

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [+WPG725 - Clean Environment Commission](#)  
**Subject:** Silica sand extraction project  
**Date:** March 23, 2023 10:23:19 PM

---

CAUTION: This email originated from an External Sender. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the source.

ATTENTION: ce courriel provient d'un expéditeur externe. Ne cliquez sur aucun lien et n'ouvrez pas de pièce jointe, excepté si vous connaissez l'expéditeur.

Date: March 23, 2023

Jay Doering

Chair,

Clean Environment Commission,

Re: Vivian Silica Sand Extraction Project

Mr. Doering:

I am writing today to register my objection to this project being allowed to proceed. I am a long time resident and cottage owner in the RM of Reynolds and an environmental enthusiast.

It seems to me that with projects like this one we have to balance economic growth with environmental protection. The Precautionary Principle is the guideline that has to be applied in all modern environmental decision-making especially with such novel and complex projects. It seems to me that the Clean Environment Commission has tried to apply the Principle's four components but with varying degrees of success.

(1) You have put the burden of proof on the project proponents to demonstrate that it will not harm the environment. The representatives of Sio Silica Sands failed to demonstrate that. That is because they are trying something completely new and aren't sure how it will work. In addition there has been no cumulative impact assessment. We are supposed to trust them anyway. They continually stress the advantages of silica sand to the green energy economy if the project is allowed to go ahead. But they minimize the potential risks to the environment. That's not good enough. Destroying aquifers cannot ever be considered economical or "green".

(2) You have explored some potential safer alternatives with them to avoid harm but not many actually exist with the risky methods they insist on using.

(3) I congratulate you for making it easy for residents, politicians, environmentalists, businesses etc. to participate in the decision. Many of us have showed up at the CEC meetings, made presentations and corresponded with the CEC by letter or online. We are all better informed as a result.

(4) But the potential of doing massive harm to the environment remains if this project goes ahead. Possible damage to and contamination of aquifers and subsequent loss of sufficient potable water for people and businesses in the region is irreversible. Damage to plants and animals, air and water purity, and human quality of life is inevitable. You must take preventative action in the face of uncertainty. Please recommend no license be issued for this project to proceed.

Sincerely,

Doris Ames