
follow-up

From: VIVIAN KRAUSE <vivian.krause@me.com>

To: d.schindler@ualberta.ca

Date: 08 June 2011 9:42:16 AM

Dr. Schindler,

Thank you for speaking with me on monday.

I have three further questions:

1) On an annual basis, the estimated deposition of airborne particulates is estimated at 34,000 MT. That's considerably higher than the estimate of 7,272 MT from the National Pollutant Release Inventory). What explains this huge gap?

2) If I understand correctly, the paper titled, *Evaluation of Four Reports on Contamination of the Athabasca River System by Oil Sands Operations*, dated March 7, 2010, suggests that Kelly et al. (2010) found lower levels of mercury deposition than were found by the Mercury Deposition Network. Have I understood that correctly? And if so, what explains this?

3) At the end of our conversation, we briefly discussed the type of monitoring that you would like to see. You mentioned, for example, setbacks from streams and air controls. If you could elaborate a little on what you believe are the key elements of a monitoring system that you would like to see, I'd be grateful for more detail on this point. Perhaps I could speak with you about this briefly, at your convenience, or perhaps you could refer me to something that you've already written? That would be appreciated.

As promised, I would like to verify the quotes that I would attribute to specifically to you, and other key points. I've listed these below. Whether or not these will appear in the final version will depend on editing - which is beyond my control.

Once again, thank you very much for speaking with me on monday.

Sincerely,
Vivian Krause
604.618.8110

Direct quotes:

- "By the time you're exceeding the guidelines, its too late. Its like closing the barn door after the mare's been bred."
- "The total amount of emissions doesn't matter so much as the levels of certain contaminants."
- "You can't assume that something isn't happening if you haven't looked at it."
- "I thought the results were kind of boring. Most people who do research like surprises. There were no surprises."
- "I wouldn't be worried about an occasional drink drink of water from the river."
- "It wouldn't have mattered who we got the money from. I was sure this I was sure this would make the oil sands look bad."
- "I would agree with slowing but I certainly don't want to shut the industry down." I will note that you suggest that the current rate of growth of the industry is 7% and that you would like to see that slow to about 3% for a variety of reasons, among them, so that community services (eg. schools, hospitals) can keep pace.

- "Anything above 3% growth is out of control. Any government that can't run an economy on 3% growth has a problem."

Other points:

- All of the data reported in Kelly et al. (2010) is in the public domain, either with Environment Canada or the University of Saskatchewan.
- Contrary to the statement in the memo from the Hatfield consultants (dated November 7, 2010), the names of all the tributaries are provided in the Supplementary Information to Kelly et al. (2010).
- The Athabasca river is about 1,400 km long. It takes about six weeks for run-off to go from snowpack to the river.
- We don't know what portion of airborne emissions get into the watershed but its safe to say that a good portion of them do.
- The total cost of the study was about half a million dollars. Of that about \$250,000 was for field costs (including helicopter) and \$250,000 was for salaries and analyses. Dr. Schindler did not take salary for this project (over and above his regular salary from the University of Alberta).
- The estimated cost of the environmental monitoring that is now proposed by the federal government would be about \$20 million per year, that's equivalent to the profit that the Alberta oil industry makes in about four hours. (Note: I'll verify this with CAPP).