

August 5, 2025

Michelle Walsh - Doucette

IRAC, Charlottetown.

Greetings;

- I find it revealing that Mr. Baker has requested that IRAC cease additional submissions with regard to this appeal. I'm assuming that he does not govern the actions of IRAC currently so I wish to mention a few additional details that he may not like discussed.
- First of all, the words "misinformation" and "false narrative" can be applied directly to Mr. Baker himself because he is the one who spoke at public meetings and said that his property **was not** polluted and that the Department of the Environment was "okay" with this development. I can prove both of those statements were misleading and wrong.
- In the Stantec Consulting Report he submitted, they acknowledge that this property has "site restrictions" because of the pollution from petroleum hydrocarbons. That fact is something that Mr. Baker refuses to recognize for obvious **financial reasons**. No where in this report does it say that this property has been cleaned up.
- Mr. Baker cherry picked part of the Joose Environmental Consulting report to attach in his submission. Without **the full report** we do not know in what context the highlighted words should be viewed and understood. He needs to supply **all the document**.
- Mr. Baker continues to bring up the fact that the drilling of wells is not allowed on the property in question. That was **never** my concern and the record shows that. If that part of the legal indenture is important and worth noting **then surely** the following statement is critical as well: "Petroleum hydrocarbon impacts in the area depicted on the drawing attached hereto as Schedule "B" **shall not be disturbed** unless managed in accordance with acceptable regulatory requirements and qualified **professionals** should be consulted to provide for management actions and controls that may be required to address any remaining impacts."
- A legal indenture is not "opinion" or "speculation" on my part. The fact that the Town of Three Rivers broke their **own bylaw** (5.22) and put the Gibsons Creek water shed in jeopardy is not conjecture.

- The fact that Mr. Baker brought up an appeal I launched eighteen years ago is **irrelevant** because you cannot compare apples and oranges. I have a legal indenture in hand to support my appeal. It is also clear that Three Rivers broke their own bylaws. This smacks of a certain level of desperation on his part.
- If lawyers from Shell Canada helped draw up this legal indenture, then I would think they would stand behind their **work product** which states a large area of this property is polluted. This fact reinforces my assertion that both the Town of Three Rivers and the Department of the Environment have a responsibility to ensure the health and safety of the public is not compromised by a developer and land owner that want to play by **their own rules**.

D Blair Sorrey

Brudenell, 902-969-1986