

Woodfibre LNG Public Comments Compilation

From/Date Received	Comments
<p>Wayne Peaker 12/27/2013</p>	<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>I respectfully request that No Substitution Request is facilitated to the old EA process.</p> <p>Less involved projects should be the ones to undergo the new process to see whether or not the process is effectual, not the risky possibilities of this complex LNG project.</p> <p>Please ensure the Substituion Request is NOT honoured.</p> <p>Please indicate why other comments are not posted publicly on the EAO website, for collected public comments for all other EA projects.</p> <p>Wayne Peaker</p>
<p>Gillian Smith 12/30/2013</p>	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I reside in Howe Sound, BC and I urge the Canadian Government to ensure Howe Sound is not an experiment for the new Environmental Assessment Process for the LNG Facility at Woodfibre. I vote NO to the Substitution Request as we need a thorough environmental assessment for public safety and the effects on the environment.</p> <p>For example, why does China place LNG facilities at least 11 km off-shore and away from residential areas?</p> <p>The new EA process is too new and too soon to know whether or not it's effective for such a potentially hazardous project. Current and future generations should not be placed at risk and at least a one year or longer EA process is more appropriate.</p> <p>It is critical that the Environmental Assessment on the LNG at Woodfibre in Howe Sound be the most thorough and precautionary of processes.</p> <p>As well, on the Woodfibre proposed pipeline public comments webpage, you state explicitly that posting will be uploaded every seven days. It took 11 days to upload the comments after Dec 13, 2013. So, how are the public to be assured when you do not fulfill the standards that have been posted on a website? The email link to provide public comments was not working as of December 27, 2013.</p> <p>Less involved projects should be the ones to undergo the new process to see whether or not the process is effectual, not the risky possibilities of a potentially lethal LNG facility. As well, I am wondering why the public comments do not appear publicly on the EAO website, like other projects. This makes it look like as though you are not accountable to what the public is saying.</p> <p>Please ensure the Substituion Request is NOT honoured.</p> <p>Gillian</p>
<p>Maurice Poulin 12/28/2013</p>	<p>To the Canadian Government,</p> <p>I am contacting you as a concerned Canadian. Howe Sound is not an experimental laboratory for trying out the new Environmental Assessment Process for the LNG Facility at Wood fibre.</p> <p>I hereby request that the Substitution Request NOT be allowed as we need a thorough</p>

	<p>environmental assessment for public and environmental safety for such a large project. The new EA process is too new. The proposed site for this project is environmentally complex. We need more in-depth study, not an expedited environmental assessment, to determine whether or not Wood fibre would be effective for such a potentially hazardous project.</p> <p>When China, with its poor environmental stewardship nevertheless, places its LNG facilities at least 11 km off-shore and away from residential areas, it begs the question: what is Canada thinking, situating a long-term potentially environmentally hazardous facility in our cherished Howe Sound.</p> <p>It is critical that the Environmental Assessment on the LNG at Wood fibre in Howe Sound be the most thorough and precautionary of processes.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Maurice Poulin</p>
<p>Scott McQuade 12/28/2013</p>	<p>A quick note of support for this project. Since the original Woodfibre pulp and paper mill shut down, Squamish has been in desperate need to find a large industrial tax payer that can fill the void left by them. many programmes have been cut and the burden has shifted to home and business owners making it difficult to sustain a community.</p> <p>I also believe that the site is a proven safe harbour with existing pipeline in place. Due to this fact, I think allowing the provincial government to complete the assessment should be satisfactory.</p> <p>Regards, Scott McQuade</p>
<p>Patty Nayel 12/28/2013</p>	<p>Howe Sound is not an experiment for the new Environmental Assessment Process for the LNG Facility at Woodfibre. Do Not approve the Substitution Request as we need a thorough environmental assessment for public safety. It is too close to neighboring communities.</p> <p>Patty Nayel</p>
<p>Gayle Neilson 12/30/2013</p>	<p>I think we must proceed quite slowly with regards to LNG infrastructure which will require huge amounts of energy and entail considerably more tanker traffic on our coastlines. It does come with risks and there definitely needs to be an environmental assessment done for this plant. The main questions are what are the impacts of a breach either on land or at sea and what impact will the development have on surrounding ecosystems. As well, some consideration needs to be given to the high energy usage of the plant and where this would come from.</p> <p>Thank you, Gayle Neilson</p>
<p>Sheila Page 12/30/2013</p>	<p>I have been a resident of the Sunshine Coast for over fifty years and I am concerned about the effects of an LNG plant at Woodfibre on the air quality and the marine life of Howe Sound. Howe Sound suffered many years of environmental degradation from the industrial activities that polluted the air and water. Fortunately with the closing of the pulp mill at Woodfibre, the closing of Britannia mine and improvements at Port Mellon there have been some improvements in our air and ocean life.</p> <p>Please ensure that the most stringent investigation of the potential impacts of the proposed LNG plant is performed and released to the public. The economic interests of business is not</p>

	<p>necessarily what is in the best interest of Howe Sound and its surrounding residents.</p> <p>Sheila Page</p>
<p>Vel Anderson 12/30/2013</p>	<p>December 28th., 2013</p> <p>Dear Minister Aglukkaq,</p> <p>Re: WOODFIBER LNG Project (http://a100.gov.bc.ca/appsdata/epic/documents/p408/1385579132701_67ef501ff7da8b345c090d12ec2a5d6eef3af286d2ccb1cd3d92c8dddb7a2d4c.pdf)</p> <p>Even though, in the "Substitution of the federal environmental assessment process under CEAA 2012" (see below) it states, "the public will be given an opportunity to participate in the assessment; the public will have access to records in relation to the assessment to enable their meaningful participation;....." The duty to inform/to consult with the public by the Provincial Government and proponent, has NOT been satisfied.</p> <p>All stakeholders, especially residents within the Howe Sound area (which includes residents on the Sunshine Coast), and residents/businesses near the facility, need to be consulted, informed, and considered in the decision making process involving risk, mitigation and disaster prevention. In order for this dialogue to occur under fair circumstances, the local population needs to be thoroughly educated as to the dangers that the LNG processing facility poses.</p> <p>An Open House event, proposing the Eagle Mountain-Woodfibre Gas Pipeline Project, was held at Squamish and Coquitlam (http://www.fortisbc.com/About/ProjectsPlanning/GasUtility/NewOngoingProjects/Documents/EagleMountainWoodfibreGasPipelineProjectOpenHouse.PDF), but nothing here on the Coast. In correspondence from the EAO I'm informed that, "Newspaper ads were also placed in the following publications: - Tri City News and Coquitlam Now- Insertions on November 8, 13, 15 and 20; - Squamish Chief, Whistler Pique and Whistler Question- Insertions on November 7 and 14; - North Shore News- Insertions on November 8, 10 and 15" (email 13/12/09 from - Dan.Motisca@gov.bc.ca) but nothing in our two weekly newspapers. We have not been afforded the courtesy of an open house. We, the residents of the surrounding islands and Sunshine Coast, will be directly affected by this LNG project. Items on the government or proponents websites are fine, however, how is the public notified about the information on a website?</p> <p>We, on the Sunshine Coast, have not been afforded public information by the proponent, or the Provincial Government, and now we are being asked to comment to your Federal office by January 6th., 2014!!!!</p> <p>This is not, I'm sure, what your office had intended, therefore we ask that we be given the opportunity to be informed of the proposed project through a public process, and that the date for comment to your office follow after the public process.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p>

	Vel Anderson
Vel Anderson 12/30/2013	<p>November 27, 2013</p> <p>Dear Josh,</p> <p>Re: Woodfiber Gas Pipeline</p> <p>Why are the Sunshine Coast residents being left out of information that they should have seen long ago? The expansion of the gas pipeline is just the start on a move for the Liquid Natural Gas (LNG) facilities to become a reality at Woodfiber. LNG tankers plying the waters of our doorstep will be of great concern to residents on the Sunshine Coast. We, the Sunshine Coast residents, will be directly affected. Why did the Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) decide not to hold an Open House here on the Coast?</p> <p>I find it unconscionable that the Sunshine Coast residents have been ignored by the EAO. There has been nothing in the local newspapers. Our Regional District has been quiet on the subject. The citizens are not being informed, therefore not given a chance to comment as they are unaware of what is happening!!!</p> <p>When will the EAO hold an Open House on the Sunshine Coast, to allow the citizens to be informed as to what is proposed for Howe Sound coastline.</p> <p>I ask for an extension of time, beyond Dec. 16th, for public comment. The residents will need time after an Open House here on the Coast, and people are now busy preparing for Christmas. Would it not be reasonable to extend the comment period to a date in January 2014?</p> <p>I also understand that there is a proposal for a Waste to Energy facility at Woodfiber to burn Vancouver's garbage, is this correct?</p> <p>Vancouver ports are seeking a solution to dealing with tankers' ballast water, is there a proposal to process contaminated ballast water at Woodfiber?</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Vel Anderson,</p>
Vel Anderson 12/30/2013	<p>December 29, 2013</p> <p>Dear Minister Aglukkaq, and Minister Raitt,</p> <p>Re: Woodfiber LNG Project, Howe Sound, B.C.</p> <p>In the document "WOODFIBER LNG Project Description" (http://a100.gov.bc.ca/appsdata/epic/documents/p408/1385579132701_67ef501ff7da8b345c090d12ec2a5d6eef3af286d2ccb1cd3d92c8dddb7a2d4c.pdf), it fails to address how the busy marine traffic coming and going in Howe Sound will not be disrupted. This is a major concern to residents and business of our coastal region.</p> <p>The document (Page 79) states,</p> <p>"Bulk vessel and barge traffic are common throughout the area of Strait of Georgia and Howe Sound and use existing shipping routes and navigation channels. Annual ship traffic in Howe Sound involves approximately 70 commercial vessel movements annually to Squamish ports and an additional 50 vessels to Port Mellon, with greater than 15,000 throughout the lower Strait of Georgia. BC Ferries also operate in the Metro Vancouver area on regular schedules and routes</p>

	<p>to ports on Bowen Island, Vancouver Island, the Sunshine Coast and Powell River, North and Central Coast, and Southern Gulf Islands.”</p> <p>Page 22 states, Shipping activities associated with the Woodfibre project include transit of LNG carriers, with up to 40 vessel calls per year or three to four calls per month for two LNG trains. Tug assist and BC Coastal pilots will be used to support inbound and outbound safe transit of LNG carriers to and from the Woodfibre LNG facility. A variety of LNG carrier sizes may be used to export LNG from the Woodfibre LNG facility. The largest vessels anticipated to use the Woodfibre LNG facility include latest standard LNG carrier designs, which are 295 m in vessel length, 47 m wide with a draught depth of 12 m. These vessels have capacity to ship up to 180,000 m³ of LNG, with a deadweight tonnage (DWT) of 85,000 tonnes. BC Coast Pilots will assist in transit of the LNG carrier to and from the project site. The LNG Vessels will likely have two BC Coastal pilots at all times</p> <p>Page 13 The AIS data is presented in Table 2 as large commercial vessel movements per day (i.e., cargo, bulk, hazardous, tug, and barge vessels). Woodfibre LNG’s incremental change in cargo and tug-barge vessel movement per day has also been estimated (Table 2). Ferry, recreational vessels, passenger, pilotage, and other vessels were not included in this analysis; however, these vessels will be considered as part of the EA being prepared for the project.</p> <p>Are you aware of the number of ocean going ferries that are active in this Howe Sound area? We have 8 ferry trips per day leaving from Horseshoe Bay, travelling to Vancouver Island, more at certain times of the year. Then, 8 trips per day from Horseshoe Bay to the Sunshine Coast, more at certain times of the year, plus 16 trips daily to Bowen Island from Horseshoe Bay.</p> <p>There is also the barging of material from Vancouver to Howe Sound Pulp & Paper at Port Mellon, proposed barging of gravel from McNab Creek to Vancouver, log barging, all this with the regular and recreational boat traffic, and fishermen. All in the path of the huge LNG tankers and tugs. Could this be a disaster in the making? This mix will disrupt our highway marine link from Horseshoe Bay to the Sunshine Coast and the islands. Interfering with our ferry schedules will not be acceptable. Now is the time to look at this big picture of present marine traffic and realize that it is a bad plan to bring the huge LNG tankers into Howe Sound. I urge you to stop the waste of time and taxpayer dollars on this unreasonable proposal.</p> <p>Respectfully, Vel Anderson, senior resident</p>
<p>Mary Frisch 12/31/2013</p>	<p>Would VERY MUCH like to see an information meeting here in Gibsons regarding a proposal for the LNG plant going into the old Woodfibre site. There is a lot of misinformation going around and it would be in the interest of the company to do some P.R. work here on the Sunshine Coast as tanker traffic passes between us and Horseshoe Bay.</p> <p>Mary Frisch</p>
<p>Marco Antonio Murillo 01/01/2014</p>	<p>January 1st, 2014 RE: Woodfibre LNG Project</p>

	<p>I am one of the funding members of the North American Legacy Foundation, a non-for-profit society incorporated in Victoria, British Columbia in 2006. The NALF is rooted in the belief of preserving the cultural and environmental richness of communities in urban and rural regions of British Columbia.</p> <p>Our vision is to contribute building sustainable communities in western Canada with educational programs, agricultural and environmental stewardship in rural and urban regions.</p> <p>Our mission is to participate with individuals, communities and the government in education, urban and social planning sessions, development proposals, public consultation processes, Environmental Assessments, and community events.</p> <p>We want to participate in the Public Comments, Consultation Process or EIA for the Woodfibre LNG Project. We would like to know as well when can we apply for the Participant Funding Program from the CEAA ? Is any other way to participate in the project other than through the processes mentioned in the lines above.</p> <p>ref.: Participant Funding Program Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency 22nd Floor, Place Bell Canada 160 Elgin Street Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0H3 Tel: (613) 957-0700 Fax: (613) 948-9172 E-mail: PFP.PAFP@ceaa.acee.gc.ca Web site: www.ceaa-acee.gc.ca.</p> <hr/> <p>Marco A. Murillo Volunteer Environmental Advisory Committee Member</p> <hr/>
<p>Derek and Jean Wilkinson</p> <p>01/01/2014</p>	<p>We are very concerned about the possible implications of the proposed Woodfibre LNG plant for the Howe Sound area, the province, the country and the planet.</p> <p>As former residents of Squamish we know that the nearby estuary is a designated Important Bird Area, as well as providing significant salmon-rearing habitat. We're worried about the potential negative effects an LNG plant would have on these. Further, the local economy is gaining strength from a vibrant tourist industry and a reputation for a high quality of life, so serious questions need to be asked about the possible economic and social impacts of this proposal.</p> <p>As citizens of BC we are concerned about the provincial government's over-enthusiastic support for fracking and LNG export, with seemingly very little concern for environmental impacts or economic realities such as the falling price of natural gas.</p> <p>As Canadians, we think that such projects need to be considered with a view to how they impact the natural environment and our country's total greenhouse gas emissions, as well as how they might or might not fit within a carefully thought-out national energy policy.</p> <p>Finally, the larger question of the effects of fossil fuel use on global eco-systems and climate must be seriously considered. We need the opportunity to have much more information and debate about the net impacts such a project would have on global greenhouse gas emissions</p>

	<p>and climate change.</p> <p>We have little faith that a provincial environmental assessment will be adequate, and call on the federal government to conduct a full environmental assessment, as well as an in-depth economic analysis, in order to properly address the concerns we and others have raised.</p> <p>Jean and Derek Wilkinson</p>
<p>Jason Ross 01/01/2014</p>	<p>To Whom it may concern, January 1st 2014</p> <p>My name is Jason Ross, I have lived in Squamish for the past 33 years. I am currently raising my family in Squamish and I'm very concerned about this project. The purpose of this letter is to ask that you consider seeing this project go through a federal environmental assessment. There are a</p> <p>number of key issues that need to be looked at at the federal level. One of the biggest is the recovery of the waters of Howe Sound. Since the closer of the woodfibre pulp mill the aquatic life has made a huge comeback in many ways. A grey whale was spotted feeding in the waters at the</p> <p>mouth of the Squamish river in Howe Sound. This was the first time in a hundred years. Grey whales are on the Endangered Species list. Also a Humpback whale was seen feeding at the mouth of the Squamish river in September of 2009. In the past several years there has also been pods of</p> <p>killer whales and dolphins spotted in the waters of Howe Sound. This past fall we saw one of the biggest pink salmon runs in 50 years. This project will most likely cause effect on the marine environment from surface & ground water discharges. Department of Fishers and</p> <p>Oceans need to be apart of a this Environmental Assessment. Other concerns I have with this LNG plant are with Air Quality. The sea to sky airshed posses geographical features that have the potential to produce poor air circulation, leading to the build up of pollutants, particularly during</p> <p>periods where high pressure systems prevent pollutants dispersions. In general, the winds in the Squamish area and Howe sounds follow a north and south pattern. In winter, when large scale, low pressure systems dominate the area, winds are generally from the north. In the summer,</p> <p>however, the dominating high pressure systems produce winds from the south-southwest. This is enhanced by a land sea breeze that draws winds from the south into the mountains due to daytime heating of mountain slopes. During the summertime under high pressure systems we often see</p> <p>very little wind flow and the wind that does blow is usually from the south west direction to downtown Squamish. This is a concern because from the proposed LNG plant to town there is only 10 km and in that area there are 3 elementary schools and a high school and downtown Squamish.</p> <p>I have this knowledge from being a local weather observer for Environment Canada for the last 20 years.</p>

	Sincerely Jason Ross
Jessica Carlin 01/02/2014	<p>To Whom it may concern:</p> <p>I am a Squamish resident and have some serious concerns regarding the proposed LNG project at Woodfibre, BC.</p> <p>Firstly, I am very concerned about the negative environmental impacts of such a project on the marine and surrounding areas, including but not exclusive to air quality, marine life and general flora, fauna and human health.</p> <p>I am also concerned about noise and lights from the project negatively impacting sea life and residents of the surrounding sea to sky corridor.</p> <p>I believe that a detailed environmental assessment of this project should be mandatory and that this project should not be permitted to go ahead if it will negatively affect the health, survival and well being of people and the environment in this area.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Jessica Carlin</p>
Wayne Rowley 01/02/2014	<p>I have read the proposal to the building of an LNG plant at Woodfibre, B.C.</p> <p>I was a resident of Lions Bay, B. C. for 27 years, retiring to Victoria, B. C. in 2002. So it is with this background I offer you the following comments.</p> <p>1) The proposal does very little to provide some of the history of Howe Sound and thereby to understand the reluctance of many to share another heavy industry within its boundaries:</p> <p>a) The Sun newspaper for many years held an annual fishing derby out of Horseshoe Bay. It was quite common for the winners to catch salmon in the 40 lb. range. I am not certain of the date when the last derby was held but suffice to say the salmon disappeared. Why? I would suggest that the answer is pollution of the water from a number of sources , among which I would include the following: Copper tailings from Britannia mines; effluent including black liquor, sodium hydroxide and chlorine from the pulp mill at Woodfibre, and mercury poisoning of the waters from FMC Chemicals located in Squamish.</p> <p>b) At one time Lions Bay locals fished not only for salmon but for crab in Howe Sound. Then there was a federal government closure of all shell fish in the area for a number of years.</p> <p>c) The water condition in Howe Sound has improved drastically since the closures of the pulp mill at Woodfibre and the caustic soda/chlorine plant at Squamish and the treatment of the water at Britannia to remove residual copper. (So also the air condition as the prevailing winds often brought the smell of Woodfibre to Lions Bay and as far south as Horseshoe Bay in West Vancouver.)</p> <p>d) In the intervening time many new residential areas have sprung up along the eastern shores of Howe Sound and I would include Furry Creek, Ocean Point, Ansell Place as well as others in that list. The residents in these communities do not want to see another heavy industry with the potential for a return to previous air and water pollution to return to the area. The proposal's lack of planned consultation with all these communities, big and small from Squamish in the north to West Van in the south will have negative consequences.</p>

	<p>I will close this for now but will communicate more concerns in a future email.</p> <p>Yours in clean air and waters:</p> <p>Wayne Rowley</p>
<p>Rich Duncan 01/02/2014</p>	<p>i am writing this letter because i feel the need to voice my opinion regarding the choices being made to the area where i choose to bring my family up to live. i live and work in squamish b.c. my children are growing up here and we moved here just before the mill shut down where the proposed lng plant is thinking of going.</p> <p>this proposal has some major concerns for me, my family, my friends and even my colleagues at work. over the past 21 years i have watched the many changes squamish has gone through. in most part for the better. in recent years i have watched the sound go from almost dead to flourishing in aquatic life. mainly due to the millions spent cleaning it up. i own a cottage on the shores of Howe sound where my kids are growing up enjoying seeing whales, seals, eagles, salmon, going fishing, water skiing, and so much more. we watch every time a ship goes by to the squamish docks and the kids play in the huge waves when they hit the shores. this is all nice to watch, but if you take a closer look at what those waves are doing then you realize that we are going to be with out much beach if this continues and shipping traffic increases. my concerns go even further then this.</p> <p>-the plant is supposed to be on a barge... what plan is in place if it sinks?</p> <p>-what will the company building this plant do for the foreshore that will get damaged from all the shipping traffic?</p> <p>-what plan is in place for protecting the unprotected morage that people have for boats that will get hit by the huge waves caused by these ships?</p> <p>i have many many more concerns and questions as to why we would even think this is a good idea</p> <p>-- thank you</p> <p>Rich Rich Duncan</p>
<p>David Rafael Sunshine Coast Regional District 01/03/2014</p>	<p>Hi Zoltan</p> <p>Please find attached a copy of the SCRD's letter (original in the hands of Canada Post) setting out the SCRD comments regarding the CEAA's request. If you have any questions please contact me.</p> <p>Regards, David David Rafael</p>

Senior Planner
Sunshine Coast Regional District
1975 Field Road, Sechelt, BC, V0N 3A1
phone: 604 885 6804 ext 4 (direct line)
604 885 6800 (Reception)
fax: 604 885 7909
www.scrd.ca

Normal office hours are Monday to Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

Sunshine Coast Regional District Letter:

January 3, 2014

Zoltan Sabian, Project Manager
Woodfibre LNG Project
Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency
410-701 West Georgia Street
Vancouver, BC V7Y 1C6

Dear Mr. Sabian:

RE: Request for Substitution — Public Input

The notice regarding the public comment period was discussed by the Sunshine Coast Regional District Directors at the December 19th 2013 Planning and Development Committee and the following issues were identified:

1. That no diminution be made to the CEAA and B.C. Environmental Assessment process requirements, related to the Woodfibre LNG Project.
2. The SCR D wishes to express concern around the timing of the public consultation period during the Christmas break.

Staff posted information about the comment period on the SCR D website and placed a notice in the local newspaper. Newspapers on the Coast are weekly publications (one comes out on Thursdays, the other on Fridays). Due to the Christmas and New Year holidays, the paper's printing dates and its ability to accept notices was compressed. Thus it was not possible for the SCR D to fully achieve its intention of giving the community sufficient notice regarding the CEAA's review. It was only possible for the SCR D to present information in the January 3 edition of the Coast Reporter.

This time of the year is probably the worst time to engage the public and it is unfortunate that this was the time chosen by the CEAA to seek input.

Staff also note that the SCR D did not receive a notification from the CEAA announcing the request for comments. It was only as a result of a conversation with a member of a community group based outside of the SCR D area that we found out about the consultation. While the site is within a neighbouring jurisdiction, the potential impacts could be felt by SCR D residents. Please let me know what steps the CEAA took to distribute the notice (for example which local governments were contacted and a list of newspapers where the notice was published).

	<p>Yours truly, SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT</p> <p>David Rafael Senior Planner</p>
<p>Trevor Chelswick 01/02/2014</p>	<p>To whom it may concern, please let me know if this has reached an appropriate person within the environmental protection agency that is involved in the wood fiber LNG development process.</p> <p>With regards to the proposed LNG facility near Squamish BC. I am very concerned about the adverse environmental impacts of this project.</p> <p>I have been a resident of Squamish BC for nearly 20 years and an active boater in Howe Sound. Over the past decade I have seen this area transform from “The dead sound” to a thriving ecosystem. In recent years I have seen Orcas, dolphins, record salmon runs and massive hearing balls all within sight of the proposed LNG facility. When I first moved here the area reeked of the pulp mill and the sky was often a hazy gray from the air born effluents from wood fiber mill.</p> <p>The Sea to Sky area has nearly no air pollution from industry and Howe sound is coming back to life. We have an economy that does not require the pollution of our local environment. With the fairly recent closure and clean-up of several major industrial polluters we have next to no industrial pollution and a strong tourism and information based industries. We have a very unique opportunity to create and build our economy without major environmental contamination from industry. Decisions made in the next two years could alter this path completely.</p> <p>With virtually no air born pollution in the area an LNG facility will have a huge impact on our nearly pristine air quality I am a realist and I see the wheels in full motion on this so here are some factors that could mitigate the environment destruction in this area.</p> <p>Do not power the cooking process by the combustion of any LNG. Use Hydroelectricity, if we do not have enough then make the construction of hydro power a key factor the plants approval. . If LNG is burned to create the massive amounts of energy required to cool and condense the LNG then our air will be forever polluted and the sulphur will stink.</p> <p>The wake of ships will destroy the coast line so set strict rules for speed and even stricter and easy to administer penalties for non-compliance. Protective breaks for the many small communities along the coast may need to be established at the cost of the LNG facility.</p> <p>Hearing habitat is a key factor to the vitality of Howe sound. Any proposal should include a significant increase of hearing habitat around Howe sound to counteract any degradation near the facility.</p> <p>These are just a few of the many concerns that I have about this facility, I sincerely hope that there is a significant public involvement in this process.</p> <p>Trevor Chelswick (Owner since 1999)</p>
<p>Wayne Rowley</p>	<p>This is a follow-up to my 2014-01-02 dated email:</p>

01/03/2014	<p>The proposal for an LNG plant at Woodfibre, B. C. lacks the following details:</p> <p>1) Base line assessments are mentioned. What is not clear includes: what is to be assessed?; where will the assessments take place?; when will the assessments take place (i.e. before construction?); who will do these assessments?; and will the public be informed of the results of these assessments?</p> <p>2) Natural gas will be supplied through an existing pipe line (age?). What is not clear includes: where will the natural gas come from?; what treatment will be done to the natural gas to remove contaminants (CO2, H2S, H2O, Hg) before the gas enters the start of the pipeline?; what is the composition of the natural gas, including contaminants, that will reach Woodfibre?</p> <p>3) At Woodfibre the natural gas is to be liquefied. What are not clear includes: what are the processes to be used, including compressing and cooling of the gas?; will any contaminants be removed from the natural gas during the compression and cooling phases?; where will these contaminants go/and how will they be treated (flare?); what is the anticipated loss of the natural gas through leakage, etc and where will this emission go?; what will be the final composition of the natural gas as it is sent to storage or to an awaiting tanker?; what coolant is to be used and what is the anticipated loss of the coolant per year and will there be any emissions of the coolant to the atmosphere?</p> <p>4) What will be monitored at the plant level?; what mediation steps will be in place to prevent small or large emissions to the water and air of Howe Sound?; will the public be informed of any emissions that may take place?; what are the liability policies of the company if there are emissions to the air/water of Howe Sound; will there be any independent monitoring of plant operations on an ongoing basis?</p> <p>And lastly the proposal has suggested an alternative to the federal assessment process, that being a provincial assessment process. Since the present Liberal provincial government is on record for supporting LNG production, it would seem unlikely that a provincial assessment process would be an entirely independent one (or at least the perception would be so). So in that light the federal assessment process should be the correct choice. In addition since the federal government is responsible for fisheries, it would seem to me that the expertise and background related to water quality is present in the federal domain.</p>
Nancy Rose 01/04/2014	<p>Dear Friends</p> <p>Can you forward or direct me to the safety dictates from the Canadian Government. Its difficult to understand why you would have a non Canadian building and operating a facility such as this as well as not speaking about the possible environmental impact on the Sound.</p> <p>Please reply</p> <p>Thank you, Nancy Rose</p>
Anne Miles 01/04/2014	<p>Please, no LNG tanks at Woodfibre. No LNG transport in Howe Sound. No ferries fuelled by highly explosive LNG! For the myriad reasons so many people have already given, this is a bad idea! And why has there been no consultation with us residents of the Sunshine Coast?</p> <p>Anne Miles</p>
Chris Joseph 01/05/2014	<p>Hello, as an EA professional and expert in EA I wish to register my concern that the Woodfibre project gets full and proper EA under both the CEAA 2012 and the BC EAA, but also that the BC and federal governments collaborate to conduct strategic EA of LNG development in BC.</p> <p>1. Harmonization of the EA processes of multiple jurisdictions can improve efficiency but can also degrade the quality of EA if the standards of each EA process are not withheld. Federal</p>

	<p>withdrawal from environmental management in recent years leads to a concern that federal standards (as laid out in the CEAA 2012, but also established in other laws and policy and precedent) may not be upheld if the BC process is substituted for the federal process.</p> <p>2. Each component of the Woodfibre LNG project needs to be enclosed within a single EA instead of splitting up the project into separate EAs - therefore the terminal, the pipeline feeding the terminal, associated shipping, and potentially other activities must be included. As the Project Description reads (regarding project components), it would appear that the project is being split up. This now common practice of separating projects into components for separate assessment is inefficient for all involved and counter to the goal of providing the public and decision-makers with a full understanding of the potential impacts of the project - the pipeline wouldn't occur without the terminal, and vice versa, etc.</p> <p>3. Any substitution of the BC process for the federal process must ensure that the federal government does not diminish its responsibilities and roles in terms addressing Aboriginal issues as protected under the Constitution and further characterized under case law. To my understanding, any substitution by which BC undertakes procedural aspects of Aboriginal consultation is problematic in this way.</p> <p>4. Probably most importantly, LNG development in BC requires strategic EA (SEA) given the many LNG projects proposed, the wide-reaching environmental, economic, and other types of cumulative effects that can be expected from all of this development, and the limited capacity of project-level EA to address issues that go beyond the level of individual projects and their proponents, demand that SEA of the wider program of natural gas extraction and export occur. The preponderance of LNG development in BC, and the lack of public engagement on natural gas development generally in BC prior to and during the current phase of rapid gas development has led to a situation in which BC risks putting itself in the situation that Alberta now faces with the oil sands.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>--</p> <p>Chris Joseph, MRM, PhD</p>
<p>Lola Westell 01/05/2014</p>	<p>There are so many common sense reasons not to allow this type of situation in Howe Sound and only 1 or 2 benefits and for the life of me, I can't see this as a positive move forward.</p> <p>Please don't build this Liquid Natural Gas facility at Woodfibre.</p> <p>Regards, Lola Westell</p>
<p>Jen Reilly 01/05/2014</p>	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>As an environmental professional and resident of the community of Squamish, I wish to register my concern that the Woodfibre project gets full and proper EA under both the CEAA 2012 and the BC EAA, and additionally that both the provincial and federal governments collaborate to conduct strategic EA of LNG development in BC.</p> <p>1. Harmonization of the EA processes of multiple jurisdictions can improve efficiency but can also degrade the quality of EA if the standards of each EA process are not withheld. Federal</p>

	<p>withdrawal from environmental management in recent years leads to a concern that federal standards (as laid out in the CEEA 2012, but also established in other laws and policy and precedent) may not be upheld if the BC process is substituted for the federal process.</p> <p>2. Each component of the Woodfibre LNG project needs to be enclosed within a single EA instead of splitting up the project into separate EAs - therefore the terminal, the pipeline feeding the terminal, associated shipping, and potentially other activities must be included. As the Project Description reads (regarding project components), it would appear that the project is being split up. This now common practice of separating projects into components for separate assessment is inefficient for all involved and counter to the goal of providing the public and decision-makers with a full understanding of the potential impacts of the project - the pipeline wouldn't occur without the terminal, and vice versa, etc.</p> <p>3. Any substitution of the BC process for the federal process must ensure that the federal government does not diminish its responsibilities and roles in terms of addressing Aboriginal issues as protected under the Constitution and further characterized under case law. To my understanding, any substitution by which BC undertakes procedural aspects of Aboriginal consultation is problematic in this way.</p> <p>4. Any substitution of the BC process for the federal process must ensure that the impacts under the jurisdiction of Fisheries and Oceans Canada are addressed. Given the location of the proposed development, this is a significant concern.</p> <p>5. LNG development in BC requires strategic EA (SEA) given the many LNG projects proposed, the wide-reaching environmental, economic, and other types of cumulative effects that can be expected from all of this development, and the limited capacity of project-level EA to address issues that go beyond the level of individual projects and their proponents. SEA of the wider program of natural gas extraction and export in the province is necessary. The preponderance of LNG development in BC, and the lack of public engagement on natural gas development generally in BC prior to and during the current phase of rapid gas development has led to a situation in which BC risks putting itself in the situation that Alberta now faces with the oil sands.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Jennifer Reilly</p>
<p>Dan Kingsbury Sr. 01/06/2014</p>	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I would like to go on record against any LNG facility in Squamish or elsewhere, against all carbon-based economies that are causing climate change, acidification of oceans and loss of species with built-in risks of complete ecological collapse. if you want to develop energy, go geothermal.</p> <p>Pacific institute of Climate Solutions PICS and Pacific Climate Impacts Consortium PCIC are leading the way in this regard. See what they say: http://www.pacificclimate.org/news-and-events/news</p> <p>Sincerely, Dan</p> <p>Dan Kingsbury Sr., DDS</p>

Dawn
Johannesson

01/06/2014

To whom it may concern,

I've attached the letter in regards to the Woodfibre LNG Project with Ref # 80060
A hard copy will go out in today's mail.

Thank you,

Dawn Johannesson
On behalf of The Convention of Baptist Churches of BC and Keats Camps.

Dawn Johannesson BC & Yukon Regional Administrative Assistant
bcyarea@cbwc.ca <mailto:bcyarea@cbwc.ca>
t: 604-420-7646 1-800-596-7772
f: 604.422.8696
7175 Royal Oak Avenue www.cbwc.ca <http://www.cbwc.ca/>
Burnaby, BC V5J 4J3

Follow the CBWC on Twitter Like the CBWC on Facebook
Subscribe to monthly eNewsletter Making Connections www.cbwc.ca <http://www.cbwc.ca/>

The Convention of Baptist Churches of BC
7175 Royal Oak Avenue
Burnaby, BC V5J 4J3
Phone: {604} 420.7646 or 1.800.596.7772 Fax: {604} 422.8696
Email: bcyarea@cbwc.ca Website: www.cbwc.ca

January 6,2014, Woodfibre LNG Project
Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency
410-701West Georgia Street
Vancouver, BC
V7Y 1C6

Dear Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency

Re: Woodfibre LNG Project REF NO. 80060

As a Community within the proposed Woodfibre LNG Project, we are providing our written comments and concerns regarding its implementation.

Firstly, we are disappointed at the process for feedback and the available time to develop comments. The request for information was released on December 1th and only circulated to our community on December 30, 2013 leaving us very little time to evaluate the proposal and provide feedback. In addition this request was made during the Christmas season in which many

	<p>people are unavailable to input their concerns. We feel that the comment period should be extended to enable the appropriate amount of time to prepare our concerns.</p> <p>In the event that this period is not extended please see our initial concerns regarding the Woodfibre LNG Project:</p> <p>We operate a children and youth camp on Keats Island with a waterfront on the south side of the island in the direct path of the secondary routing for ships. Our primary concern is that should a contamination occur within this area our waterfront program would be unable to exist. The waterfront makes up 50% of our activities provided and should it be deemed unusable this would seriously impact the viability of our organization. In addition we are concerned that during the summer months tanker traffic would create waves that previously did not exist making the waterfront unsafe for participants and damage our floats.</p> <p>We understand that you will take these comments into consideration and look forward to continuing our involvement in the process moving forward. Should you require any further information regarding our concerns please contact Dawn Johannessen with the Convention of Baptist Churches of BC at bcyarea@cbwc.ca.</p> <p>Rev. Rob Ogilvie</p> <p>Executive Secretary of The Convention of Baptist Churches of BC</p> <p>On Behalf of the Convention of Baptist Churches of BC and Keats Camps District Lot 696</p> <p>cc: Dan Galpin, Josh Lepin, David Connop, Ian Grant</p> <p>"Called of God to Enable Ministry"</p>
<p>Colette Perkin 01/06/2014</p>	<p>In the interests of all in the Howe Sound of BC, I urge you to ensure that there is a Provincial as well as a Federal Government assessment on this project. The People of this area deserve an assessment that provides for appropriate consultation and information gathering while informing those who will most be affected by this project.</p> <p>Regards, ckperkin</p>

<p>Christopher Fleck 01/06/2014</p>	<p>Hello, I am writing to express my concern over the speed of the environmental assessment process of the Woodfibre LNG Project in BC. I am concerned of potential environmental impacts, and feel that all levels of government should go through a rigorous assessment process.</p> <p>Thank You,</p> <p>Christopher Fleck</p>
<p>Mariah Battiston 01/06/2014</p>	<p>Please let this proposal go thru the federal environmental review process. It seems as though you are trying to push it through without the proper processes in place which are designed to put everyone's minds at ease. What's the hurry!!</p> <p>Mariah Battiston</p>
<p>Lynda Grant 01/06/2014</p>	<p>This should be reviewed by the federal government and not just the provincial government</p> <p>Lynda Grant</p>
<p>Vanessa LeBourdais 01/06/2014</p>	<p>Dear Christy Clarke, BC Govt. et al,</p> <p>This project must not be rushed through. This proposal must go through both the provincial and federal review processes. Our drinking water security demands careful assessment of risks and benefits.</p> <p>There needs to be greater transparency around LNG projects as a whole, and the timeline of this public-comments process does not look very good on the stakeholders.</p> <p>Sincerely</p> <p>Vanessa LeBourdais</p>
<p>Kelly Franz 01/06/2014</p>	<p>Regarding: Woodfibre LNG Project - Federal Environmental Review</p> <p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>Please perform the federal level environmental review on this major project near my home in Squamish, BC, rather than just the provincial level review.</p> <p>This will help ensure that the project is given a sufficiently robust environmental review rather than a potentially biased review which is, in my opinion, realistically possible in the BC-only process.</p> <p>Thanks for the opportunity to comment on this project during the busy holiday season. Extending the review period to account for this busy time would add to the legitimacy of this particular comment period.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kelly Franz</p>
<p>Ruth Simons</p>	<p>Attached is our Society's submission and comments regarding the environmental assessment process for the Woodfibre LNG project.</p>

01/06/2014

Thank you,

Ruth Simons,
Executive Director,
Future of Howe Sound Society
604 921-6564
www.futureofhowesound.org

www.facebook.com/futureofhowesound

Committed to the stewardship and conservation of Howe Sound for current and future generations.

Future of Howe Sound Society Letter:

Woodfibre LNG Project
Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency
410-701 West Georgia Street
Vancouver, BC V7Y 1C6

January 6, 2012

Emailed to: Woodfibre@ceaa-acee.gc.ca

Re: Substitution Request by BC Provincial Government re Woodfibre LNG Project.
The Future of Howe Sound Society is a non-profit organization committed to conservation and stewardship of Howe Sound for current and future generations. Our mission is to encourage the development of an overall comprehensive management plan for Howe Sound that recognizes and protects the social, economic and cultural value of this natural and beautiful environment.

Our purpose is to encourage, facilitate and serve as a liaison for community participation in developing a comprehensive management plan for the Howe Sound region involving local communities, First Nations, local, regional, provincial and federal governments and other interested parties.

We are concerned about the possibility that the proposed development of a Liquid Natural Gas facility at Woodfibre will not be subject to review by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency. We are also concerned about the request by the BC Provincial Government that the BC Environmental Agency assessment process be substituted for the federal process.

Woodfibre is located in Howe Sound, British Columbia. Howe Sound is an extraordinary natural environment that is less than an hour away from Vancouver. The recreational opportunities it affords for residents of Metro Vancouver are unparalleled. The proximity to Howe Sound and the Sea to Sky corridor is a key factor in Vancouver being ranked as one of the most livable cities in the world and leads to immigration and investment which contribute greatly to Metro Vancouver's economy. It is critical that this unique area and the opportunities that it affords for recreational use are preserved for future generations. As Dr. Murray Newman (former director of the Vancouver Aquarium) once said, "anywhere else in the world, Howe Sound would be a great national park". We have a duty to preserve this unique area for future generations.

The proposal to build an LNG Facility at Woodfibre raises a number of concerns about the potential impact of the project on the ecosystem of Howe Sound. This ecosystem is currently in a sensitive stage of recovery from years of environmental abuse. Woodfibre is directly across the Sound from the Britannia mine site which at one point was considered the worst point source of contamination in North America. Tens of millions of dollars of taxpayer and private funds have been expended on remediating the Sound and these expenditures are now starting

to show results with the dramatic return of marine life over the last several years.

Although the proposed LNG facility in and of itself raises issues that should require a federal assessment review, we note that this proposal is being considered at the same time that a number of other major projects are being proposed for the region, including a gravel and aggregate pit mine at McNab Creek, a waste incinerator facility at Port Mellon and new timber lots being created on Gambier Island. The cumulative impact of these projects on the regional ecosystem requires a full and comprehensive assessment.

Serious consideration needs to be given to the manner in which re-industrialization occurs in Howe Sound. Despite the fact that the region was subjected to extensive environmental abuse over a number of years, as a result of the extensive remediation efforts that have taken place, Howe Sound has undergone a remarkable recovery and the region has become a major recreational area and tourism destination. Howe Sound is the heart of the Sea to Sky corridor and is the gateway to Whistler, which is a world recognized destination resort. Renewed industrialization to the extent that could occur if the current proposed projects all proceed could have a dramatic effect on the region's attractiveness as a tourism destination. The cumulative effect of these projects and the impact it could have on the current tourism and recreation based economy needs to be carefully considered.

With respect to the proposed LNG facility itself, there are a significant issues and concerns relating to the proposal which justify a full and comprehensive review process, including a federal environmental assessment. Any reduced scrutiny could result in long-term adverse effects on the economy and livability of the region.

Our concerns about any reduction of scrutiny relate to the following issues and concerns:

- Natural gas is hazardous substance which raises significant handling and safety concerns
- Woodfibre is less than 6 kms from residential community of Britannia Beach and less than 4 km from Hwy 99 where thousands of people travel on a daily basis.
- Howe Sound is a narrow fjord where the distance shore to shore is approximately 1.5 kms at the narrowest point and so the increase in large vessel traffic can create safety and spill concerns.
- Orca Whales, Grey Whales and Humpback whales and other species at risk are found in Howe Sound with increasing frequency and the impact on these species of increased tanker traffic needs to be fully assessed.
- Howe Sound is a recreational destination, children's camps, recreational boating, several marinas, kayaking trails will all be affected by the re-industrialization of the Sound and increased vessel traffic, including wake impact. An increase in shipping in Howe Sound will affect swells and the impact to the foreshore in this narrow fjord needs to be fully assessed.
- The affect that the increase in shipping traffic from this project as well as the proposed gravel mine and possible barging of garbage from Metro Vancouver needs to be fully assessed. The risk of collisions not only with other commercial traffic but also with the many ferries, recreational and commercial fishing boats needs to be properly evaluated and proper safeguards ensured..

We believe the Woodfibre LNG project and the shipping of the gas down the Sound should not be reviewed in isolation based on current conditions in Howe Sound. Many other projects are currently being proposed for Howe Sound and combined impacts to the environment and economy of the Sound need to be fully understood. Several very large residential communities along the shore of Howe Sound are seeking a full assessment to allow public comment and participation in the review process. Each of the proposed projects can individually have

significant socio-economic, safety and health impacts and collectively, the impacts could be profound.

The cumulative impacts of all major projects on the recovering and fragile ecosystem for Howe Sound are important to consider. Collectively, these projects will impact air quality and possibly the current and future economies of this region. Large projects cannot simply be reviewed in isolation and it is critical that consideration is given to the overall impact on the Sound if all of the projects currently contemplated were to proceed. As part of the review, the proponent should be required to conduct a cumulative impact study which takes into account all of the projects that are currently under consideration.

We are concerned that the British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office will not be fully resourced to handle the significant increase in projects around B.C. requiring assessment and believe that considerations that would be examined in a federal process could be overlooked in the provincial process. Although the Province is asserting that the substitution will streamline the review process, there is little information provided as to how or why this substitution will improve the process and ensure that valid public concerns are properly evaluated and assessed. In order for the public to comment on the effectiveness of the proposed substitution, there are some basic informational issues that should be answered:

- How many staff positions does this substitution request eliminate?
- What is the ratio of projects to Project Managers?
- What guarantee of arms length relationships between proponents and project managers?
- How does the political mandate influence the assessment? Federal versus Provincial?
- What impact does the change in timeline have with this substitution request?
- With so many projects occurring in Howe Sound at one time, how effective are the Working Groups? How does local government staff attend and participate knowledgeably in all of these projects at one time?

- Is there adequate expertise within the provincial government to assess Liquid natural Gas projects since this is one of the first export facilities in this part of the province? Our other concerns relate to the changes to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and their role in this process. Will DFO still be actively involved in this assessment in order to protect the species at risk and recovery of marine life in Howe Sound.

In addition to the potential impact on fisheries and oceans which fall under the federal sphere, we note that there are a number of other issues relating to this application which fall under federal jurisdiction including navigable waters issues, international trade and commerce implications, federal environmental legislation issues and other matters. We question whether these issues will be properly considered under a provincial review process.

We feel the 20 day public comment period on announced December 17th is an extremely short timeline taking into consideration the Christmas holiday period for a project of this significance. The timing of the announcement was very unfortunate and we believe that because of the holiday season, a number of concerned stakeholders would not even have been aware of the request for comments.

Yours Truly,

Ruth Simons,
Executive Director,
The Future of Howe Sound Society
c/o Box 465
Lions Bay, B.C.
V0N 2E0
604 921-6564

	<p>Ruth.simons@futureofhowesound.org www.futureofhowesound.org</p>
<p>Eoin Finn 01/06/2014</p>	<p>Sir/Madam: The attached letter expresses my objections to the request by the BC Government to substitute the CEAA environmental assessment (EA) of the proposed Woodfibre LNG Project with a provincial-level assessment under BC Reg. 720/02.</p> <p>Woodfibre LNG Project Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency 41 0-701 West Georgia Street Vancouver, BC V7Y 1C6</p> <p>January 5, 2014</p> <p>via email to Woodfibre@ceaa-acee.gc.q; hard-copy delivered Jan.6th</p> <p>emailed ccs to: Future of Howe Sound Society (Ruth Simons), Jordan Sturdy MLA, David Eby MLA, Islands Trust (Trustee Jan Hagedorn), Village of Lions Bay (Brenda Broughton, Mayor), John Weston MP</p> <p>Re: Substitution request by the proponent/ BC Government</p> <p>Sir/Madam:</p> <p>I am writing to express my objections to the request by the BC Government to substitute the CEAA environmental assessment (EA) of the proposed Woodfibre LNG Project with a provincial-level assessment under BC Reg. 720/02.</p> <p>My principal objection is the lack of independence of the Environmental Assessment Office (EAO). That independence has been called into question by the recent agreement between the EAO and the BC Oil and Gas Commission (OGC), which appears to remove any independence the EAO may have had in dealing with oil and gas projects. The October 17, 2013 memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the EAO and the OGC commits the two organizations to work together in issuing approvals for oil and gas projects. The MOU reflects the provincial government's single-minded priority of oil and gas development, and, particularly, LNG. The EAO's heretofore independence enabled it to advocate for a wide range of environmental concerns ranging from threatened species and landscape to water supply, fracking chemicals, tailings pond management, river and coastal pollution, air quality, and greenhouse gas production. This MOU would appear to silence that voice, without the slightest effort at either public or legislative discussion.</p> <p>BC's Premier and Cabinet are on record as supporting the unrestrained development of BC's natural gas (NG) and liquefied natural gas (LNG) industry. Many voters would hold that it is hardly the public-trust fiduciary duty and role of Government to do that in advance of careful examination of the costs and benefits of such ventures on behalf of all British Columbians, and that such unfettered enthusiasm is bound to affect the objectivity of a provincial-level EA ... or at least the perception that such objectivity has been afforded to EAO staff conducting it. This will inevitably lead to considerable public skepticism of the EAO's conclusions and recommendations. If the unseemly haste with which public input to Fortis' pipeline proposal was curtailed is repeated here, that skepticism and unrest will be further amplified.</p> <p>Other objections include:</p>

- The EAO currently lacks the experience and bench-strength to conduct an adequate environmental assessment of such a plant. The office has no experience with the technical, safety, and marine loading/shipping issues involved in such a large-scale terrestrial/marine LNG venture, let alone one of this scale located in

Woodfibre LNG: Substitution request by the proponent/ BC Government Page 1

Howe Sound - a confined airshed and fragile ecosystem in the early stages of recovery from a century of environmental exploitation and degradation. Further, technical staff levels in the Ministry have been greatly reduced in recent years, calling into question the Ministry's ability to perform a competent EA. All the more so as staff will be involved in evaluating this proposal concurrently with Fortis's proposal to run a second NG pipeline through to Woodfibre and a number of other, much larger, LNG plant proposals

- The requirement - usually lacking in the cursory BC EA process - for a thorough investigation of the proponent's proposal, especially given the lack of clarity in the proponent's proposal re:
 - o Air quality: There are scant details of the "pre-treatment" acid gas removal, including details of how other hydrocarbons, elemental sulphur, N₂O and mercury removed from the NG supply will be disposed of. How this will affect air quality in the Sound; other air contaminants will be introduced by Fortis' pipeline proposal, which includes the installation of an NG-fired 9,700 BHP compressor station at Squamish; LNG tankers will emit particulates from diesel fuels; and fugitive NG and GHG emissions will occur during the piping, liquefaction, storage and transfer/shipping stages of treatment. As all of these will contribute airborne contaminants, there is considerable cause for concern about the deterioration of the air quality in the Howe Sound airshed
 - o Safety: Including measures to be employed in loading the LNG carriers from an above-ground (floating) storage barge, and the general issue of the safety of this unorthodox storage and transfer scheme for a highly flammable substance. We do not want a "Cleveland" in Howe Sound
 - o Leakage: The class (Moss, TGZ, IHI, other?) of LNG tankers which will be employed may/may not have reliquefaction capabilities. This is important to the rate of methane leakage of this powerful GHG during tanker loading and their subsequent voyage to Asian markets
 - o Tanker routing: The exact routing of the proposed tanker traffic, and the effects on foreshores and recreational facilities throughout the Sound by the wash created by these massive (-300m.- three football fields long, -150,000 tonne) vessels.
- The EAO lacks both jurisdiction and expertise in marine elements of the proposal: As DFO is a Federal organization, there is no certainty that its resources and knowledge - essential for the assessment of the project's impact on the marine ecosystem- will be available to a provincial EA

I trust you will take these objections into consideration in your decision.

Yours very truly

Eoin J. Finn B.Sc. , Ph.D., MBA

Woodfibre LNG: Substitution request by the proponent/ BC Government Page 2

Lucinda Jones

01/06/2014

Woodfibre Liquid Natural Gas Project
Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency
410-701 West Georgia Street,
Vancouver, B.C.
Canada

Dear Madam/Sir,

RE: WOODFIBRE LNG PROJECT

I wish to simply advise you of my support for the advice given to you through the letter to your office from Ruth Simons, Executive Director of The Future of Howe Sound Society.

I believe that Ms. Simons spells out very clearly the issues that must be treated with scrupulous care and unwavering regard for the natural systems that co-exist within this precious marine and earthen environment.

Industry and commerce need to be built for the long term sustainability of the citizenry of this region, an area that is increasing in population and one that is reliant on intelligent and inter-communicative governance.

We, the citizenry, look forward to being at the discussion table with you and your officers immediately and for many long years to come.

May I take this opportunity to wish you a very Happy New Year. May we all enjoy being healthy and wise together.

Sincerely,

Lucinda Jones

<p>Chris Murrell 01/06/2014</p>	<p>This project may affect the health of Howe Sound and the salmon runs in the local rivers. I think that this is a federal jurisdictional issue and should be reviewed by a federal agency. I feel that the provincial government does not have the expertise to assess fisheries issues. In addition they have a stated bias that the project proceed and may not do an unbiased assessment.</p> <p>Chris Murrell Squamish, BC</p>
<p>Kate Gordanier-Smith 01/06/2014</p>	<p>To: Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc: B.C. Environmental Assessment Office</p> <p>Re: Woodfibre LNG Project</p> <p>I formally request that the proposed B.C. Woodfibre Natural Gas Ltd. Plant near Squamish go through the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency's review process. It has taken many long years to bring our Howe Sound back to health where even the shell fish have returned and can be eaten. Any new industrial plant on Howe Sound needs rigourous independent assessment. I do not believe our B.C. government can objectively assess this project having announced its full support for developing B.C.'s LNG sector.</p> <p>Had it not been for a timely article in the Globe and Mail this morning I would not have even known about the proposal to substitute a provincial environmental-assessment process for the federal one. I was away on Christmas and New Year's holiday. The timing of this announcement was unfair and ill-timed, to say the least.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Kate Gordanier-Smith</p>
<p>Brenda Broughton 01/06/2014</p>	<p>Re: Substitution Request by BC Provincial Government For: Woodfibre LNG Environmental Assessment Comments</p> <p>Please include my attached comments in the feedback request to be filed by end of day January 6th, 2014.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Brenda Broughton Mayor Village of Lions Bay 604.921.9229 604.306.6661 (cell) <u>Village of Lions Bay Mayor's Letter:</u></p> <p>Woodfibre LNG Project 2014</p> <p style="text-align: right;">January 6,</p>

Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency
410-701 West Georgia Street
Vancouver, BC V7Y 1C6

Emailed to: Woodfibre@ceaa-acee.gc.ca

Re: Substitution Request by BC Provincial Government re Woodfibre LNG Project.

I am writing to support a review by both the BC Provincial Government's BC Environmental Agency process for the Woodfibre LNG project in addition to the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency.

This is a vitally important time for Howe Sound. Today's Vancouver Sun headlines a story, " 'World's richest' wild trout stream threatened by acid rock drainage. " When the Okanagan Connector [BC] opened in 1990 noone could have imagined that this would be the outcome. Acid rock drainage has been identified as a major concern at the McNab Creek gravel mining proposal.

With the Environmental Assessment of this project, a review should include the Tanker routing, the effects on the foreshores and recreational facilities throughout Howe Sound, by the wash created by these 300m vessels. About two years ago a tanker 'speeding' led to a 3 year old girl being swept from the shore of Steveston, BC.

During that same time frame, a speeding tanker in Howe Sound compromised the safety of at least two boating groups, who reported this event to Port Vancouver. The speed of the tankers must also be taken into consideration in relation to the boater safety in Howe Sound, as a push of 'rogue waves' can be life threatening even to a boat of 25', as in the circumstance noted involving a craft of 20' and of just over 25' in length. The earlier boat had children on board with life jackets, but the size of the wave required seasoned stewardship in order to not capsize in the middle of Howe Sound with no other boats around, at about 5pm on a quiet sunny Sunday. Importantly and additionally, a tanker disaster incident scenario must be recognized as a possibility for each Environmental Assessment review.

Woodfibre is located in Howe Sound, British Columbia. Howe Sound is an extraordinary natural environment that is a 30 to 40 minute boat ride from False Creek. The recreational opportunities it affords for residents of Metro Vancouver are unparalleled.

A website on research regarding Tourism, identified the number 2 reason for Tourists coming to Vancouver is the Sea to Sky corridor scenery. The number 1 reason is Stanley Park. The number 3 reason is the Museum of Anthropology. Tourists are drawn from afar by 'unique' items, often scenic or historic. The other interests such as a Granville Island or Capilano Suspension Bridge are important supports of the tourist 'drawing card' in order to optimize spending outcomes. To put things in context, Granville Island was about number 14 on this listing of the top 20 tourist draws.

Howe Sound and its beauty are vital to the British Columbia economy. Recreational safety is vital to the boating economy, which includes, fishing equipment, life jackets, boats and water transportation of all types including paddle boarders, canoes, kayaks, waterskiing equipment, tour companies, Cruise Ships, film of movies, commercials, TV Series, etc. All resulting in significant Provincial Tax Revenue generation. There are many amazing ski hills, but the road to Whistler is unparalleled in the World.

Safety in this area is vital to all residents of Howe Sound, vital to the economy of British Columbia, and vital to the 2.3 million residents of Metro Vancouver.

The proximity to Howe Sound and the Sea to Sky corridor is a key factor in Vancouver being ranked as one of the most livable cities in the world and leads to immigration and investment which contribute greatly to Metro Vancouver's economy. It is critical that this unique area and the opportunities that it affords for recreational use are preserved for future generations. As Dr. Murray Newman (former director of the Vancouver Aquarium) once said, "anywhere

else in the world, Howe Sound would be a great national park". We have a duty to preserve this unique area for future generations.

The proposal to build an LNG Facility at Woodfibre raises a number of concerns about the potential impact of the project on the ecosystem of Howe Sound. This ecosystem is currently in a sensitive stage of recovery from years of environmental abuse. Woodfibre is directly across Howe Sound from the Britannia Mine Site which was for decades, the worst 'point source' of contamination in North America. Millions of taxpayer dollars have been expended on remediating Howe Sound. These expenditures are now starting to show results with the dramatic return of marine life over the last several years.

Although the proposed LNG facility in and of itself raises issues that should require a federal assessment review, we note that this proposal is being considered at the same time that a number of other major projects are being proposed for the region, including the BURNCO Gravel and Aggregate Pit Mine at McNab Creek, a Waste to Energy Incinerator facility at Port Mellon, and new timber lots being created on Gambier Island. The cumulative impact of these projects on the Regional Ecosystem requires a full and comprehensive Environmental Assessment.

Serious consideration needs to be given to the manner in which re-industrialization occurs in Howe Sound. Despite the fact that the region was subjected to extensive environmental abuse over a number of years, as a result of the extensive remediation efforts that have taken place, Howe Sound has undergone a remarkable recovery and the region has become a major recreational area and tourism destination, along with a magnet for film, the Cruise Ships, when they have extra time and now fishing.

Howe Sound is the heart of the Sea to Sky corridor and is the gateway to Whistler, which is a world recognized destination resort. Renewed industrialization to the extent that could occur if the current proposed projects all proceed could have a dramatic effect on the region's attractiveness as a tourism destination. The cumulative effect of these projects and the impact it could have on the current tourism and recreation based economy needs to be carefully considered.

The proposed LNG facility alone has significant issues and concerns relating to the proposal which justify a full and comprehensive review process, including a Federal Environmental Assessment. Any reduced scrutiny could result in long-term adverse effects on the economy and livability of the region.

The cumulative impacts of any number of major projects on the recovering and fragile ecosystem for Howe Sound are important to consider. Collectively, these projects will impact air and water quality and possibly the current and future economies of this region. Large projects cannot simply be reviewed in isolation and it is critical that consideration is given to the overall impact on Howe Sound if all of the projects currently contemplated were to proceed. As part of the review, the proponent should be required to conduct a cumulative impact study which takes into account all of the projects that are currently under consideration.

We are concerned that the British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office will not be fully resourced to handle the significant increase in projects around BC. requiring environmental assessment and believe that considerations that would be examined in a federal process could be overlooked in the provincial process. Although the Province is asserting that the substitution will streamline the review process, there is little information provided as to how or why this substitution will improve the process and ensure that valid public concerns are properly evaluated and assessed.

Howe Sound is a jewel in British Columbia, much more vast than Stanley Park and including a marine ecosystem that yielded the first fishery opening in 50 years, in 2013, with a catch of

	<p>300,000 pink salmon which provided both jobs and food for British Columbians.</p> <p><i>In this light we need to be aware of what it is we are doing, what the anticipated outcome goals are and what the unanticipated outcomes and cost may be. To my knowledge, as a resident of Howe Sound since 1974, it has taken at least four decades of focused clean up to address past environmental failures.</i></p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Brenda Broughton Mayor Village of Lions Bay Box 141, Lions Bay, BC V0N 2E0 ~ 604.306.6661 (cell) ~ 921.9229 (HO) ~ mayor.broughton@lionsbay.ca</p>
<p>Kelly Bishop</p> <p>01/06/2014</p>	<p>To whom it concerns,</p> <p>I STRONGLY oppose the proposed woodfibre LNG plant in Howe Sound.</p> <p>Kelly Bishop</p>
<p>Avril Trudeau</p> <p>01/06/2014</p>	<p>We own a house in Tunstall Bay, on Bowen Island, which faces the proposed shipping lanes for your LNG tankers.</p> <p>I am writing to protest the proposed alternate route of Collingwood channel for the LNG tankers. The waters around the Paisley islands, Bowen and Keats are teeming with marine life which are already being impacted by ferries, cruise ships and tugboats. Adding tankers to the mix will undoubtedly have deleterious effects to the ecosystems your enormous vessels will be passing through.</p> <p>Furthermore, this area is a destination for kayakers and sailboaters. We would highly encourage you to conduct a proper environmental review which would necessarily include public input. To put tanker traffic through this delicate ecosystem so close to a large metropolitan centre is, in our minds, a very destructive plan.</p> <p>Please keep us informed as to the status of this proposal.</p> <p>Avril Trudeau</p>
<p>Ruth de la Giroday</p> <p>01/06/2014</p>	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I want a full-scale environmental assessment for the proposed LNG Facility at Woodfibre in Howe Sound, BC - not a substitution.</p> <p>I spend way too much time on Bowyer Island to not feel like this directly applies to me. Please take this to heart when we say that HOWE SOUND IS NOT AN EXPERIMENT! Howe Sound is not an experiment for the new Environmental Assessment Process for the LNG Facility at Woodfibre! I vote NO to the Substitution Request as we need a thorough environmental assessment for public safety.</p> <p>Why does China place LNG facilities at least 11 km off-shore and away from residential areas? Is this new EA process too new and too soon to know whether or not it's effective for such a</p>

	<p>potentially hazardous project? It is critical that the Environmental Assessment on the LNG at Woodfibre in Howe Sound be the most thorough and precautionary of processes.</p> <p>Regards, Ruth de la Giroday</p>
<p>Teresa Rowley 01/05/2014</p>	<p>To the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency,</p> <p>As a 20 year resident of the Sea to Sky Corridor, I have many questions regarding the proposal for an LNG plant at Woodfibre, B. C.. I have read the report and have found that it lacks the following details:</p> <p>1) Base line assessments are mentioned. What is not clear includes: what is to be assessed?; where will the assessments take place?; when will the assessments take place (i.e. before construction?); who will do these assessments?; and will the public be informed of the results of these assessments?</p> <p>2) Natural gas will be supplied through an existing pipe line (age?). What is not clear includes: where will the natural gas come from?; what treatment will be done to the natural gas to remove contaminants (CO2, H2S, H2O, Hg) before the gas enters the start of the pipeline?; what is the composition of the natural gas, including contaminants, that will reach Woodfibre?</p> <p>3) At Woodfibre the natural gas is to be liquefied. What are not clear includes: what are the processes to be used, including compressing and cooling of the gas?; will any contaminants be removed from the natural gas during the compression and cooling phases?; where will these contaminants go/and how will they be treated (flare?); what is the anticipated loss of the natural gas through leakage, etc and where will this emission go?; what will be the final composition of the natural gas as it is sent to storage or to an awaiting tanker?; what coolant is to be used and what is the anticipated loss of the coolant per year and will there be any emissions of the coolant to the atmosphere?</p> <p>4) What will be monitored at the plant level?; what mediation steps will be in place to prevent small or large emissions to the water and air of Howe Sound?; will the public be informed of any emissions that may take place?; what are the liability policies of the company if there are emissions to the air/water of Howe Sound; will there be any independent monitoring of plant operations on an ongoing basis?</p> <p>Lastly, the proposal has suggested an alternative to the federal assessment process, that being a provincial assessment process. Since the present Liberal provincial government is on record for supporting LNG production, it would seem unlikely that a provincial assessment process would be an entirely independent one (or at least the perception would be so). So in that light the federal assessment process should be the correct choice. In addition since the federal government is responsible for fisheries, it would seem to me that the expertise and background related to water quality is present in the federal domain.</p> <p>Regards, Teresa Rowley</p>
<p>Tony Richmond 01/05/2014</p>	<p>----- Golder's environmental assessment of the proposed Woodfibre LNG installation misses one hugely important PROBABILITY = the incidence of an earthquake just off Vancouver Island. We</p>

	<p>are overdue for a 9.5 earthquake originating from a shift in the Cascadia Fault. Just think of the damage to Woodfibre and moored tankers from a 30 m tsunami rushing up between West Vancouver shoreline and Bowen Island.</p> <p>The least we should is demand a robust barrier to protect the ship and shore installations. However this will create more environmental damage from sea floor alterations.</p> <p>Who has the guts at the political level stand up for Howe Sound.! The pulpmill at Port Mellon put its money where its mouth was and the remedial shoreline work has brought back whales and dolphins, including salmon runs.</p> <p>Tony Richmond</p>
<p>Alex Bland 01/06/2014</p>	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I am a born and raised Vancouverite living in Kitsilano. My family shares a cabin on Bowyer Island and I spend my summers in Howe Sound on the water when I am not working for the Canadian Coast Guard. I want a full-scale environmental assessment for the proposed LNG Facility at Woodfibre in Howe Sound, BC - not a substitution. I am not a radical environmentalist, simply a concerned citizen for the direction of health and environmental protection in our province and country.</p> <p>HOWE SOUND IS NOT AN EXPERIMENT! Howe Sound is not an experiment for the new Environmental Assessment Process for the LNG Facility at Woodfibre! I vote NO to the Substitution Request as we need a thorough environmental assessment for public safety. Why does China place LNG facilities at least 11 km off-shore and away from residential areas? Is this new EA process too new and too soon to know whether or not it's effective for such a potentially hazardous project? It is critical that the Environmental Assessment on the LNG at Woodfibre in Howe Sound be the most thorough and precautionary of processes.</p> <p>Regards, Alex Bland</p>
<p>Jan Hagedorn 01/06/2014</p>	<p>To Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</p> <p>I am a Trustee with the Gambier Local Trust Committee. I am speaking here, however, as an individual and not as a member of the Gambier Local Trust Committee.</p> <p>Within the Howe Sound area an LNG project is being proposed. Due to the high level of marine traffic in the Howe Sound area, high marine standards are needed. I do believe there is a need for a federal environmental assessment as concerns about marine shipping are solely within the jurisdiction of the federal government. Out of Horseshoe Bay there are 3 major ferry routes, several water taxis, and a huge recreational boating community travelling to the Howe Sound Islands and communities, with boat ramps/marina's at Horseshoe Bay, Sunset Marina, Gibsons, Porteau Cove and Bowen Island. There is also freighter traffic from Squamish Terminals. This traffic combined with LNG tanker traffic presents further risk of accident. There are several yacht clubs on the Islands as well as marine traffic transporting children to the 5 camps on the Islands in Howe Sound and many tourists, renting speedboats, kayaks, and paddle-boards, increasingly spending time in the Howe Sound area.</p>

	<p>As Howe Sound is a natural fiord of significant ecological importance, I suggest that the highest ecological standards be used when assessing said LNG proposal, in order to preserve and protect the area for all British Columbians. Historically this area has suffered from severe toxic waste dumped from a variety of sources into the environment, Only now with the help of many, and huge amounts of money, is Howe Sound recovering. We do not want to go backwards. The proposed LNG shipping route will pass Anvil, Gambier, Passage, Bowyer and Bowen Islands, while the proposed alternate route will also pass by Keats and the Paisley Group of Islands. All of these Islands have unique, finite ecosystems and are sensitive to shoreline damage and spills that affect all forage fish and marine life that is so important to the healthy ecosystem of these Islands.</p> <p>Another consideration is large number of projects recently being proposed in this area that may have significant impact on the environment. Will there be a cumulative effects study that would capture all the projects and the total affect of all the proposed projects on air, marine, noise, potential spills and ecological resilience?</p> <p>Once again I encourage The Canadian Environment Agency to use the highest standards possible when assessing this project and I do see a need for a federal environmental assessment, and I do not think the federal government should allow the BC process to be substituted for theirs.</p> <p>Sincerely Jan Hagedorn</p>
<p>Susan World 01/06/2014</p>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam:</p> <p>It is nice to read the " Project Description" about the proposed Woodfibre LNG project . But I have not seen any processing and environmental effects of the LNG wells description, and some important environmental effects are missing, and the depth of the description are not strong enough.</p> <p>The description of the LNG wells regarding their exact processing charts, chemicals are used and emitted, must be given as soon as possible.</p> <p>In short, federal environmental assessment is definitely needed in order to protect the site and related environment in a proper way. This activity is not only belonging to B.C., but also effect all people in Canada and other billions people in the whole world because we are living in the same small Earth and are related with each other in terms of climate, water, air, food , health and other daily life aspects.</p> <p>Generally speaking, LNG and other kinds of underneath fossil energy exploitation projects should not be encouraged. At least they must be managed by CEAA with a much more responsbile maner to public than other clean and green industry sectors for ourown sakes. B.C. and Canada can not afford almost the same amount of loss compared with the net gain by LNG sector.</p> <p>Obviously that the LNG and Crude Oil export Asian development policy is not the best choice for our nation for a long term. It maybe the worst economic policy from my view. We will be blamed by the seriously polluted land by so many LNGs and our future kids seriously by this generation's greedy and not responsible for them.</p> <p>Thanks for your attention.</p>

	<p>Susan World , 10 years senior environmental assessment engineer experiences globally for The World Bank, Asian Development Bank and Chinese Government Projects, half year LNG and Crude Oils buying agent experience</p> <p>Canadian New West Group</p>
<p>Dan Rogers 01/06/2014</p>	<p>My name is Dan Rogers. I am a part- time resident of Keats Island which is the 3rd most populated Island in Howe Sound after Bowen and Gambier. I am also the Chair of the Keats Island Conservancy and have been on a local Community Association Executive for over 10 years. I write in response to the Public Notice providing today as the last day for Public comments on the need for an Environmental Review and the proposal for a "substitute" review.</p> <p>First, let me say that the time lines for this Public Input was incredibly inappropriate. Besides being in the busiest personal and social time of the year, it overlapped completely with the Christmas Holidays when people are paying the least amount of attention to events around them as they have children out of school or family visiting. I won't ascribe an intention to this timing, but it could not have occurred at a time designed to elicit the least public comment. the Agency should extend the timeline and ensure the large number of people that want a say in this process have that say.</p> <p>Secondly, on the merits of the issue at hand, a full environmental review of this proposal is essential.</p> <p>Howe Sound is a special place close to a major Municipal centre. There is really nothing like it easily accessible to those in Vancouver. It has been the home to some major industries in the last 100 plus years including mining, logging, pulp and paper and large scale shipping. All of these industries had an impact on the environment and some of those impacts were devastating to the ecosystem. Thirty years ago the aquatic environment in Howe Sound was dead or dying from the toxins from Woodfibre, Britannia, the large scale shipping from Squamish and Port Mellon.</p> <p>Howe Sound is recovering finally. Port Mellon cleaned up its discharge. The docks at Squamish are an entirely different enterprise, Britannia was finally cleaned up and Woodfibre ceased operating. the wildlife is returning in numbers not seen in decades.</p> <p>This having just occurred in the past decade, Howe Sound is now the location chosen for a number of new industrial projects each of which could have profound effects on the Sound. The gravel extraction/crushing proposal at McNab Creek. a proposal for a waste to energy garbage burning facility in Port Mellon, extensive Logging proposed for Gambier and now the LNG facility proposal.</p> <p>Recently at the BC Federation of Municipalities, a motion was passed to call on the province to establish a management plan for Howe Sound. One simply doesn't exist. And that is a huge gap given the multitude of interests and governance authorities that surround the Sound. Yet the Sound is one ecosystem and it is all integrated. Without the chance to establish a management plan to balance recreational, municipal, first nations, environmental and recreational interests, there should be no expansion or large scale development.</p> <p>This proposal has been made however and thus it is essential that a full open and complete Environmental review be done to ensure that any such facility is not approved unless</p>

	<p>completely appropriate and that if approved all safeguards are in place AND that it is consistent with any management plan developed in the sound.</p> <p>A full environment review is essential and this should be a review under the CSSEA not an experimental substitute as proposed by the province of B.C.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Dan Rogers</p>
<p>Star Morris 01/06/2014</p>	<p>I strongly believe that an environmental assessment is needed and would be beneficial in considering the proposed Woodfibre LNG project.</p> <p>LNG is a new industry for British Columbia; as such, there will be impacts on the environment, some known and others yet to be realized or considered. An environmental assessment will be NEEDED to identify and assess potential significant effects of the project on – the environment, social, health, economic and First Nations heritage - areas of importance to the community.</p> <p>Completing an environmental assessment process will also be BENEFICIAL. I appreciate that – as a result of federal government cutbacks to reduce the deficit – there has been a reduction in government resources. An environmental assessment with consultation of the public and local First Nations could fill the void left by reduction of government resources, benefit from local knowledge and expertise, and inform a decision with respect to an LNG facility in our community.</p> <p>With respect to carrying out the environmental assessment – provincially or federally – the focus should be on obtaining objective, complete information in consultation with and that meets the needs of the community.</p> <p>Star Morris</p>
<p>Graham and Laurie Parkinson 01/06/2014</p>	<p>Dear CEAA Officers January 6th, 2013</p> <p>As landowners on Bowyer Island in Howe Sound myself and my wife and our family (who have also been landowners there for 54 years) will be directly impacted by the Woodfibre LNG project (as we were for years from the noxious effluent, smell, smoke and dioxins from the pulp mill once there).</p> <p>If this project goes ahead as we are directly downwind of the project we will be subjected to the smog created by combustion of fuel from the project. As Bowyer Island is adjacent to the LNG carrier route, our docks and beaches will be subjected to the wash from the passage of LNG carriers, tugs and barges and the marine environment we have worked to preserve will be impacted.</p> <p>We are concerned that substitution of a BC Environmental Review for the Federal assessment will result in a less comprehensive review and flawed assessment of the adverse impacts for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The BC EAO office is currently overwhelmed with projects to review 2) The Woodfibre LNG application involves complex elements: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Significant adverse air quality issues such as extremely large emissions of brown haze and smog creating NOx requiring specialist expertise, within a small airshed

	<p>b. Impacts on marine mammal (sound from floating compressor stations affecting cetaceans that use sound for communication and hunting activities), impacts from sound levels of shipping, blunt trauma from LNG carries on whales. (Krill, Herring, Humpbacks, Gray whales, Orcas, Pacific Whitesided Dolphins have only recently returned to this area)</p> <p>c. Pipeline through unstable terrain</p> <p>d. Public safety – Large volumes of LNG store in a limited airshed, movement of large volumes of LNG past inhabited areas</p> <p>In addition the provision of less than 10 working days for comment on the substitution of the BC review does not constitute meaningful consultation by stakeholders. The comment period for substitution needs to be extended. As stakeholders landowners on Bowyer Island were not even informed.</p> <p>We are concerned that this project offers limited benefits to BC Citizens:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · LNG trains fabricated offshore in Asia not by BC workers · LNG trains located on barges to limit local taxation, · LNG trains do not represent a fixed asset – able to be moved away to other jurisdictions of opportunity if concessions not obtained from government · Foreign ownership interested only in the most rapid extraction of BC resources while prices are relatively low <p>How can an assessment of adequacy of substitution of the BC process be assessed as the Project Description as presented is inadequate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · it presents alternate designs instead of a single coherent description of the project · it has vague descriptions of the process · there is no information on the quantity of emissions or loadings to the airshed <p>Regards,</p> <p>Graham and Laurie Parkinson</p>
<p>Lee-Ann Ennis 01/06/2014</p>	<p>January 6th, 2014</p> <p>Dear Sir or Madam,</p> <p>I am submitting this letter as public input as requested by CEAA regarding the Woodfibre LNG Proposal.</p> <p>My main concern is for the recovery of traditional herring spawning habitat in and around the Woodfibre pier. I am also concerned about increased shipping traffic in Howe Sound, the impact on marine mammals and sea birds, and for the general health of the watershed and air quality</p>

of a region that is just beginning to show signs of recovery from previous heavy industrial use.

My family has a long history of recreating in Howe Sound, we enjoy scuba diving, windsurfing, rock climbing and sailing. We have also participated in Surf Scoter bird surveys, and observed Pacific White-sided Dolphins and a Gray Whale in Howe Sound. From our perspective, Howe Sound and the Squamish River Estuary are truly awesome, and deserve the highest respect we can give it. I hope that you take the time to truly consider the wildlife, and the health of this terrific ecosystem at our doorstep.

A quick search of recent local newspaper articles regarding the Woodfibre site and the health of Howe Sound led me to the following background articles which are relevant to me and my experience with this area.

I also looked up the historical herring spawning records kept by the DFO for Howe Sound and the Sunshine Coast available to the public online. The statistics demonstrate that the current herring stocks are at risk of disappearing all together. This would be fatal to salmon, birds and marine mammals that rely on these rich and nutritious fish as a main source of energy. My number one concern regarding the Woodfibre LNG Proposal is regarding the impact further industry would have on the herring spawning habitat. For this reason I wish to see a full Environmental Assessment with public input at all stages.

Sincerely,

Lee-Ann Ennis

Thursday, 21 March 2013 13:27

Written by Dr. Jonn Matsen, Squamish Streamkeepers Howe Sound Herring Recovery Coordinator

With mention of the dock at Woodfibre again becoming a deep sea port to ship out compressed gas, it must be brought up that the whole north and west side of Howe Sound is a delicate incubator of fragile life in the form of herring eggs from late January until early April. In January of this year a logging company was blasting out a landing on the seashore just north of Defence Islands. It was Douglas Swanston of Seacology who pointed out that herring were about to spawn there and blasting must be stopped until the eggs had hatched out.

Thor Froslev of the Brackendale Art Gallery came up with a thought of how to make people more aware of the iconic herring which so much of the larger life in Howe Sound depends on, but is generally hidden from view. That is, have a herring festival, preferably at a time when their eggs are laid so that people can at least see their eggs at low tide. So look forward to a Herring Festival next year in late February or early March, depending on the tides.

One of the goals of bringing back the herring to Howe Sound is to increase the Chinook and Coho salmon numbers to their historic levels, and likely when the juvenile salmon leave the

	<p>rivers and enter Howe Sound they will now find food more readily. However, Howe Sound is only the beginning of a Chinooks journey as it will involve a trip north to Alaska.</p> <p>Squamish River Chinook hang a right hand turn as they leave Howe Sound and proceed north along the Sunshine Coast where herring runs are in jeopardy as well. The Pender Harbour run died down when tin bottom paints killed off the spawning vegetations. The Pender Harbour Rotary Club put out float lines starting two years ago and had a good hatch out and expects their first returns next year.</p> <p>March 14, 2013 Written by David Burke in The Chief</p> <p>Though Gau didn't want to get into specific concerns about the potential impacts of the Woodfibre LNG project, former Squamish councillor Meg Fellowes did. She told The Chief on Friday (March 8) that the "re-industrialization" of the Woodfibre site has the potential to threaten ongoing efforts to restore the sound to environmental health after decades of degradation, most of it the result of heavy industry.</p> <p>The struggle to clean up the sound began well before the Woodfibre mill closed in 2006, she said, but has become much more evident since that time, Fellowes said.</p> <p>Thanks in large measure to the efforts of groups such as Squamish Streamkeepers, who have worked diligently to restore the herring spawn to its former glory, dolphins and even whales have been seen at the head of Howe Sound. Tens of millions of dollars spent on water-quality remediation has also resulted in the restoration of the salmon run on Britannia Creek, she said.</p> <p>Any sort of discharge from a future Woodfibre LNG plant, or from tanker ships serving the facility, has the potential to wipe out those gains in a matter of hours, she said.</p> <p>"There's air quality, water quality — we've seen great improvements in those two, and I think there's legitimate concern about re-industrialization of that site and its impacts," Fellowes said.</p> <p>Jack Cooley of the Squamish Steamkeepers wrote in a group email sent out on Wednesday (March 13) that the announcement of the Woodfibre LNG proposal is a good time to remind people that the western shore of Howe Sound "is prime spawning area from late January until early April and needs to be protected."</p>
<p>Connor Payne</p> <p>01/06/2014</p>	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I write to you to convey my concern about the proposed woodfibre LNG plant in the Howe Sound. I am a lifelong resident of Horseshoe Bay BC which is on the ocean at the south east end of Howe Sound, I am very concerned about the proposed LNG plant and the impact it will have on our waterways, and our marine life, also the air pollution the plant and everything associated with it will create. As you should know, the Howe Sound was polluted for years by the Britannia copper mine and after Millions and Millions of dollars and many years of hard work towards detoxifying the ocean in that area, it has finally started to heal, and marine life has finally started to return to the area, there have been Orca whales, and pods of Dolphins which Howe Sound had not seen in decades, if not more than a century!! First and foremost, the air quality issue is already a Huge Problem! BC Ferries is a major polluter and I'm sure you know, Diesel exhaust is a Class 1 Carcinogen as classified by the World Health Organization!! More ships means more air pollution, and I'm worried not only about my personal health being affected, but also the tens of thousands of residents that live in the Howe Sound corridor, and also all the wildlife and marine life in the area. The Howe Sound is also a rich salmon spawning area as well as many other species of fish, the noise and vibrations from the plant itself and the increased</p>

	<p>shipping traffic I believe will be extremely detrimental to these at risk marine species. The Howe Sound is also a recreational Paradise, used by boaters, divers, fishermen, sightseers, tourists, and water sports enthusiasts just to name a few, the proposed LNG plant will definitely have a negative effect on all these activities! I ask that you please consider this letter very carefully, and the many others I'm sure you have received! And please remember a decline in the environmental health of our oceans, land, and air, has a direct correlation to a decline in the health of all the living beings connected to them! Thank you for your time.</p> <p>Sincerely, Connor Payne</p>
<p>Ellie Mulder 01/06/2014</p>	<p>As a resident of Squamish BC who enjoys the natural beauty of our area and lives within the air shed of the proposed LNG Project at the old WoodFibre Plant, I'd like to express my concerns and objections to the project.</p> <p>Our valley is just starting to see some recovery from previous decades of logging, pulp mill, and mining contamination. There seems to be a lot of different chemicals that could potentially be "flared off", aside from the gas itself, including tons of refrigerant. I don't fully understand what environmental ramifications these substances might have but am strongly opposed to pumping industrial waste products into our air. I am against the entire project but if it does move forward a full environmental assessment is critical!</p> <p>I understand the government's interest in promoting industry and the economy, but do not support it at the expense of a healthy environment which holds far more lasting value to all of us. Now and into the future. Let's not piss in the sand box, our kids play here.</p> <p>Regards, Ellen Mulder</p>
<p>Elizabeth Vander Zaag 01/06/2014</p>	<p>We own and inhabit a house on the Balfour Passage near to the Collingwood Channel on Keats Island.</p> <p>I am writing to protest the proposed alternate route of Collingwood channel for the LNG tankers. The waters around the Pasley islands, Bowen and Keats are teeming with marine life. It is a destination for kayaking and other water activities.</p> <p>We insist that a proper environmental review be done with public input.</p> <p>To put tanker traffic through this delicate ecosystem so close to a large metropolitan centre is very destructive.</p> <p>Please keep me informed as to the status of this proposal.</p> <p>Elizabeth Vander Zaag</p>
<p>Johnny Duguay 01/07/2014</p>	<p>Please do not approve this project. Squamish the and sea to sky corridor to Whistler is a beautiful area, and an outdoor recreation community. Such a project is a major step back to the stinky and unsightly Woodfiber pulp and paper mill days. With the new sea to sky highway, growing tourism and recreation in the corridor, people are seeking out the Squamish lifestyle, such a project would harm the community as a whole.</p> <p>Johnny Duguay</p>
<p>Richard Bland 01/06/2014</p>	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I want a full-scale environmental assessment for the proposed LNG Facility at Woodfibre in</p>

	<p>Howe Sound, BC - not a substitution.</p> <p>HOWE SOUND IS NOT AN EXPERIMENT! Howe Sound is not an experiment for the new Environmental Assessment Process for the LNG Facility at Woodfibre! I vote NO to the Substitution Request as we need a thorough environmental assessment for public safety. Why does China place LNG facilities at least 11 km off-shore and away from residential areas? Is this new EA process too new and too soon to know whether or not it's effective for such a potentially hazardous project? It is critical that the Environmental Assessment on the LNG at Woodfibre in Howe Sound be the most thorough and precautionary of processes.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Richard Bland</p>
<p>Vel Anderson</p> <p>Pat and Ian Ridgway</p> <p>Nancy Gaudry</p> <p>01/06/2014</p>	<p>This letter was sent by Vel Anderson, and we wanted to add our names to it as we share her concerns....please note our names at the bottom.</p> <p>January 6th., 2014</p> <p>Dear Madam Minister,</p> <p>Re; The Government of B.C. has requested substitution of the Environmental Assessment process regarding the proposed LNG business for Howe Sound, B.C.</p> <p>The proposed LNG vessel transit route would require LNG tankers to enter Howe Sound running past busy Horseshoe Bay.</p> <p>This proposal shows an ocean going vessel, around the size of an aircraft carrier, 295 m long, 47m wide with a draught depth of 12m, having capacity to carry up to 180,000m3 of LNG with a dead weight tonnage of 85,000 tonnes, running through our marine highway, in the path of B.C. Ferries. This will seriously disrupt the 64 plus daily BC Ferry sailings, and our way of life. This is not acceptable.</p> <p>Woodfiber Natural Gas Ltd Project (WNGL) states, "Shipping activities associated with the Woodfibre project include transit of LNG carriers, with up to 40 vessel calls per year or three to four calls per month for two LNG trains." These vessels will be accompanied by two or more tugs. Reports propose safety exclusion zone for LNG tankers is two miles ahead and one mile astern while a fully loaded vessel is en route to and from the LNG terminal. This moving safety exclusion zone will affect the travel of commercial maritime traffic, B.C. Ferries, and recreational boat traffic.</p> <p>Communities around Howe Sound will be negatively impacted by such huge tanker traffic. In addition to the potential risks to the safety and welfare of those living and working near the LNG vessel transit route, there are also potential economic impacts. For example, LNG vessel traffic is likely to impose a serious impact on commercial fishing, aquaculture facilities, tourism, including whale watching, and eco-tourism. Many citizens depend on the resources in this area for their livelihoods.</p> <p>The ministry asks for public comments on the proposal by Woodfiber Natural Gas Ltd Project,</p>

however I find the WNGL document lacking information and clarity.....therefore somewhat challenging to know what exactly is being proposed. Example: no assessment of the cumulative impact of the marine activity, or impact on the travel of B.C. Ferries, nothing on a terrorist attack or earthquake.

The WNGL document states that “WNGL does not intend to own or operate LNG carriers, barges, tugs or water taxis. WNGL intends to contract all vessels under WNGL terms and conditions, as required on a short, medium, and long-term charter. If Free on Board (FOB) is used, WNGL will transfer ownership of the LNG product as it leaves the Woodfibre LNG marine terminal. In this circumstance, WNGL would transfer care, safety and control to the buyer/shipper, which may or may not include the provision of LNG shipping. This would be subject to the specific terms of LNG sale and Canadian and international regulatory standards and practices for shipping.”

This indicates to me that WNGL transfers liability to off shore contracts, and or interests, is this correct? This is worrisome, as there is potential for horrific consequences in the event of an LNG spill either on water or land, so how would compensation occur, say from offshore interests?

The Sandia study dramatically increased the predicted impact of a possible worst case failure over scenarios released in 2004. Using an average wind speed of 9 mph, Sandia estimates that a catastrophic failure of two storage tanks onboard the vessel would spread LNG and methane out in a circular pattern 7 miles from the permanently anchored ship before it would mix with enough oxygen to ignite in a fireball (providing there is a source of ignition). This scenario could be disastrous for Squamish, and Lions Bay. Imagine the wicked forest fire that would engulf the mountain side. How many people would die?

WNGL states, “Storage of LNG will be provided within the FLNG, along with dedicated storage that may be provided on one or more permanently moored FSUs. Storage capacity between 170,000 and 250,000 m³ will be provided and determined based on the selected off-take LNG carrier size. The exact storage configuration will be determined during the FEED phase of the project; however, floating LNG storage will be common for both the preferred FLNG configuration and alternative land-based configuration”

Hazards assessments is needed for all LNG facilities to identify both shipping-related and land-based risks

WNGL states, “Any pre-fabricated modules associated with construction of the LNG facility will be transported from Asia for direct offload at the project site using specialised transportation vessels contracted by WNGL under WNGL terms and conditions, pursuant to which WNGL will require the contracted transportation vessels to comply with all applicable national and international shipping and safety requirements. The number of specialised vessel movements for construction will be confirmed during the FEED design phase of the project.”

“Woodfibre LNG will purchase prefabricated modules for gas pre-treatment, LNG production, and the FSU. These construction activities will take place in shipyards and or conversion yards qualified to undertake this type of work, most likely in Asia. For the preferred configuration, individual modules will be assembled on the hull and the FLNG will be transported to site. The alternative land-based configuration will also include construction of individual modules in conversion yards in Asia. The individual gas pre-treatment and liquefaction train modules will be transported to site, before connection and assembly to the land-based infrastructure in accordance with the FEED specific layout.”

The document does not state how many FLNG and FSU facilities will be on site. What is the process for inspection of these pre-fabricated modules from Asia? Why is this work (jobs) not staying here in B.C.?

“Approximately 40 LNG carriers will be loaded per year for either the preferred or alternative LN processing configurations based on the planned 2.1 MMTPA LNG production rate. There may be some variation to the number of vessels loaded each month due to available carriers and vessel capacity. LNG will be pumped from the FSU through a cryogenic pipeline to the loading platform at the dedicated jetty head. The nature of the cargo arms, loading systems, and vapour recovery systems will be determined during the FEED phase of the project. It is anticipated that the LNG carriers would be loaded within 14 to 29 hours and any vapour generated as part of loading activities will be collected and returned to the facility through a separate pipeline.”

What are the consequences of a potential fire or of thermal radiation extending beyond the limits of the LNG processing facility, and what resources are available to control the impact and to protect lives and property.

Other public concerns -

- the foul-smelling and highly flammable odorizing chemical to be used on board the ship could be spilled, dousing the coast with a concentrated dose of odorant that could travel miles on the wind.

- air pollution increase that would be caused by the LNG ship's boilers to be highly significant

- terminal's gas-fired boilers, used to bring the liquefied gas temperature up from -260 degrees, will be loud enough to make conversation difficult outside the closed zone, and this is a 24-hour operation and will be heard ashore on calm nights, just as the engines of passing cargo ships can be heard on quiet, windless nights.

- LNG is a polluting, climate-changing foreign fossil fuel. The additional lifecycle stages of liquefaction, transportation, and gasification emit harmful greenhouse gases (GHG) above and beyond the GHG levels produced by using domestic “conventional” natural gas; indeed, LNG produces 20%-40% more greenhouse gases (GHG) than domestic natural gas; the ever-increasing amounts of GHG from burning fossil fuels is changing the chemistry of the sea by increasing its acidity, and thereby diminishing the ocean’s ability to serve the free and vital role as the Earth’s largest and most effective absorber of climate fluxes, as well as making the sea itself harmful to marine life;

- Cargo ships cause oceanic pollution and degrade the marine environment therefore impacts on marine life-cycles

- The transfer of LNG is very intense and incorporates many pressure changes, valve operations and refrigerant processes one of which causes the greatest problem – propane. In cases where ignition has occurred, the attributed cause has been individual oversight or failure of equipment. In all instances, the outcome was massive reduction of the facility. NFPA requires the calculation of fire radiation based on the assumption of zero wind speed. With wind factors, a vapor cloud may travel great distances before finding an acceptable ignition source. Once ignition is found, the burn flame will continue to the source of vapor point (fireball) with catastrophic results,

- The LNG, which arrives as a minus-260-degree liquid, must be heated up and turned back into a gas before it can be injected into the natural gas pipeline network. How many million gallons

of water will be required to heat up the superchilled LNG cargo? Federal scientists say, everything sucked up in the water will be killed, millions fish eggs and larvae representing the microscopic young of almost every creature that swims in the area.

- The proposed LNG project will have a detrimental impact on public travel, our way of life, the environment, tourism and businesses. LNG projects will permanently exclude the public from portions of the ocean, a publicly-held resource.

- The LNG terminal and its attending fleet of ships would be visible at elevations all along the coast

- Along with LNG tankers, BC Ferries (64 plus daily runs), barging material from Vancouver to Howe Sound Pulp and Paper, proposed barging of gravel, log barging, fishing, recreational boat traffic, boat tours, water events, water sports, plus more, we see that WNGI proposes approximately one barge movement per month to transport chemicals, cement, fuel, and refrigerant to the site at Woodfiber. In addition, two ferry trips per day will occur to take site personnel and food supplies for these personnel to and from the site during construction, operation, and closure. Additional water taxis may be used each day.

The dilemma we are facing here in the beautiful area of Howe Sound, B.C, is the madness to industrialize Howe Sound. As Howe Sound is still in the healing process, after numerous years of commercial impact and total disregard for the environment, why would government consider disrupting that fragile balance?

Another major concern is that the public is totally unaware of this businessnothing in our two weekly local newspapers here on the Sunshine Coast. No open house to inform the residents.....but here we are, being asked to comment. All this over the holiday period. In December, we were asked to comment on the Woodfiber LNG Pipeline by Dec 16th., 2013again no information provided to the public by the proponent or the government.

There is legitimate concern around just the Provincial EAO dealing with this business, especially since we know that the B.C. government is sitting on a report commissioned by its climate-action secretariat that measures the greenhouse-gas emissions associated with developing a liquefied natural-gas industry. <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/british-columbia/secret-report-measures-impact-of-lng-on-bc-environment/article15334449/> This report is not being released to the public. Why is the public is not allowed this information?

These types of tankers require careful and delicate handling owing to the precariousness of the material they carry, and will have acute (immediate) and chronic (months to years) effects on the health of wildlife, fish and humans and reduce habitat quality, and under the Canadian law vessel transportation and related activities in Canadian waters fall within the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal government, therefore need for the Transport Canada technical review process for marine terminal systems and transshipment sites (TERMPOL) study is in order to fully examine the hazards associated with LNG vessels operating in our waters. Such a study is required in Canada with respect to LNG vessel traffic to a Canadian regasification terminal, and should be required for all LNG vessel traffic through Canadian waters.

The Federal Environmental Assessment is absolutely necessary. The Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA) states;

It is also anticipated that the Woodfibre LNG project will be subject to the federal environmental assessment process under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012 (CEAA 2012) travelling in and out of Horseshoe Bay because the project includes the construction of:

	<p>“13(d) a facility for the liquefaction, storage or regasification of liqueied natural gas, with a liquefied natural gas processing capacity of more than 3 000 t/d [tonnes per day] or a liquefied natural gas storage capacity of more than 50 000 t [tonnes] (Regulations Designating Physical Activities, SOR/2012-147, s.13(d) of the Schedule)”. The Woodfibre LNG project is expected to have a liquefied natural gas process capacity of 1.5 to 2.1 MMTPA (4,110 – 5,753 t/d), and a storage capacity of 170,000 – 250,000 m³(78,200 – 115,000 t) which exceeds the thresholds set out in the regulation above. Therefore, the project would be considered a physical activity pursuant to the Regulations Designating Physical Activities, and thereby reviewable.</p> <p>This LNG business must be subject to serious scrutiny by all relevant Federal and Provincial departments. In all fairness, the public must be allowed information.</p> <p>In conclusion, may I suggest, by focusing efforts on efficiency, conservation, and renewables, our province/Canada can create a win-win situation of reduced GHG emissions and long-term, stable, job creation.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Vel Anderson Pat and Ian Ridgway Nancy Gaudry</p>
<p>Rob Baxter 01/06/2014</p>	<p>The proposed LNG should not be approved.</p> <p>This project will result in over 6 million tonnes of additional GHG emissions each year:</p> <p>1,375,000 from extracting/processing 108,000 from transport to the plant 283,000 from the LNG Plant itself and 5,166,667 from burning the fuel at its final destination.</p> <p>This is a disaster for future generations.</p> <p>Rob Baxter</p>
<p>Vel Anderson 01/06/2014</p>	<p>January 6th., 2014</p> <p>Dear Madam Minister, Re; The Government of B.C. has requested substitution of the Environmental Assessment process regarding the proposed LNG business for Howe Sound, B.C.</p> <p>The proposed LNG vessel transit route would require LNG tankers to enter Howe Sound running past busy Horseshoe Bay.</p> <p>This proposal shows an ocean going vessel, around the size of an aircraft carrier, 295 m long, 47m wide with a draught depth of 12m, having capacity to carry up to 180,000m³ of LNG with a dead weight tonnage of 85,000 tonnes, running through our marine highway, in the path of B.C. Ferries. This will seriously disrupt the 64 plus daily BC Ferry sailings, and our way of life. This is not acceptable.</p>

Woodfiber Natural Gas Ltd Project (WNGL) states, "Shipping activities associated with the Woodfibre project include transit of LNG carriers, with up to 40 vessel calls per year or three to four calls per month for two LNG trains." These vessels will be accompanied by two or more tugs. Reports propose safety exclusion zone for LNG tankers is two miles ahead and one mile astern while a fully loaded vessel is en route to and from the LNG terminal. This moving safety exclusion zone will affect the travel of commercial maritime traffic, B.C. Ferries, and recreational boat traffic.

Communities around Howe Sound will be negatively impacted by such huge tanker traffic. In addition to the potential risks to the safety and welfare of those living and working near the LNG vessel transit route, there are also potential economic impacts.

For example, LNG vessel traffic is likely to impose a serious impact on commercial fishing, aquaculture facilities, tourism, including whale watching, and eco-tourism. Many citizens depend on the resources in this area for their livelihoods.

The ministry asks for public comments on the proposal by Woodfiber Natural Gas Ltd Project, however I find the WNGL document lacking information and clarity.....therefore somewhat challenging to know what exactly is being proposed. Example: no assessment of the cumulative impact of the marine activity, or impact on the travel of B.C. Ferries, nothing on a terrorist attack or earthquake.

The WNGL document states that "WNGL does not intend to own or operate LNG carriers, barges, tugs or water taxis. WNGL intends to contract all vessels under WNGL terms and conditions, as required on a short, medium, and long-term charter. If Free on Board (FOB) is used, WNGL will transfer ownership of the LNG product as it leaves the Woodfibre LNG marine terminal. In this circumstance, WNGL would transfer care, safety and control to the buyer/shipper, which may or may not include the provision of LNG shipping. This would be subject to the specific terms of LNG sale and Canadian and international regulatory standards and practices for shipping."

This indicates to me that WNGL transfers liability to off shore contracts, and or interests, is this correct? This is worrisome, as there is potential for horrific consequences in the event of an LNG spill either on water or land, so how would compensation occur, say from offshore interests?

The Sandia study dramatically increased the predicted impact of a possible worst case failure over scenarios released in 2004. Using an average wind speed of 9 mph, Sandia estimates that a catastrophic failure of two storage tanks onboard the vessel would spread LNG and methane out in a circular pattern 7 miles from the permanently anchored ship before it would mix with enough oxygen to ignite in a fireball (providing there is a source of ignition). This scenario could be disastrous for Squamish, and Lions Bay. Imagine the wicked forest fire that would engulf the mountain side. How many people would die?

WNGL states, "Storage of LNG will be provided within the FLNG, along with dedicated storage that may be provided on one or more permanently moored FSUs. Storage capacity between 170,000 and 250,000 m³ will be provided and determined based on the selected off-take LNG carrier size. The exact storage configuration will be determined during the FEED phase of the project; however, floating LNG storage will be common for both the preferred FLNG configuration and alternative land-based configuration"

Hazards assessments is needed for all LNG facilities to identify both shipping-related and land-based risks

WNGl states, "Any pre-fabricated modules associated with construction of the LNG facility will be transported from Asia for direct offload at the project site using specialised transportation vessels contracted by WNGl under WNGl terms and conditions, pursuant to which WNGl will require the contracted transportation vessels to comply with all applicable national and international shipping and safety requirements. The number of specialised vessel movements for construction will be confirmed during the FEED design phase of the project."

"Woodfibre LNG will purchase prefabricated modules for gas pre-treatment, LNG production, and the FSU. These construction activities will take place in shipyards and or conversion yards qualified to undertake this type of work, most likely in Asia. For the preferred configuration, individual modules will be assembled on the hull and the FLNG will be transported to site. The alternative land-based configuration will also include construction of individual modules in conversion yards in Asia. The individual gas pre-treatment and liquefaction train modules will be transported to site, before connection and assembly to the land-based infrastructure in accordance with the FEED specific layout."

The document does not state how many FLNG and FSU facilities will be on site. What is the process for inspection of these pre-fabricated modules from Asia? Why is this work (jobs) not staying here in B.C.?

"Approximately 40 LNG carriers will be loaded per year for either the preferred or alternative LN processing configurations based on the planned 2.1 MMTPA LNG production rate. There may be some variation to the number of vessels loaded each month due to available carriers and vessel capacity. LNG will be pumped from the FSU through a cryogenic pipeline to the loading platform at the dedicated jetty head. The nature of the cargo arms, loading systems, and vapour recovery systems will be determined during the FEED phase of the project. It is anticipated that the LNG carriers would be loaded within 14 to 29 hours and any vapour generated as part of loading activities will be collected and returned to the facility through a separate pipeline."

What are the consequences of a potential fire or of thermal radiation extending beyond the limits of the LNG processing facility, and what resources are available to control the impact and to protect lives and property.

Other public concerns -

- the foul-smelling and highly flammable odorizing chemical to be used on board the ship could be spilled, dousing the coast with a concentrated dose of odorant that could travel miles on the wind.

- air pollution increase that would be caused by the LNG ship's boilers to be highly significant

- terminal's gas-fired boilers, used to bring the liquefied gas temperature up from -260 degrees, will be loud enough to make conversation difficult outside the closed zone, and this is a 24-hour operation and will be heard ashore on calm nights, just as the engines of passing cargo ships can be heard on quiet, windless nights.

- LNG is a polluting, climate-changing foreign fossil fuel. The additional lifecycle stages of liquefaction, transportation, and gasification emit harmful greenhouse gases (GHG) above and beyond the GHG levels produced by using domestic "conventional" natural gas; indeed, LNG produces 20%-40% more greenhouse gases (GHG) than domestic natural gas; the ever-increasing amounts of GHG from burning fossil fuels is changing the chemistry of the sea by increasing its acidity, and thereby diminishing the ocean's ability to serve the free and vital role

as the Earth's largest and most effective absorber of climate fluxes, as well as making the sea itself harmful to marine life;

- Cargo ships cause oceanic pollution and degrade the marine environment therefore impacts on marine life-cycles

- The transfer of LNG is very intense and incorporates many pressure changes, valve operations and refrigerant processes one of which causes the greatest problem – propane. In cases where ignition has occurred, the attributed cause has been individual oversight or failure of equipment. In all instances, the outcome was massive reduction of the facility. NFPA requires the calculation of fire radiation based on the assumption of zero wind speed. With wind factors, a vapor cloud may travel great distances before finding an acceptable ignition source. Once ignition is found, the burn flame will continue to the source of vapor point (fireball) with catastrophic results,

- The LNG, which arrives as a minus-260-degree liquid, must be heated up and turned back into a gas before it can be injected into the natural gas pipeline network. How many million gallons of water will be required to heat up the superchilled LNG cargo? Federal scientists say, everything sucked up in the water will be killed, millions fish eggs and larvae representing the microscopic young of almost every creature that swims in the area.

- The proposed LNG project will have a detrimental impact on public travel, our way of life, the environment, tourism and businesses. LNG projects will permanently exclude the public from portions of the ocean, a publicly-held resource.

- The LNG terminal and its attending fleet of ships would be visible at elevations all along the coast

- Along with LNG tankers, BC Ferries (64 plus daily runs), barging material from Vancouver to Howe Sound Pulp and Paper, proposed barging of gravel, log barging, fishing, recreational boat traffic, boat tours, water events, water sports, plus more, we see that WNGI proposes approximately one barge movement per month to transport chemicals, cement, fuel, and refrigerant to the site at Woodfiber. In addition, two ferry trips per day will occur to take site personnel and food supplies for these personnel to and from the site during construction, operation, and closure. Additional water taxes may be used each day.

The dilemma we are facing here in the beautiful area of Howe Sound, B.C, is the madness to industrialize Howe Sound. As Howe Sound is still in the healing process, after numerous years of commercial impact and total disregard for the environment, why would government consider disrupting that fragile balance?

Another major concern is that the public is totally unaware of this businessnothing in our two weekly local newspapers here on the Sunshine Coast. No open house to inform the residents.....but here we are, being asked to comment. All this over the holiday period. In December, we were asked to comment on the Woodfiber LNG Pipeline by Dec 16th., 2013again no information provided to the public by the proponent or the government.

There is legitimate concern around just the Provincial EAO dealing with this business, especially since we know that the B.C. government is sitting on a report commissioned by its climate-action secretariat that measures the greenhouse-gas emissions associated with developing a liquefied natural-gas industry. <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/british-columbia/secret-report-measures-impact-of-lng-on-bc-environment/article15334449/> This report is not being released to the public. Why is the public is not allowed this information?

	<p>These types of tankers require careful and delicate handling owing to the precariousness of the material they carry, and will have acute (immediate) and chronic (months to years) effects on the health of wildlife, fish and humans and reduce habitat quality, and under the Canadian law vessel transportation and related activities in Canadian waters fall within the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal government, therefore need for the Transport Canada technical review process for marine terminal systems and transshipment sites (TERMPOL) study is in order to fully examine the hazards associated with LNG vessels operating in our waters. Such a study is required in Canada with respect to LNG vessel traffic to a Canadian regasification terminal, and should be required for all LNG vessel traffic through Canadian waters.</p> <p>The Federal Environmental Assessment is absolutely necessary. The Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA) states; It is also anticipated that the Woodfibre LNG project will be subject to the federal environmental assessment process under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012 (CEAA 2012) travelling in and out of Horseshoe Bay because the project includes the construction of: “13(d) a facility for the liquefaction, storage or regasification of liquefied natural gas, with a liquefied natural gas processing capacity of more than 3 000 t/d [tonnes per day] or a liquefied natural gas storage capacity of more than 50 000 t [tonnes] (Regulations Designating Physical Activities, SOR/2012-147, s.13(d) of the Schedule)”. The Woodfibre LNG project is expected to have a liquefied natural gas process capacity of 1.5 to 2.1 MMTPA (4,110 – 5,753 t/d), and a storage capacity of 170,000 – 250,000 m³(78,200 – 115,000 t) which exceeds the thresholds set out in the regulation above. Therefore, the project would be considered a physical activity pursuant to the Regulations Designating Physical Activities, and thereby reviewable.</p> <p>This LNG business must be subject to serious scrutiny by all relevant Federal and Provincial departments. In all fairness, the public must be allowed information.</p> <p>In conclusion, may I suggest, by focusing efforts on efficiency, conservation, and renewables, our province/Canada can create a win-win situation of reduced GHG emissions and long-term, stable, job creation.</p> <p>Respectfully, Vel Anderson</p>
<p>Shawn Gosnell 01/06/2014</p>	<p>For much of the public the Environmental Assessment process for the Woodfibre LNG plant proposal has only come to our attention in the past few days. The incredibly short time frame given for public input to the EA process seems intended to stymie any of a considered and informed feedback from the our community. I urge you to extend this deadline so the public can provide meaningful comment.</p> <p>Shawn Gosnell</p>
<p>Charles Haynes 01/06/2014</p>	<p>TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN</p> <p>We are concerned about the proposed alternate route of Collingwood channel for the LNG tankers because our house is on the waterfront in that channel on Keats Island.</p> <p>What will be the effect of these tankers as a result of normal operations, and, in case of an accident on our property which is in the Islands Trust.</p>

	<p>The waters around the Pasley islands, Bowen and Keats are teeming with marine life. It is a destination for kayaking and other water activities.</p> <p>I am requesting that a proper environmental review be done with public input. And, I am deeply concerned that Woodfiber is sub-contracting out the movement of the LNG to tankers which may be registered in jurisdictions that enables them to avoid actual responsibility in our courts.</p> <p>I insist that Woodfiber, BB Government and the Canadian Government be held responsible and accountable for any damage that occurs to our Howe Sound waters and surrounding lands as a result</p> <p>Please add my name to any and all email lists that will keep informed of this proposal.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Charles Haynes</p>
<p>Sarah Weber</p> <p>01/06/2014</p>	<p>January 6, 2013</p> <p>To proponents of the Woodfibre LNG Project, the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, and the Government of B.C.:</p> <p>I am writing to comment on the potential environmental and social effects of the proposed LNG Project, the need for a federal environmental assessment and the requested substitution.</p> <p>As a resident of Squamish and the Howe Sound area, I have serious concerns about the proposed LNG Project. These are described in the points below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Howe Sound is finally showing sign of ecological recovery after a respite from years of heavy industrial activity. I want to see the ecological health of the Sound continue to improve, and not be set back by a new round of activities with negative effects. Herring are starting to spawn here again. We are seeing whales in the Sound now on occasion, sea lions as well as dolphins. With a massive salmon return in 2013, there was actually a commercial fishery opening. So the ecological health has a potential economic benefit. -Local environmental concerns include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Effects to air quality in Squamish and throughout Howe Sound, especially if the plant is powered by natural gas rather than electricity. -Underwater noise pollution disturbing marine mammals and fish. -Dumping of ballast water and other pollutants by transport ships -Increased marine shipping traffic, risk of spills, increased pollution - Ambient light and noise disturbance throughout the sound, disturbing both wildlife and people. -Could noise and light be an issue for the federally listed Marbled Murrelet in their flights between forest and ocean? -What would happen in the case of an earthquake? -How does this proposed project contribute to implementation of BC and Canadian Climate Action goals and initiatives? -Any EA conducted needs to consider cumulative effects with other proposed industrial projects in Howe Sound (e.g. McNabb Creek gravel), run of river power projects, etc.

	<p>At a larger scale, my biggest concern is regarding the source of the natural gas. I understand it would be produced through hydraulic fracturing “fracking”, which involves injecting a toxic soup of chemicals deep into the earth to fracture the rocks and release gas. The entire process is a waste of precious water and puts huge areas of groundwater and drinking water at risk, as well as the health of animals and people who live nearby. It also creates huge difficulties for farmers near the fracking areas, whose water and soil may be contaminated. The assessment of the Woodfibre LNG proposal should consider the impacts to the project’s natural gas source areas.</p> <p>In conclusion, the Woodfibre LNG project has numerous serious potential environmental impacts that would need a full-scale federal environmental assessment. I would like to see the most rigorous, thorough and objective process take place. I question whether the BCEAO would conduct the assessment free from provincial political pressures which support fracking and industrial resource development.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Sarah Weber</p>
<p>Ann Ramsay</p> <p>01/06/2014</p>	<p>Dear Sirs:</p> <p>I am writing to inform you that we have serious reservations to the plan for the LGN tankers navigating Howe Sound as well to the alternative route around Bowen, Pasley and Keats Island and Collingwood Channel. As owners on Bowen Island, we have been delighted to see the return of sea life after the serious financial investment in the last 6 or 7 years to recover the health of the waters in Howe Sound and the Squamish area.</p> <p>It seems like a destructive and short sited plan to run tanker traffic through this delicate area. It is vital that you insist on a serious independent environmental study to determine the impact of this project. To lose this area of nature beauty so close to the Vancouver area would be seen an criminal to those who follow.</p> <p>I would like to be kept informed of the progress on this issue.</p> <p>yours truly, Ann Ramsay</p>
<p>Nancy Leathley</p> <p>01/06/2014</p>	<p>Dear Dan Motisca and Minister Aglukkak:</p> <p>I request that a full federal environmental assessment take place before the Woodfibre LNG project goes forward and that the plans for this project are amended in line with such an environmental assessment.</p> <p>This project will endanger every living thing in its area. First the huge tankers and their tugs with their huge exclusion zones will interfere with ferry traffic, shipping lanes and other marine traffic. Schedules will be disrupted and worse, collisions with large and/or small vessels will happen.</p> <p>A vapour cloud fire from a storage tank can extend many miles swallowing up everything within its range.</p> <p>Land transfer of LNG in pipelines is far more dangerous than ordinary natural gas transfer and</p>

	<p>involves many pressure changes, valve operations and refrigerant processes.</p> <p>In addition, millions of gallons of seawater are needed for cooling in generators and this water will be discharged at many degrees higher than the ambient ocean temperature. The hotter ocean will kill plankton and small fish on which marine animals and larger fish depend.</p> <p>In addition LNG emits 20% - 40% more greenhouse gas than conventional natural gas, adding to global warming when a serious threshold for GHG has just been exceeded last year.</p> <p>Please at least have a proper full environmental review before you approve this project.</p> <p>The environment of Howe Sound has just recently recovered from decades of misuse: Britannia Mines, the pulp and paper plant in Port Mellon and the docks of Squamish Terminals, to name three major offenders. These companies, because the public has made it clear they want the environment protected, have spent millions of dollars to clean up their act and the results are amazing. Salmon returned to Britannia Creek, dolphins, killer whales and a humpback were seen last spring in Howe Sound and last year there was an unbelievably huge run of pink salmon in the Squamish River.</p> <p>Are we going to destroy all this so China can have LNG? Many other countries are sending fuel to China and we probably will be undercut by those countries in the future. For a few temporary construction jobs to give everyone except the affected communities the warm fuzzies, is this LNG proposal at Woodfibre morally, financially and environmentally sound?</p> <p>Please think again and at least allow a full environmental review.</p> <p>Yours truly,</p> <p>Nancy Leathley</p>
<p>Barbara Elliott 01/03/2014</p>	<p>As a resident of the Sea to Sky region since 1988 and of Squamish since 2009 I am very concerned about the environmental impact and would most definitely prefer to know that the fullest possible environmental review processes and checks were in place before a final decision is reached. B.Elliott</p>
<p>Michele Stobie 01/03/2014</p>	<p>Dear Minister Aglukkak</p> <p>Please accept my voice of concern that there has been inadequate consultation on the Woodfibre LNG and Gas Pipeline Projects with the public and probably with environmental departments of all levels of government.</p> <p>It appears that the security/safety constraints around each LNG vessel would seriously interfere with current personal and commercial traffic. Who get the right of way in these cases needs to be clarified and essential services such as ferry traffic and movement of wastes etc that have been established should not be modified to suit the needs of this project and these vessels.</p> <p>With the current ferry schedule between Horseshoe Bay and Langdale on the Sunshine Coast, for example, there are 16 crossings per day during the winter and more during the summer and holidays. The constraints suggested for LNG vessels would most likely interfere with scheduling.</p> <p>Please allow more time for public and professional input, let the general public be aware of the process for input - there has been limited publication of avenues and dates - and do not</p>

	<p>sacrifice the environment for big business profit.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of this matter</p> <p>Marjorie Michele Stobie</p>
<p>Erin Hanson</p> <p>12/20/2013</p>	<p>Dear Ms. Walls,</p> <p>Please find attached a letter from the Tsleil-Waututh Nation regarding the EA process for the proposed Woodfibre Liquid Natural Gas facility in Howe Sound, BC. Feel free to contact me should you have any questions.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Erin Hanson Consultation and Accommodation Coordinator Treaty, Lands, and Resources Department Tsleil-Waututh Nation 3075 Takaya Drive North Vancouver V7H 3A8</p> <p>Ph: 604-924-4184 Fax: 604-929-4158</p> <p>This electronic mail communication may contain privileged and confidential communications and/or work product. If you have received this communication in error or are not the intended recipient, please delete the communication without using, copying or otherwise disseminating it. Please notify the sender that you have received the message in error. Any modification of the contents of this e-mail is strictly prohibited unless expressly authorised by the sender. Thank you.</p> <p>TSLEIL-WAUTUTH NATION</p> <p>People of the Inlet</p> <p>Lisa Walls Regional Director, Pacific and Yukon Region Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency PO Box 10114 701 West Georgia St, Suite 410 Vancouver, BC V7Y 1C6</p> <p>Our ref: 13-223</p> <p>December 20, 2013</p>

	<p>Dear Ms. Walls,</p> <p>Re: Determination of the Requirement for an Environmental Assessment of the proposed Woodfibre Liquid Natural Gas Project, in Howe Sound, British Columbia, and Notice of Request for Substitution</p> <p>This letter is in response to your December 17, 2013 letter to Chief Maureen Thomas of the Tsleil- Waututh Nation regarding the above project.</p> <p>The proposed Woodfibre Liquid Natural Gas Project does have the potential to impact Tsleil- Waututh rights, title, and interests. Therefore, we request that an environmental assessment is undertaken. Ideally, the British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office (BC EAO) and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA) would each conduct an environmental assessment (EA).</p> <p>Should CEAA decide that an EA is necessary for this project, we expect that a consultation process would be established in accordance with the Tsleil-Waututh Nation’s Stewardship Policy (2009) that would enable Tsleil-Waututh to provide CEAA with further information regarding impacts the proposed project may have.</p> <p>I must also point out that the time frame for comments was exceedingly brief (10 business days), particularly considering the comment period falls over the holiday season. We expect that for future documents requiring our review and comment, CEAA provide us with a minimum 30-day comment period.</p> <p>Lastly, please send all correspondence relating to this project to myself (Erin Hanson, Consultation and Accommodation Coordinator). My contact information can be found below. I can also be reached by phone at 604-924-4184 or by e-mail at ehanson@twnation.ca.</p> <p>Please don’t hesitate to contact me should you have any questions or require further information. Respectfully,</p> <p>Erin Hanson Consultation and Accommodation Coordinator Treaty, Lands, and Resources Department</p>
<p>Chris Gall</p> <p>01/07/2014</p>	<p>Zoltan,</p> <p>Please find comments from MNBC attached.</p> <p>Best,</p> <p>Chris</p> <p>January 6, 2014</p>

Lisa Walls, Regional Director, Pacific and Yukon Region
Lisa.Walls@ceaa-acee.gc.ca

Zoltan Fabian, Project Manager
Canadian Environmental assessment Agency
Zoltan.Fabian@ceaa-acee.gc.ca

Woodfibre LNG Project
Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency
410-701 West Georgia Street
Vancouver, BC, V7Y 1C6
Woodfibre@ceaa-ac.gc.ca

Dear Ms. Walls and Mr. Fabian,

Subject: Métis Nation British Columbia's review and comment on the Determination of the Requirement for an Environmental Assessment of the Proposed Woodfibre Liquid Natural Gas Project, in Howe Sound, and Notice of Request for Substitution

Métis Nation of British Columbia (MNBC) would like to thank the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA) for inviting comments and providing notice of request for substitution. MNBC would like to comment on the request for substitution and potential impacts of the Project on the interests of Métis people in BC. Therefore, this feedback will cover CEAA's explanation of the MOU outlining the substitution process and finally comments on the Woodfibre Liquid Natural Gas Project.

Introduction

MNBC currently represents over 9000 Powley compliant Citizens (1000+ more/year) in British Columbia, with a large number residing in the Lower Mainland part of the province. There are many citizens in the region around the proposed project residing in the Squamish and the Howe Sound area. There are over 2100 MNBC citizens in the Lower Mainland Region. As an Aboriginal rights holding group identified by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA) and therefore the federal crown, and affirmed by s. 35 (2) of The Constitution Act 1982, MNBC would like to bring forth the following written submission. The Métis have had an established community along the BC Coast for more than 200 years and still use the land and resources for traditional purposes.

Utilizing the Métis Nation BC (MNBC) Traditional Harvesting Database and preliminary Métis Traditional Knowledge (MTK) research confirms that Métis Nation BC citizens, from adjacent Chartered Communities and nearby smaller communities, are exercising their Aboriginal right to harvest (hunt, fish, trap, gather plants) within the proposed Project's footprint. The database shows use of fresh and saltwater species and coastal Blacktail and Mule deer for sustenance.

The construction and operation of the proposed Woodfibre Liquid Natural Gas Project could put local Métis Aboriginal rights and traditional land-uses at risk. Métis harvesters who rely on the direct and surrounding area for sustenance, social and ceremonial purposes could see negative impacts from the construction and operation of the proposed Woodfibre Liquid Natural Gas Project. Because there is current traditional harvesting (hunting, fishing, and plant harvesting for foods and medicines) occurring in the proposed project area, there is Métis traditional knowledge and land-use information activities that could be negatively impacted.

Métis citizens of British Columbia desire sustainable use of their natural resources which

includes: managing natural resources to meet present needs without compromising the needs of future generations; providing stewardship of natural resources based on an ethic of respect for the land; balancing economic, productive, spiritual, ecological and traditional values of natural resources to meet the economic, social and cultural needs of the Métis peoples and other aboriginal and non-aboriginal communities; conserving biological diversity, soil, water, fish, wildlife, scenic diversity, and other natural resources; and restoring damaged ecologies. All of these may be significantly impacted by the proposed project. MNBC's interests in an environmental assessment are to protect the sustenance and cultural needs of Métis citizens and ensure adequate consultation has been undertaken. Further, that Métis Rights and Traditional Land Uses are taken into consideration, that where possible the impacts to these rights and uses are minimized and where not possible, mitigation measures are employed.

Comments on Substitution Request

MNBC has worked hard to develop a government structure with regional and local community representation. MNBC leadership has implemented a number of institutions of governance such as the Senate, Métis Nation Governing Assembly, Youth representation, Women's representation, an Electoral Act, and an objectively verifiable citizenship process. MNBC represents thirty-five (35) Métis Chartered Communities in British Columbia and is mandated to develop and enhance opportunities for Métis communities by implementing culturally relevant social and economic programs and services. MNBC has developed our own acts, policies and guidelines. The objective of the Consultation Guidelines is to produce better communication, stronger relationships, and a Métis specific approach for government, industry, and MNBC relations. MNBC has professionals within each of its ministries to deliver programs, consult citizens and engage with government and industry. The purpose of working with other institutions and businesses is to support and develop community programs that meet community priorities and needs, while also protecting Aboriginal rights.

The Department of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada, 2011, Aboriginal Consultation and Accommodation Guidelines speaks of geographical considerations. "Differences in history, geography, demographics, governance, relationships and other circumstances of Aboriginal communities and organizations in Canada are relevant when considering how to address any consultation obligations that may arise (AAND, p. 8, 2011). Geography needs to be considered in regards to MNBC. Métis in BC do not share the same geographic concerns as First Nations groups. The geographic situation for MNBC operating in a Province that does not recognize Métis rights needs to be acknowledged. Geography presents unique challenges with the large Métis population spread though out such a vast province and the difficulty this presents in consulting with smaller communities within regions. The geography of having a community of people spread throughout province presents challenges of having multiple organizations such as elders groups or groups that are not officially recognized that attempt to represent the Métis people in BC. There are risks to industry and government that engage with the wrong groups or with persons who do not have authority to speak on behalf of the relevant Aboriginal group or community. Government and industry can help avoid many of these problems if they meaningfully engage with the community at the outset.

Comments on the Woodfibre Liquid Natural Gas Project

MNBC would like to be involved and have input in the potential continued development and evolution of the federal and provincial EA process. The Woodfibre Liquid Natural Gas Project sections that MNBC would like to make comments on are those relating to Aboriginal issues. As previously mentioned, the MNBC Harvesting database shows the use of fresh and saltwater species and coastal Blacktail and Mule deer for sustenance in the proposed project area. Therefore, traditional harvesting activities in the area may be negatively impacted by the

	<p>proposed project. In the Executive Summary it states that Dungeness crab, Tanner crab, Kelp crab, squat lobster, and shrimp may all suffer from habitat loss. This is of great concern to MNBC.</p> <p>MNBC interests in an environmental assessment are to protect the sustenance and cultural needs of Métis citizens and ensure adequate consultation has been undertaken. Further, that Métis Rights and Traditional Land Uses are taken into consideration, that where possible the impacts to these rights and uses are minimized, and where not possible, mitigation measures are employed. MNBC's believes that an Environmental Assessment should take place and that MNBC should be consulted along with its regional representatives and local Métis communities mentioned in the introduction. MNBC is of the view that it would need to provide a Traditional Land Use study to government and industry that would inform affects, impacts and changes to Métis people due to the Wood Fibre LNG Project.</p> <p>MNBC will work cooperatively to ensure that its Citizen's Aboriginal rights are respected and appropriately addressed. MNBC will work diligently and in good faith to protect all the natural resources that Métis people have, and continue to rely on, as a way of life and cultural connection. MNBC's vision is to build a proud, self-governing, sustainable Nation in recognition of the inherent Rights of our Métis Citizens.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Christopher Gall Acting Director of Natural Resources Métis Nation British Columbia 1-604-557-5851 cgall@mNBC.ca</p>
<p>Kathleen Johnnie 01/07/2014</p>	<p>Greetings we are in receipt of the above noted referral, we bring to your attention that the closing date for comments was Monday, January 6, 2014. However, we anticipate that our comments will still be accepted as CEAA did not account for the Christmas or New Year's interruption in postal service and in office closures when determining the date of response.</p> <p>We are concerned about how the new Act oversees projects and need greater understanding of that matter, before providing comments on the BCEAOs request for substitution of your process in favour of their process.</p> <p>We are concerned in general, but without any project studies and associated Aboriginal interest capacity studies we cannot provide comment on our Aboriginal interests, including title and rights, at any detailed level. However, our island Le'eyqsun (Valdes) Island - and many of our traditional and contemporary activities are focused on this island - would take the brunt of shipping accidents and spills to and from this facility. Therefore, we rate our level of interest at the high end of the Haida Spectrum and anticipate a very fulsome engagement on the part of the Crown in reviewing this project.</p> <p>Huy ch q'a (thank you), Kat</p>

	<p>Kathleen Johnnie, Lands & Resources Coordinator Lyackson First Nation</p> <p>Address: 7973A Chemainus Road Chemainus, BC V0R 1K5</p> <p>Phone: 250-246-5019 Fax: 250-246-5049</p>
<p>Kaitlan Lay</p> <p>01/06/2014</p>	<p>January 6, 2014</p> <p>MUSQUEAM INDIAN BAND 6735 SALISH DRIVE VANCOUVER, B.C. CANADA V6N 4C4 TELEPHONE: 604 263-3261 FAX: 604 263-4212</p> <p>Lisa Walls Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency PO Box 10114 701 West Georgia Street Suite 410 Vancouver, BC V7Y 1C6</p> <p>Sent Via Email and Mail: woodfibre@ceaa-acee.gc.ca</p> <p>Dear Lisa Walls:</p> <p>Re: Woodfibre LNG Plant</p> <p>Thank you for your letter dated December 17, 2013. Below please find some initial comments regarding possible adverse environmental effects and potential changes to the environment that may be caused by the proposed project.</p> <p>Attached to this letter you will also find documents containing information regarding Musqueam's traditional use in the proposed Project area. Please do not consider this an exhaustive list representing Musqueam's traditional use of the area; these are selective references for this proposed Project. The attached information is considered confidential and is to be used for the sole purpose of the determination of the requirement for an environmental assessment for this project. This information is not to be used without Musqueam's consent.</p> <p>As referenced in the attached documents, Musqueam traditionally hunted within the Howe Sound/Squamish area, as well as went berry picking, cedar bark gathering, and used the area for other cultural and spiritual purposes. The Musqueam also fished within Howe Sound and continues to express interest in the area for fishing, prawning, and the collection of shellfish. The increased tanker traffic that will be caused by this proposed Project, will not only impact Howe Sound, but will also impact Musqueam's ability to fish within the Straight of Georgia. It is</p>

important to note that Musqueam, unlike other First Nations has the proven right from the Supreme Court of Canada, under Sparrow, to fish. Due to the possibility of infringement upon these proven rights, as well as the traditional use of the Project area, it is believed that Musqueam should be consulted at the high end of the spectrum for this proposed project.

Initial Concerns and Questions from the Musqueam Indian Band:

Possible Adverse Environmental effects?

There are great potential environmental impacts on habitat and all aquatic resources within the areas surrounding the proposed project.

Potential changes to the environment that may cause changes to Musqueam Indian Band?

Any type of disaster regarding a spill would have a negative impact on the habitat and the survival rate of all aquatic resources in Musqueam's traditional territory and the proposed project area. This would negatively impact Musqueam's ability to continue the practice of gathering traditional resources in our traditional territory.

The depletion of aquatic resources from potential adverse impacts from this project would have a direct impact on the general health and socio-economics of the Musqueam people as we are a community that has relied on fishing since time immemorial.

The proponent must provide their justification to their infringement on the established Supreme Court of Canada aboriginal right to fish as detailed in "Sparrow". Musqueam is in a unique position as the only First Nation Community in the project description geographic area that has a proven right to fish for "Food Social and ceremonial" purposes.

Question: Has a baseline study been conducted for the proposed project area?

Question: What is the total number of vessels that will be traveling to and from the proposed project site and will this number increase over the years (LNG carriers, chemical transport, fuel, etc.)?

Question: Can you please provide Musqueam with a clear understanding of the cumulative impacts that this project will have on the proposed project area over the years.

Question: Is there proposed traffic for this project in the Fraser River? Sincerely,

Doug Raines
Band Manager, Musqueam Indian Band

ATTACHMENTS EXCLUDED PURSUANT TO SECTION 20(2)(b) OF THE ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT (ATIA)

