

**Subject:** [Fwd: FW: NS Outlook "Hazardous Debate" Jan. 4]  
**From:** Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>  
**Date:** Mon, 08 Jan 2007 16:40:27 -0800  
**To:** Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>

---

**Subject:** FW: NS Outlook "Hazardous Debate" Jan. 4  
**From:** Wendy Qureshi <qureshi28@shaw.ca>  
**Date:** Mon, 08 Jan 2007 12:57:50 -0800  
**To:** 'Jim Cuthbert' <jimcuthbert@telus.net>, 'Julie' <jwong99@stargate.ca>, 'John Hunter' <hunterjohn@telus.net>, 'alf cockle' <aacockle@telus.net>, "'Andersen, Eric'" <EA@sagafc.com>, 'Cameron Ward' <cward@cameronward.com>, cathyadams@shaw.ca, davesadler@telus.net, DarrylWolf@telus.net, fonvca@fonvca.org, Ian Stabler <stablerfamily@shaw.ca>, 'Trigg Family' <mjtrigg@shaw.ca>

---

**From:** Wendyqureshi [mailto:wendyqureshi@shaw.ca] **On Behalf Of** Wendy Qureshi  
**Sent:** Monday, January 08, 2007 12:42 PM  
**To:** 'North Shore Outlook Newsroom'  
**Cc:** 'Ernie Crist'; 'John Sharpe'  
**Subject:** NS Outlook "Hazardous Debate" Jan. 4  
**Importance:** High

Dear Editor,

Unfortunately there is no debate, hence this letter.

The proposed 25 percent chlorine production increase in the Maplewood site of Canexus is of major significance to all residents of B.C. Some 25 years ago an agreement was made that there would be no further expansion of the plant and that the on-site storage would be reduced, and that any further changes would be subject to approval by District of North Vancouver Council.

Before this recent plan was even readied there should have been a public debate about the desirability of even continuing to allow such a hazardous chemical plant to exist in our midst, much less allow them to increase production. The idea that DNV Council is "bartering" with Canexus, i.e....We'll fix up our plant and make it safe if you will allow us to increase production....is ludicrous . They should be forced to make it safe, period! No increased production as was stipulated 25 years ago.

This is the same logic DNV Council used to approve a development proposal in Lynn Valley recently. The owner let the premises deteriorate, so now the dilapidated condition is a reason to approve the development.

This issue is of particular importance in light of the many recent CN derailments. This is how the chlorine is transported. Also, what about the predicted earthquake?

"We're looking at, "What does the upgrade in technology mean from a risk perspective?" said Margaret Eckenfelder, DNV Director of Sustainability.

The answers are:

1. 25% more chlorine is 25% more chlorine.
2. A reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and energy savings, while commendable, means nothing if there is

a spill.

3. District Council has no stance? How can they possibly even consider putting their community at further risk?

4. "around the clock rail shipments". Note that there have been two CN derailments in the last week.

Wendy Qureshi  
North Vancouver  
604-980-1885

John Sharpe  
North Vancouver  
604-983-3354

**FW: NS Outlook "Hazardous Debate" Jan. 4**

**Content-Type:** message/rfc822

**Content-Encoding:** 7bit