

From: [REDACTED]
To: [+WPG725 - Clean Environment Commission](#)
Subject: Sio Silica Project
Date: March 24, 2023 11:57:10 AM

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.

To the Members of the CEC,

I've tried to think about what I wanted to say for weeks, perhaps even months, regarding the Vivian Silica Sands Project. It is hard to put into a succinct email just how unconfident I am about this exploitation of the land and resources. I am distrusting of this project for several reasons.

Firstly, I would like to discuss Sio's use of the word "innovation". I am not an unreasonable person, I understand that words like "innovation" are attractive and necessary as we continue forward. However, have you read any latest climate reports in the last week even - from highly regarded experts and professionals? Continuing to support exploitative practices is not recommended. Tearing apart what many of us call a "carbon sink" can not be a part of the plan. The one thing I could potentially agree with Sio Silica is that yes, innovation is needed. But, we disagree on what many of us concerned community members call "innovation". How can we agree that "innovation" still includes exploiting the earth at an alarming rate? How about the fact that there is no guarantee what this project will achieve or produce? How many wells will continuously be dug even after many may fail? How will these well sites be monitored for the centuries that follow?

Secondly, I am concerned with the inadequacy of the licensing and enforcement process. To quote a Winnipeg Free Press article from May 19, 2021:

"Back in 2008, the Manitoba Ombudsman's office undertook an investigation of licencing and enforcement practices related to the Water Rights Act, and stated in their report that:

"We reviewed all relevant statutes and regulations, as well as all relevant policies and procedures. Serious underlying issues were identified including: significant resource shortfalls; confusion about the department's role and mandate; inadequate and outdated policies; deficient or non existent administrative procedures; and backlogs in both license applications and complaints investigations."

As a community member, who is not in a political position, is it my job to know every inch of regulating bodies? Policies? Licenses? What has changed since this investigation?

I would like to know because my livelihood is at stake. Along with a potential 100,000 people who live and survive off of the aquifers in question. That isn't even a generational approximation. That is current.

Thirdly, who will protect us during this project? Who is even included in potentially being protected? Is it a radius? Who will protect us when disaster strikes? How can you even compensate for a contaminated water source? It is priceless.

Lastly, I am very concerned about the company's attempt to "green wash" this project. It is dishonest and sinister. Pushing the agenda that this material will be used for solar, electric batteries, etc. without even being able to fully prove that is the case. You also cannot guarantee that all of the jobs will be local. What is "local" about a project that will export material nationally and internationally? How is that supporting a "green initiative"? The language used is honestly lazy and it feels like the wool is being pulled over our eyes.

To conclude, I would like to bring attention to the following quote from Mining Watch Canada, October 5, 2020:

Today, mining in Canada generates over [30 times the volumes of solid waste](#) that all citizens, municipalities & industries combined produce on a yearly basis.

As the grades of the ore deposits that are mined [get lower and lower](#) over time, the more waste is generated.

Mine waste sites are also failing at an increasing rate, with more and more [catastrophic spills](#) documented in recent years.

Many Canadian lakes, rivers and watersheds are already [contaminated](#) by mining, some very recently.

Dozens of mine waste sites will require [wastewater treatment](#) for the next 200 to 400 years, or more.

Before this project is even continued to be considered, I would like to further quote Mining Watch Canada, October 5, 2020:

From communities on the ground to the U.N. International Resources Panel, an increasing number of citizens, scientists, and organizations are urging governments to act [to reduce resource extraction and consumption](#), especially in [affluent countries](#) like Canada. They also urge governments to enact and enforce stricter mining conditions.

As a concerned member of Springfield, I strongly object to the Sio Silica proposed

project. I'd like us to consider the responsibility we have to move forward in a way that protects people, the land, animals, today and tomorrow.

Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns,

Kathryn Laframboise