From: Bob Price
To: EAOINFO EAO:EX;
cc: OfficeofthePremier, Office PREM:EX; Minister, ENV ENV:EX; Sven Biggs; bute.review@ceaa-acee.gc.ca; James.MLA, Carole A LASS:EX; Simons. MLA, Nicholas LASS:EX; Weston.J@parl.gc.ca; ignatieff.m@parl.gc.ca; Jack Layton - M.P.; Duceppe.G@parl.gc.ca; Martin.K@parl.gc.ca; admin@wcel.org; Prentice.J@parl.gc.ca; Greg Gowe;
Subject: NO! to the massive Butte Inlet IPP
Date: Wednesday, February 18, 2009 3:50:53 PM

Kathy Eichenberger
Environmental Assessment Office
eaoinfo@gov.bc.ca

Ms. Eichenberger:

Subject: No to the Butte IPP.

This massive assault on BC's Natural beauty; freshwater; and fish and wildlife habitat; has got to stop.

We need a moratorium on this ridiculous giveaway of BC's power and water until a full, cumulative study has been done and the BC public has a chance to go to the local population center meetings, that your office arrogantly and stubbornly refuses to host, in large populations centers. You are overseeing the sellout of BC's water and by denying the public a chance to be honestly informed of the intent, you are merely setting the stage for an overthrow of this irresponsible Liberal Government behavior- on May 12. The public has a right to see what damage you are doing ... while cloaked in the deceit of small meetings in isolated, hardly accessible villages...willy nilly.... here and there. A schoolboy could pick better and more suitable locations.

This is not politics!! This issue, is pure and simple about: environmental planning, environmental foresight, environmental resource management. and BC's environmental legacy.... and therefore comes fully into play with these IPPs.

I have been up Butte Inlet. Have YOU??????

Butte Inlet, as with other coastal Inlets, are the future of this province's tourist trade... and you plan to permit desecration of these inlets and rivers by certifying the local IPPs in those inlets as environmentally friendly? ... when they are not.

Why would the BC government do a extensive "Commercial and Public recreation Study for the Sunshine Coast Forest district study" by Geoscape Planners, on the increasing value of eco -tourism value on the Sunshine Coast and then proceed to grant destructive IPPs to desecrate the very areas the government study said were so good? An extract follows:

Geoscape Environmental Planners ***Clover Point Cartographics Ltd.*** http://ilmbwww.gov.bc.ca/cis/initiatives/tourism/tos/Sunshine/SC_Report_Full.pdf

TOURISM AND RECREATION ON THE SUNSHINE COAST

Tourism and recreation in the Sunshine Coast is strongly linked to land use and is directly dependent on back country, fish, wildlife and other resource values. About one quarter of all visitors directly participate in outdoor activities, while the majority of the remainder place a high value on the wilderness and wildlife attributes. Rising park and recreation site visitation, heightened competition for new commercial tenures and anecdotal evidence of unlicensed commercial activity point to increased demand for outdoor recreation and tourism. Globally, there is increased demand for adventure and eco-tourism products, such as those found in the region.

There are 605 *tourism operators* (businesses) in the FD broken up into 335 accommodation providers, 112 attractions/facilities, 46 transportation providers and 250 outdoor or adventure-based tourism businesses.

The total of tourism types is greater than the total number of tourism operators as some offer multiple types of operations (e.g. a marina may offer an attraction, accommodation

and outdoor tour). The majority
(75%) of the outdoor business offerings are marine-based lead by saltwater fish guiding, general marine
charters, sea kayaking/canoeing, scuba diving and sailing. The land-based operators are primarily involved
in hiking/mountaineering and nature tours. Cycling tours (mountain biking) is becoming more popular in
the region.
The study area is well represented by protected areas, which are experiencing increasing use. There are 41 provincial parks
and four ecological reserves in the FD, a few of which account for sizeable and increasing visitor volumes.
Day use and campground use, a significant proportion of which is by non-residents, grew by 62% and
Sunshine Coast Tourism, Public Recreation and Commercial Recreation Study
34% respectively, over the 1991-2000 period. Data on camping and day use trends for park districts across
BC indicate that the Garibaldi/Sunshine Coast District is experiencing high utilization rates during peak
summer months and growth rates about double that of the provincial average. Interestingly, registered
boat users at provincial parks in the region declined in the 1990s.

As an informed Taxpayer who knows these coastal waters and rivers, I am completely against the Butte development for the following reasons:

Some proponents claim on their website they are not damming rivers. They are.

They are planning to reduce, restrict and alter water flow.

Their effect on spawning grounds will directly, and negatively, impact fish spawning areas. In fact you were present in Egmont when the Plutonic CEO made the announcement to the effect that "...rubber bladder dams were a good thing as they can be deflated and the sand and

sediment built up behind the dam can be..." and I quote "... flushed downstream"... in one glob .. right into fish habitat and you did not flinch or draw the CEO's attention to destruction of fish habitat which a minister of the crown of this very government stated, "If it harms fish habitat, the project will not proceed." Canada has just participated in a five nation worry conference on "what happened to the Salmon? Well, combining previous disastrous logging practices, fish farm lice and now IPP's is a disaster. Cumulatively, they are going to hurry the west coast indigenous salmon into the extinct pile... (just like with the East Coast Cod and we all know how well DFO and government stewarded those resources.)

But specifically back to Butte:

Diverting 17 rivers?

Clear cutting for 440 KM of roads?

Clear cutting for transmission lines?

Chainsaws, Blasting, bulldozers, construction noise.... polluiton during the construction phase. Do the wildlife of Butte, when under duress, get a free pass to Palm Springs or ...perhaps Maui, as in the case of our party-loving premier?

And the current Forest Licence owners? ... is their extensive, Ministry of Forest forest planning process now to be run rough shod over by Foreign capital, in Campbells' sellout? In perpetuity? And these IPPs claim they are about making jobs, but Forest workers have their work cut so that part time workers can have temporary jobs in BC? People have worked hard for responsible forestry planning, hence the Forest Practices Code... and a water code? Not insight.
Visual impact, carefully considered and public consultation, by forest companies in their annual cut plans are now to be thrown out of the window by these IPPs?

100 new bridges?

This massive Butte hydro electric project will impact the wildlife in that area. I know most city centered bureaucrats take their kids to petting zoos and aquariums, but the vast majority of BCers enjoy viewing Grizzly

bear, black bear, osprey, peregrine falcons, eagles, fishing all five species of salmon, steelhead; viewing migratory birds- ducks, trumpeter swans; never mind coastal plants ... they want to see them in their natural habitat- national georgraphic-"live and close up" so to speak..... - not stuffed in a museum, as Victoria's bureaucrats do.

With Whistler Blackcomb now an anthill of human madness. And the Squamish highway now a rock pile of debris and blasting- well over budget.... and all for two weeks of winter fun... and the environmental impact?? Hello EAO??? hellooooo? Anyone know? Or care?

Nature seeking people, from all around the world, find and visit the Sunshine Coast and we do not want it destroyed ... from Gibsons to Juneau, by this "Greed power", not 'green' Power" in the new Gold Ru$h for export profit as a local proponent's biologist declared.. At least when this country experienced the Klondike Gold Rush we had the NWMP to monitor things. Once approved Proponents have a green light to go on, it's without any oversight.
In those "bad old" days of that wild Gold Rush in Dawson City, the senior legal counsel or the BC SEC did not jump to a local IPP's corporate board as V/P. Announcing the " Gold Ru$h expre$$..... all in$ider$ aboard."

And posted bonds for safe and prudent performance of the environmental issues? Not a chance!

And the Clean UP cost for an environmental disaster such as a mis-function and Fish Kill a la Miller Creek? The BC taxpayers burden of course?

Forest Fires. Mud or rock slides? on Transmission lines?

and the pending increased hydro rates once this given away electricity is in private hands.... to companies like US General Electric? The BC taxpayer again of course.

Perhaps if the EAO and her staff actually did some thoughtful and mindful consideration of BC's Environment, and had pro-actively developed a far reaching, clear policy on cumulative environmental impact - overall, and not considering these IPPs as "one-off stream projects", the EAO might be more credible- both federally and provincially.

It might even come to our political "leaders" (??????) that "Consume"

"Consume", "Consume" is not actually an environmental term or process in this contemporary and conservation aware age.

"Reduce", "limit" "Recycle" and "conserve" should actually be the operating principles of the less than satisfactorily functioning EAO and CEAA departments. If there's too much workload to keep up! slow down the train.

The director of the EAO and staff seem so busy catering to proponent's wishes, traveling to proponents numerous private coaching meetings- as the BC EAO director did in traveling to the Gibsons area to discuss the Stilix'wim project, on Feb 12, 2009, at Taxpayer's repeated expense no less Why can't the proponent pay to visit the EAO office in Victoria? Inconvenient? costly? tiring? And even after the travel, expense, the proponent didn't take the EAO office staff into the Tzoonie Watershed, so why do taxpayer's pay for t his outrageous waste of money in tight economic times. The director need a taxpayer paid break from the office? Always conducting isolated meetings, in time consuming and expensive travel to far distant places and then slowly posting hundreds of submissions, on over 600 projects, no help for the interested public, just massive lists of submisisons..... How can the EAO possibly get a grasp on the various, complex environmental issues? never mind respond to the public's concerns? Probably because they do't' read them. Don't care, never mind bother .... to don't respond. Consultation with the public? A charade. That's why there are no minutes kept of the EAO director's publicly funded and hosted "consultation meetings. The EAO is not interested in facts, concerns and a record of those concerns. Not in the slightest. large, taxpayer funded and attended meetings and NO minutes!

This charade is particularly noticeable when BC has no publicly predicted and proven and urgent need for these countless hydro electric projects. When BC's spring and summer runoff is NOT when BC needs more power anyway, (that need is in winter, when the flow is lowest FYI). and ?? Guess what? California does need lots more summer power?
How convenient? Nudge. nudge, wink, wik. has BC got a deal for you! And how is it that the EAO, as the "expert" on environmental assessment, thinks that the EAO can approve a small package of less than 50 megawatts and not subject it to an environmental assessment? And that EAO, unilaterally established threshold fails the California hydro import law! .... nothing over 30 megawatts of hydro from any project is

to be imported???why? Because in California law, over 30 MGW is "NOT GREEN" power. Anyone awake in the Ministry of Environment? EAO?

And if there is such an urgent need to give away control of hydro electric development to "insiders", and it's so profitable for those insider proponent's, why not turn it all over to BC Hydro? The public's utility for hydro?

Until there is a moratorium and adequate, scientific study, not a mere EAO guess.... , and the May 12 election ....on this horrendous giveaway of BC's prime resource, Fresh Water, and until both BC and Canada have determined if the water, which has been processing through a turbine is " A NAFTA commodity, you should delay and stop any certification of IPPs.

so tourism is becoming the big thing on the West Coast of Canada. On the Sunshine Coast alone, including the Butte area, ... there were 225 tourist operators, in 1996, according to the Tourist Resource Inventory?

In the Sustainable Resouce Management Data base there are 605 tourist operators identified. And do they get any significant say at any helpful, public meeting on the impact of these IPPS on their business development in the future?

There are 250 outdoor recrationalaventure businesses. And them?

Dam emergency safety procedures?

Fish habitat restoration?

One final note. Once Canada's shortsighted governments, federal and provincial, give away control of BC's water, there is no recovery, no turning back. The river water of the once magnificent and mighty Colorado River, the "architect", "engineer" and "excavator" of the expansive and centuries old, magnificent Grand Canyon no longer reaches the sea! Too many golf courses. Too many pools. Not enough common sense. Is this environmental destruction and waste for profit becoming contagious. An epidemic?

The recent World Economic Forum also lamented the chronic high deficits in most major western countries that put governments in a "precarious" position as they try to bail out industries, while simultaneously facing rising health and pension costs. The

report singled out the U.S., the United Kingdom, France, Italy, Spain and Australia.

The report noted that close to half the world's population lives in parts of the world under stress due to water access issues.

With water so crucial in the production of most energy supplies, and with energy supplies also a concern, the world could see rising tensions over access to this natural resource.

It noted that water has emerged as an alternative "asset class," with firms in both the U.S. and Turkey already getting involved in long-distance water pipeline investment initiatives.

"Over time, as the effects of climate change on both water and land availability become apparent, the rising demand for food and the pressures on land use for industrial and residential purposes could trigger intra-state or even interstate tensions as sovereignty or contractual issues arise."

This great country was built by courageous, hard working people, 142 years ago... and successive Canadians have thought it important to defend rights, the land, the environment, the people.... and support justice, and democracy to keep Canada sovereign- "From sea to shining sea" and not just give Canada's resources and its sovereignty away to foreign "korporate groups".

If this current BC Liberal government is so wonderfully democratic, proud of its policies, and decisions.... and the EAO is so concerned about our environment, let's have them hold public meetings in large population centers: the city states like Vancouver, Victoria, lots of votes and seats for the Legislature there.... there..... and the outlying cities like ... Kelowna, Prince George, Abbotsford, Kamloops, Nanaimo, so that this sellout by Campbell can be publicly debated.... particularly for the upcoming May 12, 2009, provincial election.

R. Price, C.D.

Narrows Inlet, BC, Canada