

**From:** B Fidler <contact information removed>  
**Sent:** July 19, 2016 6:49 PM  
**To:** EA Review / Examen EE (CEAA)  
**Subject:** Review of Canada's environmental assessment process.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the current review of Canada's environmental assessment process.

I am pleased to see that the mandate letter of the Minister of Environment and Climate Change (the Minister) directs her, as a top priority, to “immediately review Canada's environmental assessment processes to regain public trust and help get resources to market and introduce new, fair processes that will:

- Restore robust oversight and thorough environmental assessments of areas under federal jurisdiction, while working with provinces and territories to avoid duplication;
- Ensure decisions are based on science, facts and evidence and serve the public interest;
- Provide ways for Canadians to express their views and opportunities for experts to meaningfully participate, and
- Require project advocates to choose the best technologies available to reduce environmental impacts.”

I would like to suggest that an additional essential part of this process must include the opportunity for the public to participate with comments and stories of how the proposed projects will impact them personally and act upon their lives.

As a resident of a Gulf Island who is a university educated retiree with a wealth of both professional and work place experience, I feel I have a unique and important perspective to offer any present or future environmental review process for current and future industry proposals for the area where I live.

Specifically, I am concerned about the current lack of a legitimate opportunity to comment on the Kinder Morgan Pipeline expansion proposal, so I will use this proposal as my primary example of why my comments should be included in the process.

I don't need to be an expert to be informed enough to have an opinion and comment upon the likelihood, yes likelihood, of an oil spill in the future in the Gulf of Georgia and the Salish Sea.

I don't need to be an expert to know that in the event of oil spills, so called "world class" oil spill clean ups are at best capable of cleaning up a small fraction of a spill. (By industry standards a 10-15 % rate of recovery is considered adequate to claim success!)

I don't need to be an expert to know that oil spills and increased tanker traffic on the Salish Sea will cause significant damage to marine habitat, including salmon, bottom fish, and shell fish which will have an impact on both commercial and sport fisheries.

I don't need to be an expert to know that Kinder Morgan's proposed pipeline expansion project at the end of the day will produce as little as 35 permanent full time jobs, while one major oil spill could potentially result in hundreds of jobs in tourism, and fishing. There are far more permanent jobs being created at this time in the renewable energy sector of our economy.

I don't need to be an expert to know that increased industrialization the Strait of Georgia and the Salish Sea impact negatively upon my use and enjoyment of my retirement home on a Gulf Island. I also don't need to be an expert to know that these industrial projects and the likely negative effect of these projects (eg.oil spills and increased tanker traffic) will in all likelihood have a negative impact on the real estate value of the my retirement home; a home my wife and I have worked a lifetime to acquire and hope to leave as a legacy for our children.

Finally, I don't need to be an expert to know how projects like the Kinder Morgan Pipeline Expansion Project will impact on me and my life. My wife and I have worked hard all of our life. We have paid taxes and contributed in many ways to our society (and continue to do so) and we feel rightfully entitled to participate in the democratic decisions of our society through participating in the democratic institutions that allow that participation. The current exclusion of our input in the decision making process around current industrial projects has impacted us negatively and we feel justifiably angry for this fact. Surely, in a democratic society, the opinions of citizens, whether or not they are deemed to be "experts" should be taken into consideration when projects that potentially have major impacts upon their lives are being considered.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comment on the proposed review of Canada's environmental assessment process.

Sincerely,

Burt Fidler

<contact information removed>

<contact information remov