time immemorial jobs have been lost, jobs have changed, new ones have been created in their place. Almost every day I am hearing about changes that have happened in many other job markets--including over the centuries--due to advancements in knowledge, technology and practices. Things come and things go. Why should it be any different for the oil industry? (Dost thou, for instance, remember buggy whips, wagon wheels, the stagecoach, horse-drawn carriages, schooners, the steam train, the gramophone, \_\_\_\_\_?) Any major change can be painful

for *someone*, even many, in the beginning, but if done right it can/will ultimately benefit everyone.

I also don't understand the reasoning behind the shell game of caps, carbon trading, carbon taxes, etc., at source--but how about the toxic burning at the receiving end? We should now have reached the peak and are heading downhill. Period. The human race survived without all these products for millennia. Suppositional question: can we now not survive without them? The conclusion would be: yes, we can. It is inevitable: why not now?

It has been said that you "won't be swayed by political arguments": *what if* the "political arguments" are arguments for life--including the quality thereof? (And in many documented cases life itself?) It is stated that deaths by pollution from combined fossil fuel sources (including coal, which we also facilitate), especially in Asia, are at least \_\_\_\_\_ per year. (Note: I was going to fill in the blank or give you a link to a Google Search page, but will just refer you to a search term, "How many deaths in Asia from pollution?" If these figures are true, **it is shocking**.) There is an enormous hue and cry over the wrongful death of only one person, and rightly so--and the recriminations can carry on for years--but it's okay if we contribute to the deaths of multiplied tens of thousands (or even millions?) every year as long as they're out of sight. May there just possibly be something wrong about this concept...? It really does boggle the mind... (Do we at least remember the lead-up to the Beijing Olympics surrounding an appalling condition that almost always exists?) Even in our own Fraser Valley the pollution often becomes so toxic in the summertime that people with compromised immune systems or respiratory illnesses are frequently advised to stay indoors--and the blue haze is thick *everywhere*, even under the best conditions. In fact, as I have been writing we had our first warning in Vancouver itself (July 6th)--this having nothing to do with smoke from forest fires--so far. This is a *huge* moral issue--if I may say that word. What do we really care about? Is it just money, no matter how we get it? The incalculable damage is becoming more apparent every day.

And I (sadly) love plastic...but may we also be reminded that, by its irresponsible use, there are huge islands of waste plastic in our oceans comparable to the size of countries and states, and our shorelines become disgustingly cluttered? As it breaks down it goes into the ocean, where it is consumed by ocean life--causing it irreparable harm--some of which is then ultimately consumed by us. Should we continue endorsing *expansion*? When we have alternatives this is *completely* insane. (How else can it be described...?) I am ecstatic to hear that there is now someone attempting to remediate this situation by collecting and disposing of this sea-borne waste--but that is not the ultimate solution.

Even natural gas has its hazards--from the fracking system that pollutes groundwater and *does* cause earthquakes (despite the lame and unbelievable protests that it doesn't), to its very explosive nature, to gas leaks killing people in their own homes and destroying buildings, etc., etc., etc. The sooner we can get better systems on a widespread basis, the better it will be.

We need to remember that the *denials* of harm are not *proof*: e.g., the tobacco industry, asbestos, coal (black lung+), uranium, mercury, rampant spraying of pesticides, acid rain, concussions, even the Holocaust, et al. Many battles have had to be fought and won. We **know better now**: should this not logically lead to much better decisions and behaviours, especially about things so obviously

destructive? What will future generations think of us when they know we had a chance to make things better--but didn't? !! It is not those of us who are opposing this that are the dinosaurs; we are the progressive ones.

And I don't think you need to give Alberta any concessions because of a hiccup... And I really like Alberta, but perhaps my "tail wagging" statement might apply...?

I am very, very serious about what I have said. I have heard all the beautiful rhetoric on the world stage and hope that's not all it will be. *This pipeline* (and most others) *should not go ahead*. This is a travesty, both for the world and also the people who do care and will be affected in British Columbia and beyond. And I really wonder what "pressures and persuasions" might have been expertly applied to the Federal Government of Canada. May the Government of Canada, the Government of British Columbia, the Government of Alberta (+) and anyone else step back and *do a better thing*, no matter how hard it may be. And thank you for listening.

Only one very (very) disturbed but hopeful citizen,

s.22

(P.S.: Copies of this will be going to various others via fwd. and bcc.)