

---

**From:** Vivian Krause  
**Subject:** **Re: Letter and Attachment for Dr. David Suzuki**  
**Date:** August 06, 2009 07:06:12 AM PDT  
**To:** Jim Hoggan , Peter Robinson  
**Cc:** Kirsten Brynelsen , Ashley Arden  
2 Attachments, 8.3MB

---

Mr. Hoggan and Mr. Robinson,

Would you mind please confirming that you have indeed received my letter of 29 July 2009 and the attachment that I sent to Dr. Suzuki, and that these have been delivered to him?

In advance, thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,  
Vivian Krause

On Tuesday, 04 August, 2009, at 09:44AM, "Vivian Krause" <[vivian.krause@mac.com](mailto:vivian.krause@mac.com)> wrote:

>Mr. Hoggan,

>

>Ms. Yaxley did not reply to my e-mail of 29 July 2009.

>As you can see below, the e-mail that I sent to Ms. Yaxley today has been returned to me as "undeliverable" or "blocked."

>

>Would you be willing to ensure that Dr. Suzuki receives the letter and the attachment that I sent to him (with cc to you) on 29 July 2009?

>

>Regards,

>Vivian Krause

>

>>From: "Mail Delivery System" <[MAILER-DAEMON@ironport1.radiant.net](mailto:MAILER-DAEMON@ironport1.radiant.net)>

>>To: <[vivian.krause@mac.com](mailto:vivian.krause@mac.com)>

>>Date: 04 August, 2009 09:30:09 AM PDT

>>Subject: Delivery Status Notification (Failure)

>>

>>The following message to <[elois@newdata.ca](mailto:elois@newdata.ca)> was undeliverable.

>>The reason for the problem:

>>5.1.0 - Unknown address error 550-'Blocked\x00id'

>>

>>Ms. Yaxley,

>>

>>Would you mind please confirming that you received the e-mail below and were able to download the two attachments and give them to Dr. Suzuki?

>>

>>In advance, thank you.

>>

>>Sincerely,

>>Vivian Krause

>>

>>On Wednesday, 29 July, 2009, at 04:20PM, "Vivian Krause" <[vivian.krause@mac.com](mailto:vivian.krause@mac.com)> wrote:

>>>Ms. Yaxley,

>>>

>>>Please find attached a letter and a draft document for Dr. David Suzuki.

>>>Is it possible for you to ensure that Dr. Suzuki personally receives these items?

>>>

>>>By courier, I will send Dr. Suzuki a CD with the files for the appendices (854 pages).

>>>

>>>Sincerely,

>>>Vivian Krause

>>>

>>>On Monday, 15 June, 2009, at 11:54AM, "Jay Ritchlin" <[jritchlin@davidsuzuki.org](mailto:jritchlin@davidsuzuki.org)> wrote:

>>>>Dear Ms. Krause,

>>>>

>>>>Thank you for your recent e-mails and attachments.

>>>>

>>>>Let me begin by saying that the science of food health and contamination  
>>>>risk is still evolving and continues to be an area of debate. There have  
>>>>been improvements to PCB levels in some regions and by some producers,  
>>>>as well as continuing causes for concern around the use and presence of  
>>>>various chemicals in farmed salmon. That said, the David Suzuki  
>>>>Foundation does not currently make this a sole centrepiece of our work  
>>>>and we place it in context of a wide range of health and ecological  
>>>>sustainability issues that seafood and aquaculture consumers must face.  
>>>>At the present time, we still believe that individuals can get a healthy  
>>>>diet from a variety of more sustainable products.

>>>>

>>>>The following link details some issues that continue to concern us  
>>>>around chemicals in salmon farming. It is a very thorough assessment of  
>>>>chemical use in global aquaculture that was undertaken by the Salmon  
>>>>Aquaculture Dialogue, a global group of industry and conservation  
>>>>stakeholders working to establish sustainability indicators for salmon  
>>>>farming. We are a member and work with industry representatives on these  
>>>>issues on a regular basis.

>>>>

>>>>[www.worldwildlife.org/what/globalmarkets/aquaculture/WWFBinaryitem8842.p](http://www.worldwildlife.org/what/globalmarkets/aquaculture/WWFBinaryitem8842.p)

>>>>df

>>>>

>>>>As regards sea lice, we simply do not agree with your assessment of the  
>>>>situation. Nearly every stakeholder in the Pacific and global  
>>>>aquaculture debate has now acknowledged that sea lice are a serious  
>>>>issue and measures to address the risks must be undertaken. The science  
>>>>continues to evolve and support the need for precautionary action.  
>>>>Bodies like the Pacific Science Forum have reviewed all the evidence you  
>>>>cite, plus more, and recommended management action to address the risks.  
>>>>Industry members like Marine Harvest are negotiating with the Coastal  
>>>>Alliance for Aquaculture Reform to find both immediate, interim relief  
>>>>for wild salmon in the Broughton Archipelago through changing their farm  
>>>>management, as well as exploring long term solutions like closed  
>>>>containment.

>>>>

>>>>We plan to update our site with more new developments on these issues  
>>>>soon and to continue our direct engagement with industry members and  
>>>>regulators on long term, sustainable solutions for both capture  
>>>>fisheries and aquaculture.

>>>>

>>>>On a final note, when I review our correspondence over the past two  
>>>>years it is apparent that we continue to have a fundamental difference  
>>>>of opinion with respect to the science of sustainable aquaculture. For  
>>>>our part, we will continue to push for the types of industry reforms we  
>>>>feel are necessary to support healthy and productive wild salmon  
>>>>populations and a sustainable aquaculture industry on the West Coast.  
>>>>We may therefore have to simply agree to disagree on this matter.

>>>>

>>>>Sincerely,

>>>>

>>>>Jay Ritchlin

>>>>Director, Marine and Freshwater Conservation

>>>>David Suzuki Foundation

>>>>

>>>>Copy to:

>>>>Dr. David Suzuki, c/o Elois Yaxley

>>>>Jim Hoggan, Chair, David Suzuki Foundation Board of Directors

>>>>Peter Robinson, CEO, David Suzuki Foundation

>>>>Lisa Monzon, David and Lucile Packard Foundation

>>>>Ed Cassano, Monterey Bay Aquarium/Seafood Watch

>>>>

>>>>

>>>

>>>

>>

>>

>