

EXHIBIT NO. 11-040
File Name Sue Ziemiński Perata
Date: 3-13-23
Received by [Signature] (Secretary)

Good evening to everyone.

My name is Sue Ziemiński, I have lived in the RM of Springfield for 14 years, on a piece of property near Birds Hill Park. I am not a scientist nor am I an expert however, I have worked in the field of environmental sustainability for about 20 years. In the five years prior to retirement I was the National Manager of Sustainability for a portfolio of about 250 commercial, retail and industrial properties in the USA and Canada for a major REIT. Over the last year or so I have attended many meetings and information sessions on the former CanWhite sands and its new rendition to Sio Silica. I have sent in a written presentation to the CEC about this issue but wanted to speak to a few heartfelt points.

These are the items that have me most concerned.

- 1) First point: We Springfield residents do not want this company to go one step further in their operations. We want them to cease any further operation and mitigate the damages they have already created in their quest for financial windfall at the expense of the present and future residents of southern Manitoba. **We want them gone.** Springfield residents were not made aware of the intentions of CanWhite nor were we made aware that our previous Mayor had consulted with CanWhite sands to allow them access to RM property to investigate what was under the aquifer. Had we been made aware of this transgression, had this been done transparently, we would have voiced enough opinion to halt this in the beginning, as did the other 7 neighboring municipalities. Of note 4 of our 5 current councillors including our mayor pledged to "not allow" Sio Silica to continue. They each said no to Sio Silica operations when asked that question directly

at the election forums held just prior to their election on Oct 22nd of last year, a scant 4 months ago. The only councillor that did not say yay or nay was the one councillor re-elected who chose not to attend any of the 3 election forums held by the grass roots organization known as Springfield Democratic Development. This group, of which I am proudly a member and has been around in excess of a dozen years, has a mandate to make residents aware of items of concern to the future wellbeing of Springfield. **Again, we want sio silica gone**

- 2) Second Point: Many concerned citizens and experts who you hear from cannot fathom how we can possibly allow a company to drill 10,000 wells over 24 years and only analyse the impact of the first 3 years of operations. And use this as a basis for allowing the further continuance of the remaining 21 years. You don't build a prototype of anything without proving the long term viability of the item. **Analysis of the first 3 years out of 24 year life does not leave anyone feeling comfortable.**
- 3) Third point: And on the subject of 10,000 wells.... How are you going to cap them effectively so that they do not capsize or depress so that no person, animal or contaminate can gain access into them or into the water below for all the hundreds of years that they will remain there.
- 4) Fourth Point: up until this weekend Sio Silica did not have a client for the sand. We see from the splashy full page add in Saturdays paper that they have an MOU signed with a German Company. An MOU, even if real, does not guarantee a commitment. To date Sio Silica has spoken of the need for silica sand for solar power panels. Until recently silica sand was needed for fracking until it was discovered that you didn't need the high quality of silica sand but rather that you could use plain brown sand, regular sand, to

frack with. Who is to say that the solar panel method of creating electricity will still be a preferable method in the near future? Will Silica sand still be the preferential component for solar panels? **Do we want to potentially destroy our drinking water today to build solar panels that may not be the popular or price effective solution in the near future?**

- 5) Fifth Point.. And even if the MOU is real why would we think that a German company is going to settle in Manitoba, employ 8,000 people that we do not have here. They would in all likelihood settle in Alberta where environmental rules are more lax, taxes are cheaper and there are more people available for work. What is more likely to happen if this project is not rejected, is for Sio to cut into our aquifer, suck out the sand, contaminate for life our water, to deliver the sand by rail cars to an Alberta plant. **That process leaves us with a forever damaged aquifer and a handful of maybe 25 employees for a 24 year term**
- 6) Sixth point: Dollars to donuts our water will get contaminated by this method of extraction. How can Sio Silica possibly state that they can extract the sand in a slurry solution with our precious water, then muck around with extricating the sand from the water, then reintroduce the left over water back into the aquifer? Even with UV treatment there is the possibility of contamination of the water with microbes and air. Air is everywhere, short of outer space. **It's unbelievable.**
- 7) Seventh point: simply, this radical and untested for safety "airlift/ water mining process", should make this process a no go. **It is not proven safe.**

In summation:

We need to save our water and save it from impurities for the countless generations that will make Canada their home. As the world warms, we will experience a vast increase of immigration to Canada. Where will those people build their new lives if we don't have the water to foster agriculture to produce the food we need and the water we need to drink to survive.

Please deny Sio Silica