## Water - Facts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Clean water is essential to our health and wellbeing. We cannot afford to pollute the sound or reverse the decades of work to bring the natural balance back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I have heard that warmer water will be pumped into Howe Sound, I would not want this to have a negative impact on sea life in howe sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Activities such as wrapping creosote-treated piling a have improved the herring numbers, bringing in Dolphins and whales. Do we really want to jeopardize this by allowing LNG tanker traffic and allowing chlorinated warm water to be released into the Sound?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>For me the question is whether the cumulative effect of all the fuel powered light watercraft used for recreation and tourism have as great a residual effect as the large watercraft escorted by tugs? And secondly, with the mid size ships at the existing port on a regular basis already now how different is the addition of export ships from Woodfibre using the same fuel systems?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Taking clean water from the ocean, only to pollute it and empty it back? Absurd!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Extremely concerned about all environmental impacts from having this plant in our beautiful, world class natural environment. There are way too many risks involved and in my opinion minimal bebefits to our community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I’m not happy about pumping chlorinated water back into Howe Sound period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Make sure it is done with the best practices possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>In the past 25 years, there has been a steady improvement to the ocean conditions around Howe Sound. There have been several factors that I feel have contributed to this, such as closing 2 major industrial sites that had poor records for chemical spillage into the ocean. That and the improvements at Brittania Beach with the EPCOR Brittania Mine water treatment plant and work by the StreamKeepers to improve herring stock has made the return of dolphins, Orca and whales to Howe Sound a reality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>- Recreational usage that brings $$ in the form of Eco tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Wild life habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>This is a very pivotal moment for the health of our marine and estuarine environment. Howe Sound is just beginning to heal, become whole again after many years of abuse from industry and so on. What we do right now, the decisions we make today, will decide on the entire future of our marine and watershed ecosystems. Any industry that poses any possible threat to our water in any form is not good for us, our children or the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>The Howe sound around Squamish is recovering from years of industry and pollution -the Herring are back which has brought more wildlife back to the area. We should not be putting chlorinated warmer water back into the sound or doing anything that will negatively impact this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The Estuary is off limits. We have lost too much of the estuary over the years. No more fossil fuel pipelines through the Estuary above or below. The wild marine life is just now returning to the Salish Sea, after many years of human assult. We have had enough of heavy industry in Howe Sounf...FMC Chemicals, Woodfibre Pulp Mill, Britannia Mines, Canoxy, Weldwood, Interfor. Trust has been broken, we don’t need more industrialization. We are doing fine without them. We want the dolfins, shrimps, herring, whales, seals, salmon to come back in numbers, no LNG tankers please please.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>When chlorine mixes with seawater, a number of toxins are produced. This will impact both invertebrate and vertebrate marine life forms which make up the important food chain in Howe Sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>A comprehensive approach that considers historical industrial activities, new research on pollutants such as fire retardants and other activities for example DoS waste water affect the marine and river environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>The water pollution ruining the to be developed ocean front and Squamish's only water front recreation space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Will the returning whales and dolphins as well as herring and salmon be threatened? Can they prove with 100% certainty that this will pose zero problems for these returning species?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Aforementioned all incredibly important and should be clear and obvious reasons to refuse this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>everything! No, No, No LNG!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>We need to consider the effect of the increase of underwater noise in the Howe sound on sea life. The studies that I have read clearly indicate noise has a suppressive effect on sea life .just when we are starting to see more Dolphins and whales in our waters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>estuary easily damaged with long term effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>All of these things are important. I would imagine that the most substantial impacts are underwater noise, chronic pollution from shipping and port activities (e.g., small spills of fuel, other chemicals), and remediation at the LNG facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Howe Sound is just beginning to recover to a healthy ecosystem, adding a major industrial project will have a massive negative impact for decades to come.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 24. | Changes in temperature and salinity in sea water, even miniscule changes has great effect on marine life.  
Fresh water is not a renewable resource.  
The areas impacted by the proposal is salmon habitat which is important for our health, culture, environment and economy. |
| 25. | We are finally starting to see marine life return to Howe Sound and the idea that we could jeopardize this is very concerning to me. I am concerned that the waters around Howe Sound will go back to their inhabitable state that they once were not too long ago. |
| 26. | We should consider the health of the Howe Sound as a whole, since it impacts us all. We need to protect the marine wildlife, the fish and the birds from noise, pollution, tanker traffic, warm chlorinated water and let it thrive and be healthy. If the Sound is healthy then our community is healthier. Also, if the Sound is thriving then our tourism industry can grow and thrive as well. We have so many other opportunities to put Squamish on the map and make it a destination and all of that will be compromised with the LNG plant setting up shop.  
We need to consider the estuary and what will happen if the pipeline goes through- what happens to all of the trees, wildlife, water? Is it not a protected area?  
What happens if there is an accident, a spill or from the general pollution? What happens to the marine life and the wildlife and the environment? How does that impact our health as community citizens- not positively, I would think.  
What about all of the trees that need to be cut down to build/increase this pipeline?  
Squamish is known for its natural beauty and outdoor recreation opportunities and that is what is helping this town grow and thrive and that will be slowly lost if the LNG plant goes through.  
Lastly, sustainability is one of the greatest concerns. How long is this plant going to be viable? I often read in the news about other LNG facilities that are closing down- so all of that money spent, all of that land decimated for what? Also, a foreign investor is making all of the profits and they don't have to live with the consequences of having this plant where they live- affecting the air quality, the wildlife, the outdoor beauty, the ocean. We have to live with that and it's not what I want and it's not what I want for my children. Why are we not looking at alternatives that will be beneficial
to the earth, the environment and our lives in the long term? We are we letting some rich guy from overseas (with a really bad track record already) come in and ruin our town and our beautiful Howe Sound. We need to protect it and we need to find alternatives - work on a solution that is viable long term for us and the environment.

27. Copied from the Canadian Environmental office comments at: http://a100.gov.bc.ca/appsdata/epic/documents/p408/1425490115555_ZyrTj30QhXLSVDQh3TcB0Q9tpC2111YkkFp1HG1K1NT9cWPsLy6l1378338455!142548689594.pdf

: Annex - Amphibians at Risk

As described in section 5.14.3.2.1 of the Application, potential impacts of the Woodfibre LNG Project (the Project) on amphibians include loss of habitat (direct loss of breeding habitat during construction and indirect loss of breeding habitat during the construction and operation)............

The Canadian Environment office makes 18 + recommendations, such as: Amphibian migration corridors be identified prior to construction and operation, measures implemented to maintain water quality, protocols to ensure diseases not be spread from various water sites, potential loss of habitat, identifying existing amphibian populations, possible effects of mixing genetics.

28. We need the tax base of bigger companies to keep personal raxes lower

29. the government agency with jurisdiction over yhe environment will ensure this project is held accountable for its processes. They are professionals charged with the protection of our resources. Dont listen to quacks who disagree with the project on principle who will say or do anything to stop it.

30. I am very concerned that there seems to have been very little actual testing of what might happen from the cooling water outflow. The water temperatures and the currents vary greatly during different times of the year. I am concerned that the models they used do not have enough real data to accurately model the cooling water outflow. I am concerned about how the pollutants and water temperatures will be monitored. Who will monitor them? Are the reports public? What are the penalties if they exceed the guidelines? I am very concerned about the construction in the estuary and the consequences of a pipeline rupture in the estuary or under the estuary. I have seen the estuary severely compromised by the dredging for Squamish Terminals. It has taken 30 years to recover to where it is now. I think there should be no more development in the estuary.

31. It is a well known fact that even slight changes of temperature and acidity can drastically effect marine ecosystems. I fail to see how this would be controlled to preserve the state of the waters near this facility.

32. The DOS will be having to do a lot of work in the estuary with regards to upgrading dykes and flood control structures in the future and by working with Fortis a great deal of knowledge can be gained by working with them. It is important to maintain the very highest standards in any work we do in the estuary, but there must be a way to work within this area. It is unrealistic to think that nothing will ever happen in this area, and the more knowledge we can gain from working with Fortis will greatly help the DOS in the future.

Working with the proponent to establish a green zone will establish high environmental standards that other projects that may take over this property would not need to do. If another industrial activity were to set up at that site which is an allowable use it there is no guarantee they would establish this green zone. Improvements to fish habitat are long term benefits which will enhance the recreational opportunities in the sound.

Remediation of the contaminated foreshore and bottom would be a tangible benefit to the sound, The removal of the creosote pilings alone would be huge improvement and the removal of a centuries worth of organic debris would be allow this benthic dead zone to recover. Similar projects in Port Metro Vancouver in conjunction with the Vancouver aquarium have shown amazing results. The new convention centre in Vancouver is a showcase on how to develop in intertidal, and foreshore areas. This development actually has a higher diversity than you would find in any other foreshore development.
33. **Heated chlorinated water returned to the sea floor cannot be good for aquatic life**

34. The impact to the estuary will be minimal. Once the pipeline is in, 270 feet under the river, no one will know it is there and there will be no further environmental damage. My biggest concern with regard to the estuary is the fact that council allows people to camp there all year long, polluting the area with litter and human waste! The windsurfers and other windsports participants are allowed to pollute the estuary all year long yet four people on this council said no to two boreholes which would leave the land better than it was before it was disturbed. Hypocritical! One August day 200 people were counted at the spit. Twice the Windsport Society has been allowed to expand the beach area into the spawning channel and the District has granted them $50,000 to do it! Save the estuary from the tourists and windsurfers!

35. It's about our future not just about making money.

36. I have no concerns about the cooling system as I worked at the pulp mill. I know that the discharge of the cooling water will not impact the receiving environment. The pulp mill met all guidelines and so will this plant.

37. The water warming, pollutants expelled, and potential of a tanker crash and leak are too risky.

In broader terms, as well, we need to consider where this LNG is coming from. Fracking has been banned in many States in the US and is now banned in Scotland. It is scientifically proven to contaminate drinking water and cause earthquakes. We cannot support this incredibly invasive, destructive, and dirty industry.

38. We are finally seeing the return of sea life to the sound after heavy industry has left. Why push them away again.

39. The fact that marine life is returning to Howe Sound after years of having a "dead zone" makes it very valuable for scientific research. If marine life returns to the sound, especially large marine life like orca's and dolphins, the sustainable tourism dollars would roll in indefinitely. The value of LNG long term is already being debated.

40. **Habitat and Natural beauty**

41. The Council should focus on cumulative impacts of this project and others and consider this in a time continuum: our current industrial, commercial and recreational activities on the water, the addition of LNG project and then future expected uses. WLNG will have a large impact on the marine environment given the once-through cooling system, which has been banned in a number of jurisdictions. The reclamation activities touted as the positive features would be required of any operation on the site and Council shouldn’t consider these, as these activities would have taken place anyway with a new purchaser. The marine life in Howe Sound is just in recovery, we have made strides in protecting our estuary, these should be of utmost importance and priority in decision making. Generating baseline data from marine environment is critical but it should be done prior to any project approval.

Recent discovery of 9000 year old glass sponge reefs thought to have gone extinct 60 million years ago is a critical consideration. LNG carriers off course do not have enough clearance and thus would endanger this unique and rare marine life. WLNG has a water extraction license for Mill Creek and has proposed to remove a large quantity of water rendering the creek dry during summer months, in effect killing all fish life. No controls are in place to prevent this.

42. Howe Sound is a very important ecosystem. The discharging of chlorinated, warmer water is a big deal and it's difficult to see how this would not impact marine life, including salmon, herring and mammals in a negative, harmful way. Also, the size of the intake hole is quite large in comparison to the aquatic life that will be able to enter the opening. When I spoke to Woodfibre engineers, they confirmed that any aquatic life that entered the pipe and didn't pass through the initial filtration portal would be killed through the chlorination and heating process. This to me is not acceptable. The construction in its essence would cause damage. This is what construction of any scale does. The only way Woodfibre and Fortis could avoid impacting the area would be to not impact it at all.

43. Noise and water pollution within the marine environment will likely affect species that will have a knock on effect on a wider area, not just around the site.
44. Howe Sound is just now beginning to recover from the years of pollution only to be put in jeopardy again. This waterway is vital to all that live along its shores, humans and animals alike. We need to keep our water clean so that future generations can enjoy the wildlife that has been seen coming back to Howe Sound for many years to come.

45. Water is our most precious resource!
After many years and past pollution, Howe Sound is finally recovering - marine life is finally returning to Howe Sound and a project such as this will not help restore that natural environment.

46. WLNG - needs to support some baseline study’s so we can see IF THIS PROJECT OR OTHERS have had an effect on this environment.
Horizontal drilling proposed for the estuary should have went ahead it has been done for years and is safe

47. What are the alternatives to once though cooling systems, why were they not considered? Was it mainly costs? What innovations can be made that would make it less harmful?
What baseline is being used for the noise level? How will it be monitored? What will the impact be on marine life? Will ships at dock be running generators or will they be required to use quieter shore power? Is there any safe level of industrial noise for marine mammals?

48. Any regulation or safety policy is subject to human error....why risk it? Why risk anything when we don't have to?
example: April 2014 Blast at a US LNG site...it doesn't speak to the environmental impacts really, but you can fill in the blanks... http://business.financialpost.com/2014/04/07/blast-at-u-s-lng-site-casts-spotlight-on-natural-gas-safety/?__lsa=7e2a-d546

49. The Squamish Estuary and Howe Sound are home to many migrating animals. We have eagles fishing in the Squamish River, and whales fishing in Hower Sound. The recent recovery of these natural ecosystems is due to the cessation of the biggest industrial activity. An LNG facility would put our salmon runs at risk.

50. The marine ecosystem is important Howe Sound’s vitality. Research has revealed negative impacts of various types of industry related marine noise pollution and marine pollutants. We also know very little about the long term effects of once through sea water cooling. With decreased environmental regulations and budget cuts to DFO, our marine environment is at risk. Herring, salmon, orca, and dolphins are only a fraction of marine life that will be harmed. Also very concerned about impact to marine ecosystem from unavoidable disruption of foreshore marine pollutants from any works done at the foreshore (remediation, pile driving, etc), based on information provided by Vancouver Aquarium.

51. The remediation of the existing Woodfibre site is a huge plus for Howe Sound. Without development of the site for other purposes, such as LNG, this site may have sat in its present condition for many more years.

52. It has taken decades for Howe Sound to see a thriving marine life take hold again. We now have a herring run, pacific white sided dolphins, orcas, sea stars and other sea mammals, fish and invertebrates filling our waters again all the way up the Blind Channel. Not only does this indicate a healthy environment, it is bringing back some ecological balance. With the return of the sea life, we may see more birds and increased tourism for bird watching, scuba diving, kayaking, whale watching and possibly some small commercial fish openings or Native fisheries. All industries which provide jobs and are local and will bring more tourism dollars and taxes to our community. Our waters our precious and should be protected from future polluting industrial projects. We just have to look to our past to see the devastation that can be wreaked even with advances in emissions technology.

53. what **** impacts.. you *** people don’t even understand the **** construction process, you **** plant eating hippie wannabe’s.

54. There is no current baseline knowledge about much of the marine life in Howe Sound, in part because it’s never been measured. If we were to measure it now as a starting point (which I believe is imperative although it would require at least a full year of monitoring to have a clear baseline), we need to recognize that this baseline is at the beginning of a recovery after years of heavy industry. It really would be showing a bare minimum, and would give us less clear
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>This is all important because the Howe Sound is such a very important water way for our whole region. Negatively impacting this water way will have an adverse affect on not only our sound but the surrounding areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Risk of ‘frack out’ during HDD in the Estuary has not been fully described/evaluated to my knowledge (this should be addressed more fully).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>We need to preserve this community and Howe Sound and prevent it from becoming an environmental mess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>All of the concerns listed above (re:water) are significant but we a major concern is missing from the list. It is inferred (by absence of this issue from the list) that water used for fracking does not directly impact Squamish and is thus a 'non-issue' for city council but I highly disagree. It is fracked gas that will be traveling through the pipeline to Squamish. Taking water from healthy ecosystems and chemically altering it to make it more viscous in order to extract fracked gas affects us all. This is a harmful and shortsighted way of thinking. The whole must be understood here in order to make an informed and responsible decision locally in Squamish. To further illustrate my point, ecosystems are being ruined to obtain fracked gas and this makes our local ecosystems all the more precious and important to protect. In this way, fracked LNG shoots itself in the foot. Los Angeles and Sao Paulo are looking at water shortages while Canada is looking to contaminate freshwater and ruin ecosystems in order to export liquid natural gas abroad. Source of fracked gas by method of water waste is absolutely a concern that Council should consider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>It's clear that Howe Sound has undergone a rejuvenation over the past 10 years. The LNG plant will have a huge impact on that. A decision in favour can only harm the environment. Is it worth it? Are the other benefits there?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>The council should consider the benefits that could be obtained by having the project proponents clean up the damage to the land and water that has been done over the years by previous industrial activity and replacing with state of the art infrastructure that meets current environmental requirements and guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>I am all for ‘development’ within the District of Squamish area, as we as First Nation have been part of this community way before 'first visitor’...BUT, we need to protect our Waters...no more discharges!..WE need to SAVE Our Wild Salmon!! Change in Water getting ‘warmer’ is just not right... At what price?...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Howe Sound is finally returning to life after years of abuse at the hands of heavy industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Remediation of this area is an excellent benefit of the project proceeding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>The long-term impact on Mill Creek and the greater Howe Sound region should be paramount. The water and associated ecosystem of this area are just recovering from past industry abuse. Whatever reason could we have to repeat the same mistakes of the past? There are countless species and habits at risk in allowing the construction of a pipeline and fracking project of this nature. Council should gravity consider the impact of such a project on the future of this fragile ecosystem. This decision, (as Council is well aware), could have substantial influence on the future of many of BCs waterways, and the future directions of our economic pursuits as a province, country and planet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Woodfibre has the ability to use a air cooling system. We know that the sea water cooling system kills millions of fish and is archaic. With what we know now about the acidification of the oceans, this is unacceptable. We know Mill Creek will be dry in summer with the water usage from WFLNG, which means we effect the fish. Howe Sound is just recovering and we need to protect it from NEVER going back to what it was. The Estuary is so important and with the plans put in place and blessed by the MOE, we need to make sure it serves as further protection now that we know sea level is rising. It serves as a flood plain for our town and we should be staying out of it with any industry that will disrupt it. If you review the EA, you can see how much construction and its disruption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Increased water temperatures and the addition of chlorinated seawater will reverse the recent revival of marine life in Howe Sound, which is just now recovering from the toxic legacies of previous industries. Accidents will occur here and elsewhere. Large volumes of water will be used for hydrolyque fracturing (Fracking) (8-15 million litres per well), with the consequential the dangers of storing and disposal of wastewater, as well as the risk of migration of gas into water supplies. When wastewater is mishandled, it can contaminate surface and groundwater. This may be occurring in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
another region of BC but we will be collaborating and thus guilty of complicity.

| 67. | To consider discharging heated chlorinated water into Howe Sound is sheer stupidity. How desperate are people for short term gain and at what cost? It sounds to the uninhibited as if the clean up of the old mill site at Woodfibre is somehow contingent on the LNG export facility being approved. That is extremely misleading. If there was no industry moving in on site then the expectation of remediation would be to a much higher standard and it is unlikely that this proponent will act any more responsible in the future than his record indicates from the past. |
| 68. | Consider what would happen should a tanker become disabled and/or sink in Howe sound. How would the cumulative affects of minor spills and/or a major spill affect the District of Squamish? |
| 69. | oceans temperature levels will increase with more industrial use and will affect all marine life including pacific salmon rehabilitation. |
| 70. | One of the biggest concerns is not even local is the severe contamination of groundwater caused by hydraulic fracturing in NE BC. |
| 71. | ocean temperatures affect all marine wildlife including the rehabilitation of Pacific salmon. |
| 72. | Monitoring of environmental effects over time, including water quality. Who will do this, how often and for how long. This is a 25yr plus project and things can get forgotten over time. |
| 73. | Its not just the facts for the local Squamish environment that need to be considered. What about the travesty of the damage fracking causes at the very beginning of the supply chain and the widespread effects that causes? This is just as important! FACT: Supporting the Woodfibre site is supporting the ongoing, wreckless behaviour our province is wreaking on our land through this unsustainable practice. I very much hope council will balance the facts of more sustainable energy projects in the area. |
| 74. | Water sports/ activities are hugely important for Squamish, hundreds of kite surfers come up every weekend to Squamish, lots of paddlers enjoy the stunning sound, not the view of an LNG facility and huge tankers going forth and back. |
| 75. | We are seeing increased marine animal activity in the sound which has included large mammals returning to the area. This boasts a healthy environment for these creatures to feed which results in a healthier environment for humans to live. Socially and economically the tickle down effects are huge. Squamish is desired place to live because we are healthy environmentally. LNG will change our waters and our community socially becoming un desirable as a destination and a home |
| 76. | The ongoing, long-term threat to marine and coastal life needs to be considered, not just the initial impact of construction. |
| 77. | The impact upon Howe Sound as it is a fragile ecosystem that is in repair after 3 major phases of destruction - Britannia Beach, Wood Fibre & Nexen. |
| 78. | Marine life has only just begun to return to Squamish, and we have NO IDEA how much the community could benefit from the revitalization of the marine environment. We need to let this irreplaceable resource continue to recover, and we need more information about the direction of change that is already occurring, without the potential impact of LNG development. More information is also needed about the discharge of ballast from the visiting ships, and the introduction of destructive new species such as crabs or molluscs to the Sound. In larval form, these organisms are tiny and nearly impossible to eradicate, and effective controls are required to avoid biological pollution. |
| 79. | Millions of dollars have been spent on remediating Howe Sound, after nearly a century of heavy industry use and the resultant pollutants. To risk that investment for 20th century technology in the 21st century is asinine and irresponsible. |
| 80. | Squamish has had in past years many industry polluters of water and soil. Please consider the impact of re-industrialization on the sea water that has taken years to remediate. Orcas have been spotted and the herring are |
returning. Our estuary is world class and should be designated a Unesco World Heritage Site - a Park with facilities that educate visitors on it's nature and wildlife assets.

81. There has been a 30 year absence since the whales swam the sound they are just returning and there is not an economic price tag to be labelled with this. Our area has only been selected because it is the least expensive option for the purchaser of the project. The partner chosen has already had environmental abuses and worker abuses why would our government think it is ok to do business with this partner.

82. We are seeing for the first time in many, many years a restored marine life in the Sound. Why would we want to go backwards to the days of Britannia Mine, Woodfibre, Nexan Chemical plant etc. Our Streamkeepers group has done amazing work to bring salmon and other marine life back to the Sound (e.g. Dolphins, Orcas)

83. council should comment to the eao process to make sure that the sea water intake is done with minimal impact. there is a potential to impact here, but it is NOT council’s role to determine how to do this but to indicate that as a community we are concerned

84. COOLING. The primitive cooling system for WFLNG is not World Class, it is the easiest and cheapest method. Salt Water/Once Through Cooling systems are banned in the State of California. WFLNG's cooling system will suck 17,000 tonnes an hour (7 Olympic-sized 50 metre pools) of living sea water through pipes, heat it, chlorinate it, and spit it back into the ocean devoid of life. These cooling systems kill billions of fish eggs, larvae, and any other marine life that gets sucked in. The estuary needs to be protected at all costs as it is the most important, and largest estuary system in all of Howe Sound. It’s an insult to our community that Fortis took the DP370 issue to Supreme Court rather than try to work with our community on exploring other options in light of our concerns and priorities on protection of the Estuary.

85. the sound has just started to come back to life. We have witnessed what industry can do to kill wildlife and poison water. Why take the chance on a product that we have the technology to make obsolete?

86. Controlling pet feces in green spaces that leak into the water systems/ocean.

87. We should be just as concerned about how polluting and industrializing the waterfront will affect tourism and home prices in the area. Has there been an economic study on the impact of this type of industry?

88. Using a water cooling system is a crazy outdated system. The report states the water 100 meters from the exit point of the pipe will be within gov’t guidelines of ambient temperature. What do they say of the heat given off by the hundreds of metres of pipe extending out into the Sound. Regardless of how they say it, they are using the waters of the Sound to cool the cooling water to the ambient temperature. On the plus side the water temperature at Nexxen beach may be warm enough for swimming within a couple years and with all the added chlorine there should be little concern for the increase in bacteria the warmer water would bring.

Has LNG considered the amount of sediment that flows into the sound every year and the implications that could have on their pumps and cooling system. What happens to the plant if they have to shut down the cooling system due to pump failure?? Sure Howe Sound is a deep water port but it also fills with millions of tonnes of sediment every year which could wreak havoc on pumping systems.

With the monies put aside for committees, what experts have been brought in to explore ecological impacts on the Sound from such a development?? Will there be any professional scientists assisting the committees in defending the Howe Sound or are you leaving it up to the lay public to defend for themselves?? So far I have only heard mention of people associated with the project giving talks.

89. The water is part of Squamish so it must be top of mind. However, I feel we can develop our area with responsible development that is done with the highest standards of protection.
90. Howe Sound deserves a break, no question! It has made a miraculous recovery and it is so embarrassingly short sighted to allow this project to continue.

91. If the proponent is following existing regulations and laws council should have no concerns.

92. The estuary and waterways are a delicate ecosystem, just now showing signs of recovery from historical industrial use. The proposed LNG cooling operation will artificially warm the water, change its bacterial and chemical composition with known and unknown undesirable effects on the marine environment.

93. It seems that companies want us to have blind trust that everything with work just fine but having witnessed so many pitifully poor clean up efforts by rich oil companies I don't have any trust. When they're rich they've done a poor job and the way the economy is going these companies aren't going to have anything left to fix their problems with, leaving us as tax payers to cough up and *try* to protect what lives here.

94. marine environments are very sensitive and easily destroyed

95. Council should seek to protect the health of our marine and freshwater ecosystems by calling for thorough scientific studies on all aspects of the LNG project that could negatively impact those environments (as indicated above).

96. We share the land and water with living creatures that have made their way back to Howe Sound after years of industry abuse. We're moving backward with this development in both energy and environmental concerns.

97. Howe Sound is only now starting to recover from over 100 years of industrial mis-use. Our current government, regulations, and policies are not designed to ensure clean healthy waters and the absence of enforcement or any structure to ensure best management practices are followed are a big concern regarding ensuring our waters remain clean and healthy for generations to come. We are in a state of global warming, this year alone we have next to no snow pack. We have the opportunity now to make informed decisions that will affect the future - should we be sacrificing our fresh water reserves for gas extraction and processing? The WLNG is not just the site itself but includes the entire processing of LNG from the origin in the interior of the province or Alberta - the processing which involves fracking and the huge use of clean water to generate the LNG. This needs to be taken into consideration when reviewing the WLNG. Mill Creek & Woodfibre Creek are likely to reach all-time low flows this year and there will likely be insufficient drinking water reserves at Woodfibre in future years - the consideration for how we manage our drinking water for this community needs to be taken into consideration given the WLNG will require vast amounts of fresh water as part of the processing at Woodfibre. The foreshore around Woodfibre provides important habitat for forage fish, outmigrating salmonids, crustaceans, aquatic plants, and an entire ecosystem that will be all but obliterated if the WLNG is approved. We need to give full consideration to the environmental impacts to our water resources when considering heavy industry and we should be looking for environmentally friendly industries, not the water glut hydrocarbon industries that seem to be this provinces lowest common denominator at the moment!

98. We always have tradeoffs. There will be negative consequences to any site because of development. If would be acceptable if there were other environmental improvement projects (e.g. estuary improvements, investments herring spawning areas) funded by the proponent and/or province that offset the potential damage of the LNG project.

99. 17,000 gallons of heated, chlorinated water pouring into the sound, 24/7 365 days a year. This cannot be ok! This can only have a negative impact on all life in the sound.

100. It's not only our own water that we need to be concerned about. The natural gas for this project will be extracted by fracking, which is an enormously harmful process and will poison water in the areas from which it is extracted. It is the responsibility of all British Columbians to take a stand against this.

101. I have lived in Squamish for 12 years now. In my short time hear I have witnessed 2 devastating environmental incidents. one was a train derailment that dumped thousands of gallons of chemical into the Chekamus river, killing a number of fish and other aquatic life around the river. the other was a leak from a tanker at the shipping yard that contaminated the spit with oil and diesel I believe. by introducing another industrial process like lng into our eco system we are increasing the risks of more disasters like this. I know there stipulations and rules into effect in regards to the transportation, use disposal and storage of chemicals but if there is one thing that recent history has proved to us is that these regulations have faults and accidents happen. no matter how careful and safe, things go wrong. the consequences are too high.
| 102. | How can we be outdoor recreation and have LNG in our sound? How can we protect the marine life? |
| 103. | In my opinion, additional industry in the howe sound should not be allowed. In past, industry in howe sound has had a huge impact on marine life and only recently we have seen some of that life come back. It's obvious that the environment is on the back burner since closed-cycle cooling systems were not what LNG considered for their Woodfibre facility.  

The closure of the Woodfibre Pulp Mill and the enforcement of stricter pollution controls at Port Mellon, the clean up of Britannia Creek, and encouraging the growth of herring stocks play an enormous part in the return of the Orca and the pod of white sided dolphin. Why should we open the door to more industry after witnessing the negative effects industry has had in the area. You have allowed 3 concerns to be selected but I am very concerned about the impact of underwater noise. |
| 104. | I think it's ridiculous that pro LNGer's claim there will be no problems pumping warm, chlorinated water into the ocean.  

We have whales and other amazing sea life finally returning to Howe Sound. They are not going to stick around if there's too much noise along with some nice warm chlorinated seawater.  

The importance of the estuary is being minimized. Estuaries are so important to the environmental health of the area. |
| 105. | Squamish's place on this earth is defined by water. We sit at the north end of the fjord of Howe Sound where five rivers meet the sea creating the Squamish Estuary. Estuaries are endangered ecosystems as few still exist in their natural condition. The Squamish Estuary has already been compromised due to the building of downtown. What is left needs to be protected. The estuary provides valuable services to the health of this region, whether by harbouring biodiversity because of it's variety of habitats, as a buffer zone to filter pollutants before they enter the ocean, flood mitigation, and as a place where nutrients are recycled and made available to a large variety of organisms. Functioning ecosystems are going to be essential if we hope to weather the storms of climate change.  

Protecting the waters of Howe Sound and the estuary is our responsibility. |
| 106. | How to monitor or assess effects of the cooling system before proceeding! Apparently this type of cooling is not allowed in California, a bellwether for all things "green" |
| 107. | We have absolutely no idea what kind effect pumping that amount of heated, desalinated water will have on our ecosystem. We also have no idea of the effect of the traffic and construction on the large marine life making its way back into Howe Sound. The proponent and our Provincial government seem to think these issues are not even relevant. |
| 108. | The health of marine life is on the rise in Howe Sound! This is exciting and to think we are putting it's health in jeopardy (again) is completely heartbreaking. |
| 109. | tankers travelling through the sound. Potential of spills, etc. |
| 110. | Running water thru system will suck in small animals and raise the temperature of Howe Sound |
| 111. | The marine environment is finally recovering and we're seeing the return of herring, orcas, dolphins etc. Why would squamish 'outdoor recreational centre of the world' mess with that? |
| 112. | Please don’t ignore the amount of water used and contaminated in the fracking process, but with regards to WFLNG the fact that Howe Sound is still recovering from the last round of industrial activity. WFLG and all other proposed projects in the sound should be considered together for cumulative impact on the marine environment. |
| 113. | Warm and chlorinated water being pumped back into the Howe Sound, as an area trying to regain its former health already- this will only make the process harder and slower. I’m also extremely concerned about the mercury stored in |
the estuary being released.

114. Noise pollution. The orcas, dolphins and herring are just returning. This could upset the fragile emerging ecosystem.

115. It is not like a ship will be going into the Sound every day - in fact it won't be very frequent. We already have large ships going into the Sound, I am not concerned as long as their is some monitoring in place.

116. The issues in this section cannot be viewed in isolation. As with any project, the potential costs must be weighed against the potential benefits. The possible economic costs are high, while the benefits to the area and to the world economy are low. Because BC will always be a high-cost producer of LNG, the marginal benefits will always be relatively small. But back to the potential water costs:

117. It will have a negative impact on the marine life. Through added tanker traffic, construction, spills, accidents, etc!!!

118. I have worked as an environmental consultant for almost a decade. I’ve been involved in water quality monitoring for several different industries. I think council should be aware that regardless of rules and regulations, implementation is challenging and the fact of the matter is that construction workers don't care. The "get ’er done" attitude is the driving force behind all of these types of projects. Even with monitors on site, spills and mistakes will happen and then what? Even if thy are charged a fine the damage is done.

119. We are stewards of the watersheds of this region. We need to protect them from undue pollution and damage for future generations. Water is and will become an increasingly precious resource; it is worthless when toxic. This project should only be allowed to proceed if it can be on the leading edge of clean.

120. Considering the amazing work done by many local groups to help start restoration of the estuary and waters in and around Squamish it seems like a risky development. Especially if there is minimal/limited funding available for research and long-term monitoring and the benefits of the project are not high for the people of Squamish.

121. The DFO was not willing to present to the LNG Committee. Their capacity to adequately monitor and respond to issues is questionable. I think we need a better understanding of the impacts of the cooling systems on herring and other sensitive creatures in the Sound, as well as human health impacts related to disruptions of the sedimentary pollutants near the site. Ongoing monitoring of these things are important, as it is my understanding that there’s a lot of nasty stuff in the sediment, left over from the last Woodfibre.

122. Please consider all the ocean wildlife that has recently came back over the last few years. Please consider that because they can’t speak our language they still have a right to a livable home.

123. Water is our life force!

124. The cooling operation will damp approx. 10,000 gallons of chlorinated hot water per hour into the Howe Sound. Even a slight change in water temperature affect seriously marine life. I wonder what would happen to Howe Sound life with the chlorines and temp change? Chlorines is a poison! How is going to affect our air? What about using the Howe Sound water for water sports and recreation? Who is going to come here and kayak, kite, fish, etc in dead chlorinated water?

125. Impact on newly returning sea life and the consequential impact on brand dependant business.

126. Fra king

127. Water being a resource which refuses to remain within boundaries will impact a far larger region than the immediate area. Therefore to demonstrate that there is intelligent comprehension of this fact, a larger picture and population needs to be part of all considerations. As well, the impact over the projected lifetime of the project also needs to be considered. ie what is the estimated total increase in heat dumping over the life of the project. That heat will not simply disappear into some alternate universe. The area will need to accommodate and it's questionable whether the normal marine flora and fawne will survive the total number to be added during the lifetime of the project.

128. The water use involved throughout the process of getting gas to the LNG facility should be considered! From my understanding, fracking uses a lot of fresh clean BC water, and may have potential to pollute BC's fresh water supplies.

129. a) Estuary should be protected from any industrial development. This is a super-fragile environment, too precious for wildlife and people of Squamish to be destroyed or disturbed.
b) discharge of massive amounts of chlorinated and warmer than surrounding water will have harmful impact on the marine habitat in 3 ways: raising water temperature, release of chlorine to the sea; disturbance of existing potentially harmful sediments on the sea bed around Woodfibre site.

c) underwater noise from construction and tankers traffic is detrimental to marine wildlife in the area.

130. Water is a limited resource that supports a fragile infrastructure of plants and living species and we should be aware that every action has an impact.

131. BC has not yet developed the legislation that would be necessary to protect the water, the marine environment. LNG would be a new industry with new (as well as old) repercussions. Further, BC does not have the money and manpower to effectively monitor the existing ocean environment related industries and efficiently clean up when marine disasters happen.

Woodfibre LNG, which is under the control of Sukanto Tanoto’s empire (even though Woodfibre LNG’s public relations minimize this fact), would only be required to meet minimum standards of existing legislation.

This company has the money and power to sue and get whatever they want in order to make the most money. Their ways of conducting business are well documented on the net. Does Council believe that our governments would be able to regulate Woodfibre LNG?

Howe Sound’s water is now beginning to recover from the pollution caused by previous industries which have been closed because their serious harm to the environment was recognized. There are serious concerns about the significant harm to the marine environment that our one example of the LNG industry, Woodfibre LNG, would have the potential to do in Howe Sound. The water-related impacts that this industry could have here first need to be assessed. This has not been done because of the extreme pressured rush from the BC and Canadian Governments. The sea water in Howe Sound is presently cleaner than in many parts of the world which makes it more possible to help enable a healthy marine environment.

132. I’m concerned about WFLNG long term expansion plans, once gaining a foothold, promoting more environmentally polluting fracking to the general environment, when we should be focusing on, and encouraging alternative sources of energy, which would employ more people and not add to global warming.

133. The remediation of the Woodfibre site including shoreline will in my view by far have the biggest environmental impact. It is a positive impact -- if done comprehensively according to best practices -- as it will deliver, in addition to important environmental benefits and reduced risks, a significant long term waterfront industrial land asset of benefit to community of Squamish tax base and economic development.

134. I have concerns for the fragility of a returning marine ecological balance in Georgia Straight, Howe Sound, and surrounding areas. Through environmental stewardship and conservation efforts (such as the wrapping of creosote pilings in Howe Sound and False Creek and pH balancing in Britannia Beach), we are just now starting to see a return of population diversity and improved numbers in species like herring and other marine life like cetaceans (Humpback whale, white sided dolphin and orca sightings in Howe Sound). It is alarming that a return to non-renewable natural resource related industry would be under consideration for this area.

135. It was very difficult to choose just my top 3, I believe that all of these factors hold weight and should be considered.

136. The herring need to be protected.

137. The impacts on water cannot be predicted with certainty. Accidents happen with disturbing frequency. The fossil fuel industry will make promises, perhaps gambling that our governments, especially the federal government, will continue to gut and muzzle the agencies meant to monitor such operations.

138. Marine life is just beginning to return to Howe Sound following the clean up at Britannia. Salmon runs are important and marine life needs clean water to flourish.

139. The old saying history repeats itself. History repeats itself until we learn the lessons that we need to change. If history is any indication of what LNG could do to our waters. After reviewing the environmental impact on the water that LNG has had in Australia. There was a scandal when millions of tonnes of dirty silt dredged up from the long-time industrial port – partly because of the LNG projects – leaked out of a thin enclosure meant to isolate it from the ocean.
Fish have been showing up in the harbour with lesions and infected eyes. Some dolphins have washed up dead, while others seem to have been driven far away from the harbour by the increased levels of noise. Source: Globe and Mail April/2014 http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/international-business/the-lng-race-the-lessons-canada-can-learn-from-australia/article17946509/?page=all

THE GLADSTONE HARBOUR enquiry investigate the failure of a 'bund' wall, designed to contain dredge spoil, dating back to 2011 which was the design of the bund wall and the management of the 26 million cubic metre dredge program. Source: http://www.abc.net.au/news/2014-01-20/qch-gladstone-inquiry/5209064-- January 2014

Australian news source 9 May 2014

http://www.abc.net.au/environment/articles/2014/05/09/3999783.htm

LNG: the energy projects they'd rather you didn't notice

Setting fire to your water might be a cool party trick, but drinking neurotoxins is generally ill-advised. And as for constructing massive LNG plants in coastal areas, we now have Gladstone Harbour as a shining example of what can go wrong. Lines are leaking chemicals into the ground poisoning the water we drink.


With marine life just returning to Howe sound from the Copper mine spill and pulp and paper factory, we need to protect the sea life. The Sea feeds us and we can benefit through eco tourism from all the treasures that the ocean provides

140. the WLNG site is a contaminated industrial site that needs to be cleaned up. A clean industry needs to be put in its place. I think LNG is a clean industry.

141. I am not going to type more this time. I did last time, spent about an hour on it, and then the program didn't work and it was all lost. So if this goes through successfully, I will do it again and put comments. Hopefully you are ok with that.

142. A great opportunity to remediate the site (I.e. Improve on its existing state).

143. the howe sound waters are just returning to the natural state from years of polluting why ruin it again the previous companies are gone with their profits and the tax payers were left with most of the cleanup bill, lets not make this mistake again.

144. Marine life is only now restoring back to it's natural habitat for wildlife to survive. By preserving this natural habitat of our Sound we will continue to entice whales, dolphins and other wildlife to come to stay. The LNG site would cause significant threats to this wildlife. We have a conservation and moral obligation as safe keepers to our environment to ensure the longevity of life (on land and in water) and the preservation of natural beauty and healthy surrounds which I perceive as the most invaluable commodities of our community and the reason why we choose to live here and visitors come from far and wide to experience it.

145. Surely in this day and age we're not naive enough to believe chlorinating and, more importantly, raising the temperature of surrounding water by a full degree won't have profound effects on local marine life? As a veterinarian with knowledge of aquatic health, I can assure you that minute differences in water quality have devastating effects on local fish and cetacean, as well as mammalian life. Possible ripple effects would include reduced sport fishery, reduced interest in our area from tourists, loss of food sources for native/non-native locals, etc. Simply put: if you kill tons of fish, the dolphins leave, the recently returning whales leave, the people suffer.

146. Woodfiber LNG is a big expense that we as tax payers will have to pay now. Some of us won't see any benefit. Another industrial area will bring more pollutants to Howe Sound that is finally showing marine life coming back.
We live in a beautiful area and people come for our hiking and biking and wind surfing and eagle watching do we want to compromise all of these good things for LNG. I don't.

I think the project is environmentally sound. I have no concerns other than the monitoring we would for any industry to ensure they follow the rules set out.

So many people from Squamish and elsewhere (tourists) use this water to recreate and fish. The idea is to continue doing this and not pollute our waters which are still healing from the Bretania mine days. There is still a limit on the amount of crab you can eat from Howe sound because of the Bretania Mine, Do we need to add more industrial sized pollutants to our waters?

We have delighted in the resurgence and rejuvenation of marine life in Howe Sound. The joy that we have experienced by watching dolphins and orcas swim in our waters is indescribable. So I have a lot of concerns when I hear that the cooling method proposed for the LNG facility is outdated and damaging to the environment. They propose to extract seawater from Howe Sound, chlorinate it, heat it, and then spit it back out into the sound every hour of every day for the next 25 years. This method has been banned in California and several other places as it is very damaging to marine life such as juvenile salmon, herring, and plankton (the building blocks for all other life in Howe Sound). The impacts of this could reverse the recent revival of marine life in Howe Sound, which is just now recovering from the toxic legacies of previous industries. This is unacceptable.

That the company works at ensuring the discharged water temperature is managed in the best possible way, and that the ongoing clean up continues.

The sea life has just started to come back to this end of the Howe Sound - slowly recovering from Woodfiber.. LNG will destroy the ocean environment yet again... and our water here will again be desolate.

Aquatic environments are exquisitely sensitive to minute changes. I am a veterinarian with training in fish diseases and management. Chlorinating and increasing the temperature in Howe Sound water next to the proposed plant WILL affect survival and reproduction of surrounding marine life (negatively), thus also affecting our local sport and commercial fisheries, hence Eagle populations as well as tourism spin-offs.

Howe Sound has just in the last couple of years, seen the return of Orcas, Whales and other large mammal sea life. The LNG project stands to undermine the environment, making it unattractive to marine life, dissuading diversity.

Marine mammals have a right to enjoy the sound. Let's make sure that they continue to re-colonize these beautiful waters.

Protecting our water is paramount NO LNG

Increased industrial activity in the sound will clearly have negative impacts on the marine life, from a cumulative effects point of view or other. The marine ecology has been responding well recently, remarkably well in fact. Cleaning the creosote piles is important regardless of the LNG or not. Of much greater importance than a relatively small economically beneficial industrial operation with a high risk is the long term tourism and real-estate benefits associated with a clean environment so close to a major city.

Remediation off land and fillings etc should have been done by the previous landowner. Negligence on their part should not be considered a benefit by having it fixed now. Marine ecosystem is just Recovering. Give it more time to thrive without industrial impacts.

In this day and age of engineering, I believe the environmental impacts from this plant will be absolutely minimal.

I think that water use is covered in the EA.

very concerned about the impact of pumping 17,000 metric tonnes of warmer, chlorinated water back into Howe Sound per hour.
That it can be managed well if a balanced and risk management approach is taken. We can ensure that localized impacts are within reason to receive the economic benefits industry on the water brings.

Continue with remediation aiming for as much marine biodiversity as possible.

While I really appreciate that council has finally agreed to engage the public in this way, I have an issue with the way a lot of these questions are phrased as they repeat a lot of the propaganda from Woodfibre LNG for the "positives" and essentially just divide people into the "Yes" versus "No" groups.

For example, there is a big issue with Mill Creek as Woodfibre LNG has secured the water license to extract water from Mill Creek, which flows through the Woodfibre site. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans has objected to this because the amount of water that WLNG is proposing to remove will reduce water levels in Mill Creek to levels that will no longer support fish life, especially in the summer months. Woodfibre LNG needs to source water for this project from somewhere else to protect this important stream habitat which is home to several native fish species. The creation of a "green zone" around Mill Creek and claims of "best practice" design is pure propaganda.

I also have a real issue with Woodfibre LNG listing site remediation as one of the "benefits" of this project. The site remediation should have been done as soon as the pulp mill was shut down. The fact that Western Forest Products has been allowed to ignore existing site contamination through the loophole of "keeping the lights on" highlights the issues with government rules and regulations surrounding these kinds of industrial projects. Taxpayers are often left on the hook for the cleanup of toxic industrial waste, for example, the millions of dollars that have been spent cleaning up Britannia mine, or Nexen chemical plant. What is there to prevent Woodfibre LNG declaring bankruptcy, and disappearing into thin air, leaving us with yet another toxic legacy from industry to clean up?

The impacts to the estuary from pipeline construction and borehole drilling is unacceptable. Squamish residents have been very clear that our estuary is sacrosanct. The town's OCP and SEMP (Squamish Estuary Management Plan) require Squamish council to protect sensitive estuary habitat from industrial developments. According to legal counsel from West Coast Environmental Law, FortisBC's application does not follow the DPA 11 guidelines as FortisBC failed to provide an assessment report that identifies buffer zones by a qualified environmental professional. They conclude that Squamish Council was within its rights to refuse to issue a development permit on the grounds that FortisBC's application does not meet the guidelines in DPA 11. I fully support Mayor and Council's efforts to protect our estuary.

Underwater noise is also a big issue for me. According to Dr Kathy Heise from the Vancouver Aquarium, noise from the LNG tankers transiting in and out of Howe Sound are only one source of underwater noise for marine mammals. While a land-based LNG facility may reduce underwater noise, sound is still transmitted from these kinds of industrial facilities through the substrate and into the marine environment. There will also be significant underwater noise generated by the loading pumps inside the floating storage and offloading facility for the duration of the loading. The floating storage facility also needs to continuously stir the LNG which will be an additional source of noise. If the number of tankers transiting into Howe Sound increases, this will further increase the amount of significant underwater noise from both the LNG tankers transiting to and from Woodfibre LNG, and the 2-3 tugs that accompany the tankers.

More information about underwater noise and the impact of marine mammals can be seen here in this talk by expert, Kathy Heise. https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=7EbyZwXb3Q

The once-through seawater cooling system proposed by Woodfibre LNG is outdated, and is the real deal-breaker of all of these issues. Woodfibre LNG is proposing an outdated and damaging cooling method to help cool the LNG facility. They propose to extract 17,000 tonnes (= 3.7 million gallons, or 7 Olympic-sized 50-meter swimming pools) of seawater from Howe Sound, chlorinate it, heat it, and then spit it back out into the sound every hour of every day for
the next 25 years. This method has been banned in California and several other places as it is very damaging to marine life such as juvenile salmon, herring, and plankton which are the building blocks for all other life in Howe Sound. If the herring are impacted, the dolphins, orcas, and humpbacks are also impacted as they no longer have a food supply. The impacts of increased water temperatures and the addition of chlorinated seawater will likely reverse the recent revival of marine life in Howe Sound, which is just now recovering from the toxic legacies of previous industries. This is unacceptable. A different cooling system needs to be chosen.

164. If the Plant is to exist it must be done safely without a large cost to the valley’s inhabitants.

165. The addition of warm water and chlorinated water will be so destructive to marine life, now that is finally slowly returning to it’s natural state after the destruction from previous industrial poisons dumped into the water. Please do not allow this to happen.

166. We need to have this for the betterment of Squamish

167. This project is a paradigm shift away from Squamish’s new direction, and de-industrialization. I am concerned about catastrophic failures and 100 year events that are becoming very common. I have not forgotten the freighter that breached its hull in Squamish terminals and leaked diesel fuel into the sound.. powerful tugs could not match the Sounds inflow winds. Underestimation of nature will happen again, this time to an LNG tanker with far greater consequences.

168. Global warming is such a concern to our future survival that discharging this amount of warm water back into the ocean is unacceptable.

169. Status of the water being used and returned to the sound?

170. The estuary is our natural water filtration system. If we put too much strain on that system, it doesn’t matter how much we clean up the environment, it will take longer and longer for our local ecosystem to find balance and recover.

171. This project simply does not fit our values. It does not fit our vision of ourselves, Howe Sound, or any of the communities on its shores. Any benefits are far outweighed by the significant impacts to our health, our safety, and our sense of community which is intrinsically tied to the health of our environment.

172. We should be concerned both with the environmental implications of both fracking and what could happen here. Fracking is an important component of this process and has been shown to be very destructive to the environment. We should not be doing this. I think the lists of concerns and benefits was constructed in a way that removes power from my comments. Obviously the “concerns” that were chosen as boxes for me to check are “concerns” that can on paper be addressed. There is no box to check for concern of the overall environmental impact, only small specific things that LNG can demonstrate they are addressing. I am concerned about fracking. I am concerned about the direction that Squamish is going if we accept this questionable project. This cannot happen without having impacts. I do not believe that 25 jobs and 2 million in taxes a year are enough to justify this.

173. Warmer chlorinated water will harm the ecosystem.

174. It’s going to negatively effect Howe Sound with more large tankers and more pollution.

What will a spill or burst pipe do to area?

175. Howe Sound used to handle up to about 250 ships yearly besides 700 Tug/Barge calls in Squamish Harbour only. These transits never used assisting Tugs during passages through the inlet except in/out of berths.

Six LNG Tankers monthly will have less impact. These ships will be new and crews will have more training than the above mentioned bulk carrier crews at that time. These ships are the safest to date in recorded history.

176. Concerned that Howe Sound be kept clean and for the pleasure and use of the residents in and around Squamish, and therefore NOT for commercial interests.

177. The LNG plant must create their own source of water to cool the plant with (maybe a lagoon where they keep it at similar temperatures to Howe Sound waters and use/recycle the same water over and over again). It is unacceptable
| 178. | It will be of benefit to the environment to remove the creosote pilings at Woodfibre and in the Mamquam Blind Channel. I believe the chlorinated warmed water discharged into the Sound will have a minimal impact according to the published data. |
| 179. | Do not put a pipe in the estuary |
| 180. | Proponent is using the cheapest option available - once through system. This would have way more impact on the environment than safer alternatives and is banned in some countries due to its impact. |
| 181. | Disturbance of toxic sediments in the underwater near Woodfibre would be impossible to contain if disturbed. |
| 182. | Effects of marine and birdlife due to underwater noise. |
| 183. | Proponent is using the cheapest option available - once through system. This would have way more impact on the environment than safer alternatives and is banned in some countries due to its impact. |
| 184. | Is there anyway of recycling the chlorinated water |
| 185. | Howe Sound is a jewel. To have pristine, clean, non-industrialised water ways so close to major cities and urban centres is beyond measure - financially, socially, environmentally. Why risk this? I grew up in Sydney Australia. I am now a Canadian citizen and have called Squamish home for 7 years. One of the bravest and smartest decisions over a century ago, was to make Sydney harbour industrial free. The governing bodies back then chose Botany Bay as the main port of business for industry and shipping. Look at the result today. Sydney harbour is an icon and emblem of Australia. Its tourism pull and value is measured in the hundreds of millions. Howe Sound is a jewel of Western Canada, nay Canada. Lets keep it that way and protect it for future generations. I wonder how an LNG plant proposal would go in Sydney Harbour? |
| 186. | Amount of water used in this process and poison being added to it and released back to ocean |
| 187. | This needs to continually monitored to ensure that the warmer water does not effect marine life, I believe that the remediation of the site will improve the eco system |
| 188. | Recently, I attended the BCRPA spring training conference where 2 guest speakers spoke animatedly about their attempts at estuary restoration and the vital importance of their preservation. They explained that “estuaries are basically marine gardens and one of the most productive ecosystems on earth”. They went on to say that “only 3% of our coastline is estuary while estuaries are responsible for 80% of all wildlife on the coast” and “are critical for osmoregulation of juvenile salmonids, act as a habitat bank and of course provide feeding opportunities for birds”. This is because estuaries are semi-enclosed mixing areas for tidal, rain, fresh water, sediments and tidal nutrients. Also, fortunately, it is rarely difficult for Squamish residents to find roommates as people come to Squamish from all around the globe for the world class rock climbing, mountain biking, fly-fishing, skiing, SAILING, PADDLE BOARDING, KITE and WIND SURFING that Squamish has to offer. Many of my friends and peers rely on rental income from seasonal outdoor recreationists in order to offset the high cost of housing. Tourists coming to participate in activities like kite surfing tend to be more willing and able, to afford rent. In the event that any unforeseen accident should occur and jeopardize our water based, and other outdoor recreational activities, many people in this community would be at a very high risk of losing their homes and businesses. This is due to the fact that many home owners rely on extra revenue generated by renting out rooms in their homes to outdoor enthusiasts and many businesses in this
Community cater solely to recreational pursuits or indulge their post activity libations.

189. Cumulative Impacts, what about the combined used of freshwater (upstream) from fracking combined with those from Mill Creek (downstream) and the use/warming/chemical alteration of seawater (downstream).

190. The health and life in the water has seemed to improve during the last 7 years that I have lived in downtown Squamish.

191. Water effects everything and we have an opportunity to protect it we should. The discharge temperature is what concerns me and how it may effect the ecosystem. Also the chlorine discharge no matter how small says it is will still stay in the ocean.

192. Even a minimal risk is still a risk. The stakes are too high in the event of possible contamination. Noise pollution is also a concern for larger marine mammals.

193. The damage that the warmer, chlorinated water from the once-through cooling process will cause to marine life will not be a short term thing. This is everyday, 24 hours a day for decades. The land might recover from construction in a few years, but the day to day operations will impact our sound negatively for decades.

194. I have lived here first time in 1977 for 2 yrs., second time 1986 and I am still here. This is the first time I have seen whales, dolphin, trumpeter swan and a lot more to come back. I am so sorry to see what is happening out there. I moved here for my own reasons. My husband and I have raised 4 kids out here, now we have 4 beautiful grandchildren which I’m sure that these children will not be able to see the real beauty in this place once they have grown. I could go on and on about how great this beautiful place was but I’m sure you already know that. Therefore, there is absolutely nothing that I can think of that LNG has to offer me. Thank you for listening. DRMP.

195. The proponents have acknowledged that the proposed water cooling system is detrimental to small organisms. In their language small organisms will “experience mortality”. The intake will be taking up millions of litres of water every day and essentially sterilizing it. This portion of the proposal is completely unacceptable.

196. From a water-centric perspective I have been part of several studies around Mill Creek and Woodfibre Creek and upper Howe Sound both in studying how juvenile salmonids and other fisheries make use of the shoreline as well as in a recreational capacity as a SCUBA diver where I have seen first hand the nearby glass sponges, sea pens, and sea whips which thrive nearby off of Defense Islands. We have learned the hard way how little we know and understand about our oceans and any changes have long-term impacts. We are seeing for the first time in a hundred years the return of a healthy aquatic ecosystem to Howe Sound and by allowing heavy industrial use, such as an LNG plant, will most definitely have a significant impact on this marine life. We need to study the area far more before we can allow a new industry to go into this site and before we can allow an industry that will change the water temperature, oxygen, pH and salinity through the sea water intake/discharge that will create noises that may heavily impact whales, dolphins, and salmonids, and before we can allow new construction, pilings, and structures to go along the foreshore.

197. Tankers (freighters) are polluters. Thats a proven fact. There is currently a push from Cowichan Bay residents to stop the anchoring of large freighters in or near the Bay as they have seen a very rapid and apparent loss of sea life such as mussels, barnacles and seaweed along the shoreline since freighters have been allowed to anchor there. They burn bulk fuels that are incredibly more damaging to the atmosphere than cars. Increasing the traffic of large carriers in Howe Sound will inevitably damage sea life and the land and air based life that depends on it for food.

198. I am also concerned about the marine traffic as it relates to returning fish habitat and our growing self propelled marine recreation (wind, paddle, and scuba sports).

199. I would like council to take a hard look at this project. Walk slowly and ask many questions. Industry usually promises the world and under-delivers.

200. Keeping it as clean as possible and therefore, marine life healthy.

201. I think the district of Squamish puts chlorinated water into the Howe Sound via our sewage and domestic water systems. I am not sure of the concentration of the district’s discharge, but this is necessary for people to live, not for a company to make money. If Woodfibre LNG wants to discharge water, then I think the district should get the facts of exactly what the concentration of their discharge would be.
The remediation of the existing pollution is a very significant benefit of this project and the partnership with WLNG and the Squamish Streamkeepers to monitor and regenerate fish habitat is also good.

All of those points are a concern! Why limit us to 3!!!??

Let me ask you this, if you lived in a beautiful house that provided for you and kept you warm and safe and then something just moved in and dirtied it and made life just unpleasant.. Would you like that? We have to think about the wildlife not only in the estuary, mill creek and surrounding areas but in the grand scheme of things. What about the tankers that will cross over to China. What about the whales and fish that live in these waters. We humans are not the only living things on this planet. We are greedy and think the earth is ours to develop. IT IS NOT. IT simply is not. When will we wake up to this? We need the earth healthy in order to survive. The earth does not need us. It will eventually heal long after we destroyed ourselves. Do i really need to list a bunch of facts of why i think you should consider when there is already so many already on the internet and in public knowledge. What we have to do is just stop and take a look outside. This is not ours to destroy.

I will first draw on the expertise of others:

1. SAFETY: Siting an LNG facility in Howe Sound violates international safety standards and practices, putting Howe Sound residents at risk.

As LNG tankers transit Howe Sound, there is a high-danger zone for 1,600 metres (1-mile) on either side of the LNG tanker. If an accident happens, people within this zone risk death by asphyxiation, or death/injury by fire or explosion. Every time a tanker travels through Howe Sound (approximately 6-8 transits a month according to Woodfibre LNG) several Howe Sound communities will be in that high-danger zone, including: Bowen Island, Bowyer Island, Anvil Island, Passage Island, Porteau Cove, West Vancouver, and parts of the Sea to Sky highway. The Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) LNG Terminal Siting Standards states that LNG terminals should not be located in narrow, inland waterways with dense local populations and significant commercial, recreational, and ferry traffic. Why would that guideline not apply to Howe Sound? The proposed siting of the Woodfibre LNG terminal and associated transit of LNG tankers through Howe Sound poses an unacceptable risk to safety of people in communities along the shores of Howe Sound.

Sources: Sandia Report, 2004 and SIGTTO LNG Terminal Siting Standards

2. ENVIRONMENT: The once-through seawater cooling system proposed by Woodfibre LNG is outdated.

Woodfibre LNG is proposing an outdated and damaging cooling method to help cool the LNG facility. They propose to extract 17,000 tonnes (= 3.7 million gallons, or 7 Olympic-sized 50-meter swimming pools) of seawater from Howe Sound, chlorinate it, heat it, and then spit it back out into the sound every hour of every day for the next 25 years. This method has been banned in California and several other places as it is very damaging to marine life such as juvenile salmon, herring, and plankton which are the building blocks for all other life in Howe Sound. If the herring are impacted, the dolphins, orcas, and humpbacks are also impacted as they no longer have a food supply. The impacts of increased water temperatures and the addition of chlorinated seawater will likely reverse the recent revival of marine life in Howe Sound, which is just now recovering from the toxic legacies of previous industries. This is unacceptable.

3. HEALTH: Social costs and health impacts of air pollution

Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Emissions of NOx and SO2 interact with other compounds to form fine particles, which can affect both the lungs and the heart. Exposure to these particles is linked to increased risk of respiratory symptoms, such as irritation of the airways, coughing, or difficulty breathing; decreased lung function; aggravated asthma; onset
of chronic bronchitis; irregular heartbeat; nonfatal heart attacks; and premature death in people with heart or lung disease. A new study published in the scientific journal, Climatic Change, estimates the true social costs of air pollution that aren’t accounted for in the cost of fossil fuels and other pollutants. Social costs include the health impacts of air pollution as well as impacts from climate change. The study found that sulfur dioxide costs $42,000 per tonne, and nitrous oxides cost $67,000 per tonne. Sources:


4. SITE SUITABILITY: The Woodfibre site is not a safe location for a hazardous LNG facility

On February 15th, 2015, a 3.4 magnitude earthquake hit Vancouver’s coast that was felt throughout Howe Sound. The Woodfibre LNG proposal is located within this zone of moderate to high earthquake risk, on two known thrust faults. The Woodfibre site also has a history of slope failure. In 1955 a wharf and three warehouses collapsed into Howe Sound at the Woodfibre site, causing $500,000 – $750,000 in damages (Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4). A recent, but unreleased, geotechnical study by Knight Piesold identifies that approximately 46% of the study area was mapped as having rapid mass movement. This means landslides and slope slumpage... including existing natural landslide hazards as well as terrain where construction activity may increase landslide initiation. Why hasn’t the geotechnical study by Knight Piesold been released?

Sources:
Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4
B.C. Ministry of Energy and Mines

5. ECONOMY: The requested socio-economic study has not been provided

During construction, only 4.3% of jobs (=38.5 out of 895) will be for locals living in the Squamish/Whistler corridor (See Table 6.2-8 of the Labour Market section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Why are there so few jobs predicted to be filled by workers in the Squamish/SLRD area? The EA application is also very unclear about how many of the 100 full-time jobs will be filled by residents of Howe Sound once the LNG terminal is operational. What are the benefits to Squamish? What are the costs? There is still no clarity around how much in municipal taxes will be paid to the District of Squamish. How will this project impact existing small businesses and existing industries in Howe Sound?

6. CLIMATE CHANGE: 142 thousand tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions is unacceptable

Woodfibre LNG is now estimating greenhouse gas emissions to be 142 thousand tonnes of CO2 equivalent every year. These annual emissions of CO2 equivalent from Woodfibre LNG is equal to adding over 18,000 cars to the highway, driving to Vancouver and back, every day. This is more than six times greater than current highway traffic. It is irresponsible to approve this kind of polluting industry at a time when we need to transition away from fossil fuels to mitigate the risks associated with climate change, and to reduce the economic and health impacts of air pollution in general.
7. GOVERNMENT REGULATION: Inability of government to monitor, enforce, and respond to issues

There are no regulations adopted to regulate this LNG industry from a technical standpoint. Any of the current standards are not applicable to the LNG industry. Do the regulators have the knowledge and the expertise and the capacity to oversee this industry or will they be relying on the proponent to monitor themselves and report to the regulator? Self-monitoring industries have created several examples of accidents with resulting environmental destruction in recent years, including the Lac Megantic rail disaster and the Mt Polley tailing pond spill.

8. ENVIRONMENT: Removal of water from Mill Creek unsustainable for fish life

Woodfibre LNG has secured the water license to extract water from Mill Creek, which flows through the Woodfibre site. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans has objected to this because the amount of water that WLNG is proposing to remove will reduce water levels in Mill Creek to levels that will no longer support fish life, especially in the summer months. Woodfibre LNG needs to source water for this project from somewhere else to protect this important stream habitat which is home to several native fish species.

9. ENVIRONMENT: Missing baseline studies

The following baseline studies are either missing or are inadequate as they do not conform to any recognized scientific standards: fish, birds, marine mammals, air quality, shipping, water quality, marine sound, and atmospheric sound, marine life near the Woodfibre site, and the cumulative impact assessment. Proper studies need to be completed before any decisions can be made regarding this project.

10. VIEWSCAPES: BC Hydro clearcut of two 64 metre swaths of forest at the Woodfibre site will impact viewscapes from the Sea to Sky highway and the gondola

BC Hydro is proposing to clearcut two 64 metre swaths of forest at the Woodfibre site which will create visible scars in the Howe Sound viewscape which will be very visible from the highway and the gondola. This information was only made available during the recent BC Hydro open house held on 19th March, near the end of the public comment period. This information is not included in the cumulative impact assessment of the Woodfibre application and it should be. This late release of information pertinent to this project and the timing of the BC Hydro open houses is unsatisfactory.

11. ENVIRONMENT: 9000 year old glass sponge reefs endangered by tanker traffic

LNG tankers do not have enough clearance to get over the 9000 year old reef if they go off course. These 9000 year old glass sponge reefs have been called “Living Fossils” by National Geographic as until recently this species was thought to have gone extinct over 60 million years ago. MLA Jordan Sturdy recently made a statement in the House about the importance of this discovery in Halkett Bay near Gambier Island, and to support the proposal to expand the Provincial Park Protected Area to ensure these reefs are protected.

Sources:
http://jordansturdymla.ca/bcltv_videos/mla‐sturdy‐halkett‐bays‐glass‐sponges/
12. ENVIRONMENT: Will there be smog? Will there be a smell?

Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application).

Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2) is a reddish-brown gas with a pungent, irritating odour. It absorbs light and leads to the yellow-brown “smog” pollution haze seen hanging over cities. It is known to irritate the lungs and increase susceptibility to respiratory infections. In combination with either ozone (O3) or sulphur dioxide (SO2), nitrogen dioxide may cause injury at even lower concentration levels.

Sulphur Dioxide (SO2) is a toxic gas with a pungent, irritating, and rotten smell. Current scientific evidence links short-term exposures to SO2, ranging from 5 minutes to 24 hours, with an array of adverse respiratory effects including bronchoconstriction and increased asthma symptoms. These effects are particularly important for asthmatics at elevated ventilation rates (e.g., while exercising or playing). Studies also show a connection between short-term exposure and increased visits to emergency departments and hospital admissions for respiratory illnesses, particularly in at-risk populations including children, the elderly, and asthmatics. The addition of these air pollutants in Howe Sound is of particular concern as recent research by MSc student Annie Seagram (studying under Professor Douw Steyn, Department of Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Sciences at the University of British Columbia) has shown that the Howe Sound airshed and Lower Fraser Valley airshed are connected. Emissions from Woodfibre LNG will add to the pollution in Howe Sound, exacerbating the existing air quality conditions, particularly in the Squamish-Brackendale corridor.

Note that Metro Vancouver annually issues several Air Quality Advisories due to high concentrations of ground-level ozone. This pollution also impacts the Howe Sound and Squamish, and exposure to these pollutants are of particular concern for infants, the elderly, and is directly linked to health issues such as lung or heart disease and asthma.

In addition: the BC government needs to ensure the protection of the 9000 year old glass sponge reef at Halkett Bay off Gambier Island.

About Glass Sponge Reefs: http://www.eao.gov.bc.ca/pcp/forms/Woodfibre_LNG_form.html

Glass Sponge Reefs in Halkett Bay off of Gambier Island

MLA Jordan Sturdy spoke in Legislature about the glass sponge reef at Halkett Bay off Gambier Island.
http://jordansturdymla.ca/bctv_videos/mla-sturdy-halkett-bays-glass-sponges/

Tankers do not have enough clearance to get over the 9000 year old reef if any off course action happens.

Transport Canada Dangerous Goods Dept. is not at all ready for LNG. In fact they now have a task force for rail and road.

I have been a member of 2 Stakeholder Teams focused on the protection and restoration of salmon habitat. I include information and links for your convenience and ask that a similar project be implemented for the WLNG and Fortis BC applications.
2005 SALMON RECOVERY PLAN
Entire Salmon Life Cycle
$250,000 Pacific Salmon Foundation

$2 million
5 year plan
Cheakamus Salmon Recovery
Squamish Nation and Stakeholders

CERT C
Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Technical Committee

The Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Technical Committee (CERTC) website, provides information on Cheakamus ecosystem restoration activities.

CERTC was formed in August 2005 in response to a train derailment and subsequent spill of sodium hydroxide into the Cheakamus River. CERTC’s mandate is to understand ecosystem-level impacts and develop restoration and monitoring strategies for affected species to accelerate the return of the Cheakamus ecosystem to a pre-spill state as quickly as reasonably possible. CERTC Terms of Reference (pdf).

CERTC recommends programs for implementation to the Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Steering Committee based on input from experienced professionals, external specialists, interested parties and the public.

Both committees include representatives of:

CN
District of Squamish
Fisheries and Oceans Canada
BC Ministry of Environment
Squamish Nation

Thank you for your interest in Cheakamus ecosystem restoration.

Comments can be made to CERTC at comments@cerc.ca

Fish Assessment

Following the spill, B.C. Ministry of Environment (MoE) fisheries biologists, technicians and contracted staff documented fish survival and compared fish density information to available previous data.

Fish mortalities were collected from the Cheakamus River downstream of the spill, with activities including:

Recording mortalities by species and location;
Collecting length data to determine age classes of impacted fish;
Collecting scale samples to further supplement brood year identification; and, freezing and storing of samples for further examination, if required.

Fish Impact Assessment (MoE and DFO) (pdf)

MoE Estimated Impacts on Salmon and Trout Populations:

Chinook
- 25% of juveniles from 2004 spawning population
- 50% of 2005 spawning population

Chum
- juveniles not affected
- 2005 spawning population not affected

Coho
- 50% of juveniles from 2004 spawners
- 2005 spawning population not affected

Pink
- juveniles not affected
Steelhead
- 90% of mainstem juveniles from 2003 to 2005 spawners
- 2006 and 2007 steelhead spawning populations not affected

Estimated Impacts on Other Fish

Ninety percent of resident fish in the mainstem Cheakamus River may have been affected by the spill including:
- Dolly Varden/Bull Trout
- Rainbow Trout
- Lamprey (2 species)
- Sculpins (bullheads - 2 species)
- Sticklebacks
Juveniles rearing in tributary streams at the time of the spill were not affected.

Benthos Recovery Presentation - Triton Environmental, 2008 (pdf). New!
Appendices (pdf) New!

Ecological Assessment

A screening level qualitative assessment of ecological effects has been conducted for CN to understand the potential effect the spill could have had on receptors other than fish in order to identify and target the need for ecosystem restoration activities.

Given the broad scope of the project and the limited amount of available data (i.e., exposure data, such as concentration of NaOH in environmental media, NaOH ecotoxicity toward specific species) it is not possible to conduct a comprehensive ecological risk assessment for each species present in the ecosystem. The screening level assessment focused on the functions of populations and communities within the ecosystem. This recognizes populations are less sensitive than their most sensitive individual member and some effects may be observed at the population level.
without impairing the functions of the ecosystem as a whole.

Qualitative methods using subjective ecological effects ranking categories, such as high, medium and low, were used to describe the likelihood of adverse effects rather than providing a numerical estimate of effects. To minimize subjective influence, the interpretation of ecological effects contain a clear explanation of the lines of evidence leading to the conclusions, including a description of the uncertainties and assumptions used. Additionally, matrices were used to provide a structured framework for the characterization of ecological effects. The assessment used existing information from baseline and monitoring reports and from previous scientific literature.

This screening level assessment of ecological effects consists of three main steps: problem formulation, analysis and characterization of the likelihood of adverse ecological effects. Results from the ecological effects assessment will be used to determine the direction of future recovery efforts for other components of the Cheamamus River ecosystem.

For more details, view the

Ecological Final Report (pdf) New!
Amphibian Assessment – October 2007 (pdf) New!
Study Design: Screening Level Assessment of Ecological Effects (pdf)
[ Back to Top ]

Water Quality

River Sampling

Water quality professionals tested and monitored the following:
Water quality in the Cheakamus and Squamish Rivers, August 5 - 8, 2005
Water quality in the Cheakamus during site remediation activities, August 10 - 26, 2005
Water quality in the Cheakamus after rainfall events, August 17 - October 28, 2005

Monitoring was conducted over a variety of meteorological conditions and river levels. The parameters monitored included: pH and conductivity, sodium, total dissolved and total suspended solids, total and dissolved organic carbon.

Results

The Cheakamus River was cleared for recreation after 24 hours by Vancouver Coastal Health on August 6, 2005. Water quality downstream of the derailment site was determined to be similar to that upstream.

Well Sampling

Forty-eight wells within 100 metres of the Cheakamus River were sampled on August 6 and 7, 2005. The parameters
monitored included pH and conductivity, sodium, total dissolved and total suspended solids.

The sampling was coordinated by Environment Canada, Vancouver Coastal Health Authority, Triton Environmental Consultants Ltd., and Quantum Environmental Services.

Drinking water from wells was cleared for drinking by the Vancouver Coastal Health Authority after 48 hours on August 8, 2005.

No additional detailed water quality sampling is required.

Water Quality Report – September 2007 (pdf)
Water Quality Report Appendices – September 2007 (pdf)
http://certc.ca/recovery_fund.shtml

CERT C Stakeholder Team

The Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Stakeholder Team (Stakeholder Team), established by CERTC, is a public advisory group comprised of representatives from interested organizations and individuals with local knowledge of and experience with the Cheakamus River.

Meeting Notes

September 30, 2010 (pdf) New!
June 24, 2010 (pdf)
March 25, 2010 (pdf)
October 29, 2009 (pdf)
June 17, 2009 (pdf)
March 5, 2009 (pdf)
November 27, 2008 (pdf)
September 25, 2008 (pdf)
May 27, 2008 (pdf)
March 27, 2008 (pdf)
January 24, 2008 (pdf)
December 6th, 2007 (pdf)
September 27, 2007 (pdf)
June 21st, 2007 (pdf)
April 25th, 2007 (pdf)
February 28th, 2007 (pdf)
December 6th, 2006 (pdf)
July 6th, 2006 (pdf)
May 25th, 2006 (pdf)
April 27, 2006 (pdf)
March 25, 2006 (pdf)

Presentations

Overview of the Cheakamus River Large Woody Debris Stream bank Protection and fish habitat development project, June 2011 (pdf) New!
Update on Cheakamus River recovery strategies and monitoring programs, March 2009 (pdf) New!
Update on Cheakamus River recovery strategies and monitoring programs, January 2012 (pdf) New!
Cheakamus River Sculpin Recovery Presentation to CERST - Fall 2010 (pdf)
Adult Wild-and Hatchery-Origin Steelhead Returns to the Cheakamus River in 2009(pdf)
Cheakamus River Bull Trout Radiotelemetry and Enumeration Program, 2007-2009(pdf)
Cheakamus River Side Channel Re-watering Projects, March 2010 (pdf)

Role

The Stakeholder Team provides input into the development and implementation of monitoring and restoration programs for the Cheakamus ecosystem.

The Team helps coordinate and communicate comments and recommendations from interested parties to CERTC, and also receives updates on CERTC activities, as the information becomes available. All input from the Stakeholder Team is considered advisory in nature and final decisions regarding monitoring and restoration programs rests with CERTC and the Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Steering Committee.

Stakeholder Team Terms of Reference

CERTC Communication to the Stakeholder Team

CERTC Responses to Dec 6 2006 Stakeholder Team Questions (pdf)
http://certc.ca/public_events.shtml Events and Brochures.
http://certc.ca/monitoring_programs.shtml
http://certc.ca/recovery_plan.shtml to 2012

SQUAMISH ESTUARY MANAGEMENT PLAN

[PDF]Skwelwil'em Squamish Estuary Wildlife Management Plan


PDF]View the 1999 Squamish Estuary Management Plan

REPORT OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE ON THE PROPOSED
SQUAMISH ESTUARY MANAGEMENT PLAN

Volume One and TWO THE PLAN  September 1982

Volume TWO Pages 211 to 233 re: PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT WORK GROUP
REVIEWS OF SEMP DRAFT 1982


PAGE 94

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT WORK GROUP MEMBERS
Squamish Estuary Nature Centre ad hoc Committee
Squamish Council
1999
SEMP
https://squamish.civicweb.net/document/10318/February%202,%201999

Page 19  Signatures to 1999 SEMP


1982 TO 1992
SEMP!

Howe Sound has also been improved because the Fraser Basin Council has successfully restored the waters at Britannia Beach on Howe Sound BC.
http://www.fraserbasin.bc.ca/about_britannia.html

Clean up after industry pollutes is never complete and restoration actually takes centuries.
The economy here in Howe Sound no longer depends on big polluting industry. What is evolving is self-employment in businesses that depend on "the scenery". Like the film industry. Also tourist activities because HOWE SOUND NOW HAS WHALES! DOLPHINS! HERRING!

Eagles and salmon have always drawn the public to the wilds of Howe Sound. People stay to live in a healthy environment and to co-exist with nature. There are economic benefits to all aspects from the sea, keeping the wild fishing industry to the sky where Whistler/Blackcomb are world class ski resorts with a growing population in what was once a village. Our proximity to Vancouver BC, also a source of employment, allows those who live in the Howe Sound area to park the car and enjoy recreating without it when not commuting to work elsewhere.

The LNG Project needs to be assessed as a having a negative impact on a recovering Howe Sound.

Many have written who have been able to study and report on the negative impact of the WLNG project, the Fortis BC pipeline and the gigantic tankers.

For me this is a forced endeavor. I feel quite intimidated by the fact that the WLNG company can afford $250 million dollar fines for environmental atrocities elsewhere.

It brings to mind that Woodfibre had 600 pollution violations that could have been charged against the owners and the government would not allow that to happen in 1983.

When in 2005 Woodfibre was closed, there was a statement from the government that the Woodfibre site would never again be used for industry. The re-zoning never took place and now this is a legal application with deadly consequences. Global warming could have been avoided had alternative energies been used these last 40 plus years.

I have lived here since 1977 and I have enjoyed the transition to a Howe Sound that is recovering. Those moving to Squamish now, afford to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars to buy a small accommodation here. This isn't so as to return to dirty industry and the putrid polluted smell of money when industry has an "accident".

Sincerely

XXXXXXXX

205. I believe we have witnessed the improvement of our water since Wood fiber closed such as the return of the orcas. I do not want to see this destroyed

206. All points are important, but keeping LNG from starting is most important.

207. Woodfibre LNG has bought the water license to take water from Mill Creek. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans has objected to this because the amount of water that WLNG is proposing to remove will reduce water levels in Mill Creek to levels that will no longer support fish life, especially in the summer months. Woodfibre LNG needs to source water for this project from somewhere else.

The once-through seawater cooling system proposed by Woodfibre LNG is outdated.

Woodfibre LNG is proposing an outdated and damaging cooling method to help cool the LNG facility. They propose to extract 17,000 tonnes (= 3.7 million gallons, or 7 Olympic-sized 50-meter swimming pools) of seawater from Howe Sound, chlorinate it, heat it, and then spit it back out into the sound every hour of every day for the next 25 years. This method has been banned in California and several other places as it is very damaging to marine life such as juvenile salmon, herring, and plankton which are the building blocks for all other life in Howe Sound. If the herring are
Impacted, the dolphins, orcas, and humpbacks are also impacted as they no longer have a food supply. The impacts of increased water temperatures and the addition of chlorinated seawater will likely reverse the recent revival of marine life in Howe Sound, which is just now recovering from the legacies of previous industries. This is unacceptable.

208. Our water is just starting to support diverse marine life and despite all the marketing that this project will not have an impact, significantly increase tanker traffic, etc. it will. Accidents are not planned and an accident with these tankers, the pipelines or the site could have catastrophic impact on the water.

209. with the sea water intake, this will take in all invertebrates, algae etc, in, ie nothing is screened out. This will have a major effect on marine life. Constant noise and light pollution on site will have negative effects on the marine ecosystem. Re pipeline, impacts to water quality, fish streams and culmulative effects of water quality downstream will be serious effects.

All these points above are important, it is difficult to limit to 3. the point Monitoring and tracking pollutants in the foreshore marine environment over time is very important also. We need to have a baseline and monitoring in place so that if this was to go ahead there would need to be limits / thresholds that would trigger action.

210. Any type of additional pollution for the sake of "economic growth" is unacceptable. It has taken a long time for Squamish to recover from the pulp and paper mill. The beauty of Squamish lies in its people's commitment to the outdoors, the environment and NOT to industrial development.

211. Once-through cooling systems have been banned in California and several other places as they are very damaging to marine life such as juvenile salmon, herring, and plankton which are the building blocks for all other life in Howe Sound. Why would we allow such a system to be introduced here? The intake/discharge would run 24/7 for the entire life of the project. That is a lot of Howe Sound water having all its plankton and valuable ecosystem contributions cooked. It would be a cumulative, ongoing damaging process.

Howe Sound water and marine life is just finally recovering from previous industry. Let's allow that recovery to continue, not put it at risk, especially at this fragile stage.

The source of the natural gas to fuel the LNG project would be from fracking in NE BC. Fracking uses and pollutes a huge amount of water and contaminates groundwater. To expand that industry, especially for the sake of export is not acceptable.

Would construction of the pipeline in the estuary disturb any existing contaminants there? e.g. remaining bunker fuel from the spill some years ago?

212. Water is something we are blessed with in Bc but it is also one of the basic things we need to live. Clean water and protecting the sound are a priority for residents who live and come to play here.

213. Hard to choose, as foreshore impacts are also very important, as is protecting fish habitat. Re: impacts to estuary - I'm concerned about the precedent that might be set by allowing industrial uses in the WMA. Fragmentation of habitat.

Alternatives to 'once through' sea water cooling are available and should be used (if the project goes ahead).

214. Squamish has already been down this path. Most of the World is currently on this path. We all know its time for something new. You, (we) have all worked so hard to see improvements in the estuary and Squamish is in a great position to lead the way in Canada in this new movement. Let's make it sustainable in our town and on our shores, beautify our shore-lines and create examples of healthy communities.
215. Clean water, both fresh and marine, is a crucial value for our community. This project puts the safety of our estuary and our marine ecosystem at too great a risk.

Woodfibre LNG is proposing an outdated and damaging cooling method to help cool the LNG facility. They propose to extract 17,000 tonnes (= 3.7 million gallons, or 7 Olympic-sized 50-meter swimming pools) of seawater from Howe Sound, chlorinate it, heat it, and then spit it back out into the sound every hour of every day for the next 25 years. This method has been banned in California and several other places as it is very damaging to marine life such as juvenile salmon, herring, and plankton which are the building blocks for all other life in Howe Sound. If the herring are impacted, the dolphins, orcas, and humpbacks are also impacted as they no longer have a food supply. The impacts of increased water temperatures and the addition of chlorinated seawater will likely reverse the recent revival of marine life in Howe Sound, which is just now recovering from the toxic legacies of previous industries. This is unacceptable.

Woodfibre LNG has secured the water license to extract water from Mill Creek, which flows through the Woodfibre site. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans has objected to this because the amount of water that WLNG is proposing to remove will reduce water levels in Mill Creek to levels that will no longer support fish life, especially in the summer months. Woodfibre LNG needs to source water for this project from somewhere else to protect this important stream habitat which is home to several native fish species.

216. Impacts the the Marine environment: Squamish is a coastal community and our economy rely on a clean and abundant ocean.

217. Monitoring and tracking pollutants in the foreshore marine environment over time. WILL also be important.

218. I want to know what will happen in the event of a leak and how our water will be monitored? I want to know the affect of toxic build up with regards to the water for both sea life and drinking water?

219. Combining concerns and benefits into one question is weird. The issue with Mill Creek is the amount of water being extracted from it. DFO thinks this will make it uninhabitable for fish during the low flow summer months.

220. The biggest environmental problem with WLNG is the plant itself (and at this point I’m including compressors located offsite or on site, as well as the pipeline delivering the gas). You cannot view all pieces of the puzzle as separate entities. WLNG cooling system has been described as state of the art, but many parts of the world have banned it, here is why: it is a system that slowly sterilizes everything is How Sound. The system intakes everything from below the water’s surface and the “screens out” larger objects. However, everything 4mm and under gets killed. That’s right. Take a look at the schematic drawings. The screen through which objects pass has 4mm diameter holes. Plankton, salmon and fish eggs, small fish, microbes, fish fry, essentially a world of species that feeds other species gets heated to 18 degrees Celsius (killed), and pumped back out at a temperature of 18 degrees. Now WLNG will tell you that it’s a lower temperature within 10 meters – that doesn’t matter. What are you heating the water to? 18. That’s what’s going out. “Sometimes” or more likely often, pipes will be flushed with chemicals to prevent algae growth in the cooling system. While the chlorine is removed from the water, no one knows if this is actual the case, and whether other chemicals are also used in the treatment, and then released in to Howe Sound. This right here is the biggest problem – it’s a killing machine of all species in the water by raising our ocean water temperature. And I don’t need to tell you that this is bad. You already know this.

221. This is a very difficult question to answer. If I was a creature that lived in Howe Sound or the estuary what would be the most important issue to me? Polluting my home with toxins, cleaning up existing toxins, or driving me crazy with noise and vibration so that I must move away? They are ALL important.

222. SEMP was the result of a lot of work and collaboration by all agencies and seems to lack any teeth to prevent Fortis industrial activity in the estuary. We have made a commitment to protect the estuary, the council must stand firm on this issue.
The seawater once-through cooling system has been banned in some jurisdiction because of its damaging impact on marine environments. This cooling system should not be allowed.

WLNG has a water license for Mill Creek and can take as much as water as they want, this can result in the creek running dry. Mill Creek must be protected.

223. 6. A study needs to take place on the once through cooling system. I am certain you have heard plenty of details and concerns on this one. I’d like to see a study of the ‘dead’ water that comes out of the system and dumped into Howe Sound in shocking amounts. Boiled, chlorinated water, even when scrubbed does not make this a benign activity. Nothing (no micro organism), nothing will survive this process. Can our marine life thrive in this? I highly doubt that very much. At the volumes they will be killing the water, at what point is the damage acceptable? In my opinion..zero damage like this is acceptable.

224. The once-through seawater cooling system proposed by Woodfibre LNG is outdated

Woodfibre LNG is proposing an outdated and damaging cooling method to help cool the LNG facility. They propose to extract 17,000 tonnes (= 3.7 million gallons, or 7 Olympic-sized 50-meter swimming pools) of seawater from Howe Sound, chlorinate it, heat it, and then spit it back out into the sound every hour of every day for the next 25 years. This method has been banned in California and several other places as it is very damaging to marine life such as juvenile salmon, herring, and plankton which are the building blocks for all other life in Howe Sound. If the herring are impacted, the dolphins, orcas, and humpbacks are also impacted as they no longer have a food supply. The impacts of increased water temperatures and the addition of chlorinated seawater will likely reverse the recent revival of marine life in Howe Sound, which is just now recovering from the toxic legacies of previous industries. This is unacceptable.

Removal of water from Mill Creek unsustainable for fish life

Woodfibre LNG has secured the water license to extract water from Mill Creek, which flows through the Woodfibre site. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans has objected to this because the amount of water that WLNG is proposing to remove will reduce water levels in Mill Creek to levels that will no longer support fish life, especially in the summer months. Woodfibre LNG needs to source water for this project from somewhere else to protect this important stream habitat which is home to several native fish species.

Missing baseline studies

The following baseline studies are either missing or are inadequate as they do not conform to any recognized scientific standards: fish, birds, marine mammals, air quality, shipping, water quality, marine sound, and atmospheric sound, marine life near the Woodfibre site, and the cumulative impact assessment. Proper studies need to be completed before any decisions can be made regarding this project.
Increased water temperatures and the addition of chlorinated seawater will likely reverse the recent revival of marine life in Howe Sound, which is just now recovering from the toxic legacies of previous industries. This is unacceptable.

Removal of water from Mill Creek unsustainable for fish life

Woodfibre LNG has secured the water license to extract water from Mill Creek, which flows through the Woodfibre site. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans has objected to this because the amount of water that WLNG is proposing to remove will reduce water levels in Mill Creek to levels that will no longer support fish life, especially in the summer months. Woodfibre LNG needs to source water for this project from somewhere else to protect this important stream habitat which is home to several native fish species.

Missing baseline studies

The following baseline studies are either missing or are inadequate as they do not conform to any recognized scientific standards: fish, birds, marine mammals, air quality, shipping, water quality, marine sound, and atmospheric sound, marine life near the Woodfibre site, and the cumulative impact assessment. Proper studies need to be completed before any decisions can be made regarding this project.

226. Howe sound has very nutrient dense water. These nutrients will get destroyed in the once - through water cooling system. So not only will the water be chlorinated and will have a higher acidity level than before intake, it also will be up to 10°C warmer and "dead water" containing no nutrients. The fact that WLNG will suck up 17,000 cubic metres of ocean water every hour for the next 25 is crazy. How will the pH level of the discharged water be monitored and who will monitor it? What are the long term effects of replacing huge amounts (over time) of nutrient dense water into "dead" water and pumping it back into Howe Sound?

What are the noise levels that will get emitted from the floating storage unit? How can this be asset before the plant is in operation?

What impacts will this have on juvenile fish, on orca, dolphins, herring ...?

Estuary

In recent years Estuaries finally have been recognized for what they are, key players for a healthy marine & wildlife. Healthy estuaries are critical for the continued survival of many species of fish and other aquatic life, birds, mammals, and reptiles. Our Estuary is slowly recovering from abuse caused by humans. We are so lucky that many people have put in countless hours to help its recovery. Drilling and laying a 24” pipeline in our estuary will have a huge effect on it. Even Fortis’ biologist who spoke at one of the council meetings kept pointing out that the area for the test drilling was "highly sensitive". Remediation is a great word but really damage done is irreversible.

227. How pumping that much water heated filtered back in Howe sound will affect

228. Howe sound has very nutrient dense water. These nutrients will get destroyed in the once - through water cooling system. So not only will the water be chlorinated and will have a higher acidity level than before intake, it also will be up to 10°C warmer and "dead water" containing no nutrients. The fact that WLNG will suck up 17,000 cubic metres of ocean water every hour for the next 25 is crazy. How will the pH level of the discharged water be monitored and who will monitor it? What are the long term effects of replacing huge amounts (over time) of nutrient dense water into "dead" water and pumping it back into Howe Sound?

What are the noise levels that will get emitted from the floating storage unit? How can this be asset before the plant is
What impacts will this have on juvenile fish, on orca, dolphins, herring, etc?

Estuaries

In recent years Estuaries have been recognized for what they are, key players for a healthy marine & wildlife.

Healthy estuaries are critical for the continued survival of many species of fish and other aquatic life, birds, mammals, and reptiles. Our Estuary is slowly recovering from abuse caused by humans. We are so lucky that many people have put in countless hours to help its recovery. Drilling and laying a 24" pipeline in our estuary will have a huge effect on it. Even Fortis' biologist who spoke at one of the council meetings kept pointing out that the area for the test drilling was "highly sensitive". Remediation is a great word but really damage done is irreversible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>229.</td>
<td>Quantities used, quality, and temp of returned water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230.</td>
<td>Pipeline, compressor facility and Woodribre LNG Plant should be designed not to affect salt or river water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231.</td>
<td>Extracting 7000 tons of seawater from Howe Sound, chlorinating it and heating it then returning it to the Sound every hour is very damaging to marine life. This will likely reverse the recent revival of Howe Sound marine life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232.</td>
<td>The impact on the water needs to be minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233.</td>
<td>Once through cooling systems are barbaric; there is not positive impact to adding WLN to Howe Sound. There are too many unknowns to conduct an industrial scale experiment in Howe Sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234.</td>
<td>Strict monitoring of ships, tugs, barges regarding oil, heavy diesel spills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235.</td>
<td>Only in the last year or so have we seen a comeback of some traditional sea life (dolphins, orcas, herring, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236.</td>
<td>The chlorination process the vast amount of chlorinated water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237.</td>
<td>Not acceptable to put a LNG pipeline through a wildlife management area - possible leaks due to earthquakes or equipment failure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We do not live in isolation anymore or in fact anywhere. The world is connected for better or worse more than it ever has been. The economy is truly global. Climate change is global. Therefore it makes sense that in order to reduce greenhouse gas and replace it with cleaner alternatives we all need to participate. We send cleaner fuel to places that depend now on less clean fuels. And we improve the economy as a result.

Nothing in life comes without risk. Separating fact from hearsay and hype from deliberate thought will be a challenge. Hype after all is part of the problem not part of the solution.

I am always mystified by those who would like to participate in the benefits of a global economy without taking
part in any of the byproduct of said economy. Minimizing that risk is the key.

From an environmental and economic standpoint this project makes sense.

4. It is a terrible idea and will only kill an existing healthy marine life.

5. Fact is, Squamish is a place people from all over the world come to in order to enjoy its beauty and tranquility. With LNG, Squamish would be taking large steps in the wrong direction in terms of how to deal with its environment.

6. I’m so glad the site will be remediated it’s terrible right now and this will be a huge improvement.

7. The location of the proposed LNG plant is ideal for Squamish. The area is currently an industrial site, away from the current recreational area of the wind and kite surfers, the vessel traffic will not be mooring, like in Vancouver Harbour, but going directly to and away from the plant in a similar traffic lane to the vessels currently visiting the port of squamish. I would like to see the LNG plant working with the stream keepers, using the new docks to support even more herring stock, and I would like to know that the water discharge would not effect ocean habitat. The reclamation and remediation of the pollutants from the old site (docks and lands) will be a huge benefit.

8. Council don't need to know my feelings, they need to examine the long term effects on the population of Squamish beyond the short term economic bump in jobs.

9. The Squamish Estuary is the soul of our community. It is everything I love about Squamish and why I choose to live here. There is great magic and beauty and life in the estuary, the ocean and our watershed. I will not let anything happen to this endangered ecosystem. Not after all we've done to restore it. This year alone, 600 students from Squamish elementary schools will visit this living classroom to experience science and nature first hand. The estuary is also the pride of Squamish. My family and I will fight till the end to protect the estuary and all it's connected to.

10. I really don't think this is a good thing for Squamish -there is more to lose than to gain. We have one of the most beautiful fjords in North America -it is a huge asset to this town that we should use in a positive way-Look at all the positives the sea to sky gondola has brought -do people really want to look at Tankers and an LNG facility from the viewpoint. I think not!!

11. This LNG proposal is not necessary for Squamish. It is not right for Squamish. The trend is to transition to Green energies. There is no evidence that LNG would reduce Greenhouse Gases if shipped to Asia.

12. What studies have been done to assess the impact that the millions of gallons of chlorinated water being pumped into Howe Sound each year from Woodfibre LNG?

13. How is DoS demonstrating leadership in terms of all industrial activities in Howe Sound. You may not have decision making power but you have influence in terms of asking questions rather than saying no.

14. Estuaries are like the kidneys of the earth. They mitigate so much of our pollution and runoff. I am concerned that the pipeline will negatively impact the integrity and function of the estuary. Overall, I am concerned with the impact of this project on marine life. We are just entering a time where dolphins and killer whales are returning to Howe Sound. Do we want to reverse the progress that we have made? Any discharge of warmer, chlorinated water into the ocean will impact life (even at lower levels).

15. Thus would be a betrayal to the newly developed vision of Squamish and a tragic decision that would turn the clock back in time, returning Squamish to an industry town. Anyone who thinks Eco tourism and large scale gas industry are complete fools.

16. Pollutants should also include noise, light and sound (including underwater sound). Not solely chemical pollutants.

17. Our biodiversity is just beginning to return. To risk it's destruction once again for economic "potential" is pure folly with truly terrifying repercussions.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Absolute Dread ... please just say No!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I feel very strongly that Squamish has so much natural beauty and that is our strength... LNG doesn't fit with our natural values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>wildlife corridors to and from estuary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>This project poses too great a risk to the Health of Howe sound waters to be worthwhile for the community of Squamish.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 22. | I value clean water.  
I value the sustenance the ocean gives me and my family.  
I value water as an integral part of the spirit of Squamish. |
| 23. | I think that this is a very important decision and it speaks volumes about how council views where this town is headed. Right now we are kicking butt with tourism, we are attracting all sorts of outdoor, active, smart, wealthy people, we are attracting rec-tec businesses and we are growing. We are showcasing the world how awesome our little town is and how incredible our environment is and everyone wants to come here for those reasons. We are on a roll... why stammer that? Why risk all that has been building up over the last 10 years for a plant and a method that is not sustainable in the long run? Why risk it for something that could ruin our environment in all aspects if there was an accident? Why risk the beautiful, healthy environment we have built for ourselves and the future? Why not focus on ways that will help us to protect our health and the health of our children in the long run? It's just not worth it- especially since we have so much going for us already. Develop the ocean front and you would see a way bigger return in the long run for Squamish then if that LNG plant goes in. |
| 24. | The Howe Sound and estuary in recent years are seeing life again. Marine life such as large herring schools, dolphins and whales, as well as plant life and crustaceans/octopus are returning due to the health of the area once again. I feel that the LNG Woodfibre and pipeline project will disrupt the movement toward a healthy ecosystem in the Howe Sound and estuary. The estuary and Sound have suffered major environmental disasters both historically and in recent years that have contaminated the water extensively. I think that we should not add a new potential risk to this valuable resource. |
| 25. | Council has heard about fish, I don't believe they have heard much about the amphibians. We all know this is a serious concern on any project which affects the natural environment. |
| 26. | need a good balance and so far all big industry has left the squamish area |
| 27. | I think the Ministry of Environment will hold the proponent to a high standard. |
| 28. | All of the water on this planet is essentially recycled. This is a closed system, therefore at some point we need to stop abusing and polluting the system for pure greed. You can't drink money. |
| 29. | There are many opportunities to leverage this development to improve the environment that is an environmental dead zone that has resulted from over a century of uncontrolled industry at this site. If the project does not go ahead then there will be no funding for the remediation of this site. Personally I think there can be more good results from this project than by doing nothing if the project doesn't proceed. There is actually a great opportunity through increased environmental monitoring for increasing our knowledge base of the area.  
Without a doubt there will be impacts as there is with any project that we might do, but I think it is important that we consider positive opportunities as well. If we go and build a dyke then there will be an impact on the river. By raising dykes we raise river bottoms and can actually increase the risk of catastrophic flooding because all dykes can be overtopped or undermined. Even though these impacts are real, we still go ahead and use best practices to minimize and mitigate the effects. Young engineers and biologists will have many opportunities to develop new technologies and practices to develop this site. |
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>My values tell me that LNG production is harmful to the earth’s atmosphere with all that leaks out in the process, and my values tell me that increasingly precious water is being contaminated and wasted in this LNG process too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>That if the Fortis pipeline does not go through or WLNG is not built and we get sued and lose, this town will be bankrupt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>They need to listen to everyone, we all live here and deserve the right to co ti he to enjoy life. We have a responsibility to wildlife and all organizims to take better care and ensure their lives are to help grow. It's our right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>The pipeline construction is not a concern because that area has already been used for the existing pipeline and Fortis has an excellent safety history and record of restoring the land to its original state or better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>The Howe Sound was once declared an ecological dead zone, as a result of heavy industry active in its delicate environment. Years of dedicated volunteer and non-profit rehabilitation efforts have started to pay off just recently - marine cetaceans are returning, for example. Why would we threaten this important place again? We need to be stewards of this incredible place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Further, Squamish (and the entirety of Howe Sound) is a huge tourist destination. We have made headlines internationally in the past year as one of the top places in the world to visit. Marine activities play a role in that tourism, as do the aesthetics of our marine environment. No one will kiteboard around LNG tankers. No one wants a family photo in front of a pollutant spewing plant. We cannot threaten the long-term and sustainable tourism industry, just for financial benefit of a foreign-owned company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>I've travelled to so many countries and places with the natural wealth and beauty of Howe Sound are very few and far between. The health of the water and marine life immediately impacts the health of the entire sound, as well as our local economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>We live is such a beautiful part of the world... we don't need the LNG plant... there is too much risk of something wrong and not enough analysis of long-term impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Howe Sound is a precious and invaluable asset to our community and the whole Sea to Sky Corridor. Much investment has been made via public funds to recover the Sound from its industrial past, it seems insanity to allow for the damage WLNG will cause. Human caused climate change is altering weather patterns and water is becoming an increasing issue. By supporting this project we will also support the escalation of fracking and thus uncontrolled water use by the industry. This should matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>For me, the LNG and Fortis BC pipeline project is not the Squamish I believe in. I believe our town is growing with much more opportunities for growth beyond the natural resource industry. As someone who enjoys canoeing and crabbing in the Sound, and hiking the Chief and gondola trails, I am deeply concerned about the proximity and visibility of the terminal and corresponding tanker that will be store the LNG and be a permanent fixture in Howe Sound. I fear Squamish will be taking a step back, repeating the mistakes of the past and harming the special aspects of our region that draw tourists and new locals alike. Everything about this projects feels like a big mistake that will be next to impossible to fix later should it go through.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Howe Sound is such an important part of this area. It has only recently recovered from years of industrial pollution. Reimplementing this industry is a backwards step to bringing back a health environment for residents, both human and wildlife/plants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>I feel very strongly about industry staying out of Howe Sound - we have such a precious resource that we need to protect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>the anti lng members of Council are listening to that vocal minority and are not doing their jobs and representing all of the best interests of squamish residents regardless of their personal beliefs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 42. | I think council should expect WLNG to be more innovative and to demonstrate better skills and technology advancement than the once through sea water cooling system that they are currently proposing. The recovery of a healthy ecosystem in Howe Sound is something worth far more than the tax dollars and the jobs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>I truly believe the majority of folks in Squamish reflect a cultural shift - a paradigm shift - which includes a focus on a sustainable future where we can become a leader in saying 'no more'...to get off of fossil fuels and force the powers that be to bring solar and wind online to the masses instead of extracting more of what’s underground. Climate change is a soft word for an environmentally devastated planet. We can do our part by leading the way and standing up to the Feds who sold our resources off to overseas markets. It’s not about the money. You can't drink money. Water should be the resource we protect most of all...and tankers in Howe Sound, no matter how you slice it, won't protect the water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>The natural abundance here in Squamish drive tourism from fishermen in the Squamish river to eagle watchers in Brackendale. It also drives people to want to live in Squamish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>If we don't measure it, we can't manage it. Develop a comprehensive marine environment management plan to help inform good decisions on development of Howe Sound's foreshore. I feel that the economic benefits to our town do not outweigh the marine impacts. Also, reconsider land based cooling instead of sea water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Directional drilling through the estuary and a few test holes does not bother me whatsoever. Ensuring the discharged warm water is indeed safe would be my main concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>I have lived in Squamish for just under 7 years now and I have seen the changes in the increase in sea life over the past 3 years especially. I know I have never been more excited or proud when I see what our Sound and Blind Channel and Estuary have to offer our residents and visitors and seeing the environment (the Sound) repair itself gives me and others hope for the future that we can reverse man-made catastrophes such as climate-change. Each Spring and Summer I see what is washing up on Nexen and it makes me so happy. I know that Squamish can encourage a thriving ocean front community that has a good balance of residential, commercial and light (low-emissions) industrial that provides jobs to our local residents and actual tax real, undisputed property tax revenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>I am absolutely opposed to this &quot;project&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>you are all **** idiots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>I'm concerned that if the LNG facility goes ahead before having a clear understanding of Howe Sound, that any negative changes will be blamed on other causes or, at the very least, the WLNG will be able to cast doubt on their contribution to the problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>I'm concerned about cumulative impacts of underwater noise in Howe Sound. It is not just this project, but as Squamish grows we will probably see more marine traffic. I'm glad that they are going to remove the creosote covered palings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Squamish has very little industry on its shore line. This project should clean up and bring this facility into current regulations. I am of the understanding that there will be very little water effects at this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>There are social, environment, economic and health benefits to protecting it and significant impacts to not. We have a chance to make a better choice. It may be difficult and require further educating our communities but it will be worth it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Very concerned about cumulative effects with proposed projects in Howe Sound (Burnco, WLNG etc) and increased shipping/traffic + industry acoustics will impact sea life (Orca, dolphins, herring) etc. Recent return of this wildlife signals recovery, and we need to support this going forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>I 100% oppose the LNG project. When the project first came up I was intrigued as I thought &quot;jobs for Squamish&quot; is a good thing. After researching and learning about the LNG industry and the proponent of the project I have no idea how anyone can be in favour of this project. If communities around the globe are banning fracking, why are we becoming a facilitator of the industry? It's a terrible idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>I am adamantly opposed to this unconscious consumption of water to produce fracked LNG until we learn to consume responsibly. We should be harming our environment minimally and not voluntarily for profit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
57. Our waterways are part of why I live here.

58. There is an opportunity with this development to make things better than there were before.

59. We need to 'value' our Ocean and River Waters...no more...more changes, more destructions.

60. Why take a step back to the "bad old days" now?

61. It is important that the project proceeds using proper engineering controls to minimize any potential impacts.

62. Personally, this area of the lower mainland represents the best of what British Columbia has to offer. My husband and I intend to purchase and eventually settle and move to Howe Sound to raise our family. If this pipeline goes through, we will be sorely disappointed by the short-sighted nature of the decision by a council and community that we feel (and hope) is both environmentally and progressively minded.

63. I am adamantly opposed. WFLNG does not belong in Howe Sound. We need to value the natural assets of Howe Sound and stop pretending that this type of industry is beneficial. $150 Million has been invested to date to clean up the sound after heavy industry. Without the ability to monitor this industry, we cannot stop what will happen. Let's face it, Byng was an executive at Mt Polley and he used Amer Engineering and we see the environmental issues we are having there. Now Byng is an executive at WF and he is using Amer again.

64. We will be accountable to future generations for what happens in Howe Sound, elsewhere in BC, and in the world as a result of this irresponsible use of our precious water.

65. I live in Britannia Beach and moved here in 1984. Many of us became involved in pushing for a clean-up of what was designated the "worst point source of mineral contamination in North America by the Canadian government. I have watch first the polluting chlorine plant shut down in Squamish. Then Woodfibre and finally a significant part of the remediation of the old mine at Britannia Beach was undertaken. We still carry brown sites and a heavy burden from past industry. The Woodfibre site needs to be cleaned up. With new industry moving in we will not see more than a "brown site" clean-up. Is this the future we all want for this beautiful gift we barely in recovery? While everyone is busy with downstream concerns the central issue here is neglected, fracking. Industry avoids the subject for good reasons. Internationally more and more jurisdictions are banning it outright. Fossil fuels are a sunset industry. Is this what Squamish wants to stake it long term interests on? In every way this is wrong. Try to picture what is essentially a refinery flaring off gas round the clock with the imprint of heavy industry in what is attracting the world for its natural beauty. You limit this format to 3 concerns/benefits? That isn't enough. This project fails on all fronts. It will increase our domestic energy costs. Bring very little revenue into the province and leave us with enormous debt and an ecological nightmare. Those that profit will be abroad and the money bled out of the Province.

66. Howe Sound is an important resource for the District of Squamish. It provides fresh, healthy food (fish, shellfish) as well as recreation and tourism opportunities that should be preserved.

67. The physical appearance of the facility. Architecturally the renderings available suggest a boxy looking industrial plant. Many energy facilities world wide are required to consider the presentation. Some have special designs to hide the features. We have to consider the current user groups and future users of the Howe Sound and how a big box would look. (BIG) Bjarke Ingels  https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ogXT_CI7KRU

68. I started a family here because of the natural tranquility of Squamish not the prospect of industry and jobs.

69. The proponents are either ignorant of the reality of anthropogenic climate change or don't care about sustainability. Instead of giving the petrochemical industries tax breaks and subsidies, we need to support alternative, sustainable and less harmful means of producing energy. Oil and gas reserves are finite. They will run out. Solar energy will likely be available for billions of years. It's a no brainer.

70. I started my family in Squamish for the tranquility of the natural environment of Squamish not for the potential industrial jobs.

71. It's not just the sea-life at risk if pollutants are found over time. What are the risks to Squamish's viability,
reputation and longevity as a water sports venue? Having such a valuable, natural water based recreation mecca was part of the attraction for us to move here when we started our family. We want our son to enjoy this part of Squamish’s unique and inspiring culture and awe. It sets Squamish apart from anywhere else in the world.

72. Howe Sound is too precious to become a heavy industry site AGAIN. It took many decades and lots of volunteer work to get where we are now, with a recovering ecosystem. Let’s value the environment and our health over profit from some Asian company. Let’s create a Marine Sanctuary (like Milford Sound in New Zealand), thousands of tourists would come to visit and enjoy and appreciate what has been lost in so many other places around the world. Let us do it differently here and set an example for a new era, the Green Economy.

73. If LNG goes through I will be leaving Squamish and finding a greener focused community to live.

74. I am concerned that we will be stuck with this infrastructure when we should be investing in geothermal power. Please listen to this interview with Alison Thompson, the chair and co-founder of the Canadian Geothermal Energy Association: https://soundcloud.com/the-ecoreport/bcs-geothermal-potential

75. I hope council has the courage to listen to the big picture, the long term impacts and make a choice that isn’t swayed by money.

76. I think it is a great project. An old site with many existing environmental issues, is being bought and will be reclaimed and have a new operation built with the best industry standards, including building materials, building practices and remediation the remaining environmental issues on that site today. It is great to see brown-field sites be put back to good use and help propel this community in many ways.

77. Don’t undo all the efforts and successes of Streamkeepers and other Environmental groups, by allowing an LNG plant to operate in Howe Sound.

78. Why is council now getting lobby groups directed from the federal authorities. Mr Harper setting out new incentives for construction which doesn’t go into the community it goes into big business coffers. The easy path is not the path for our community. Receiving brochures every other day spending millions on propaganda is very pathetic.

79. I love Squamish and the nature it is surrounded by. My husband and I have lived here for 35 years, our son grew up here and our granddaughters love to visit us. I cannot stay silent when I see that we are looking backwards to having a "dirty" industry on our Sound. It makes no sense to me at this time in our evolution as a community. Yes, we need more business and yes, Madam Mayor I agree with you that we need to tap into our talented resident pool to accomplish suitable businesses for our future.

80. I was on the review committee for this project and saw nothing that could not be done safely by the proponent.

81.

82. It’s an insult to our community that Fortis took the DP370 issue to Supreme Court rather than try to work with our community on exploring other options in light of our concerns and priorities on protection of the Estuary. Rather than exploring other options, Fortis is putting our community at risk for protests and actions that could otherwise be avoided.

83. Just because there are policies and procedures in place, does NOT mean we are acknowledging the blatant rape of this earth we live on. I moved to this community from Alberta to escape the disgusting oil industry. I understand we may need baby steps to get there, but this is not a wise step in any way.

84. The marine environment is facing issues of warming oceans, acidification, solution and contamination. Squamish should take the lead in saying no to adding to these important issues.

85. This is an overlooked form of pollution that is disgusting.

86. This is a boom or bust type industry. There is no guarantee of long term jobs or tax revenue. Why are we willing to risk the health of our environment on a gamble. The future of Squamish needs to be one that is green and recreation based. The businesses that match these values will come, as long as we do not industrialize what makes Squamish
so special in the first place.

87. **It took 8 years from the closing of wood fibre for howe sound to show significant signs of recovery from an industrial site. This could all be undone in three years with the development of an LNG plant. The sound exists because of its environs and wood fibre proved it doesn't take some huge development or industry to destroy and alter what goes on in the water. This is a very fragile ecosystem which we have tarnished once in the past. Lets use our 20/20 hindsight to look to the future and protect this extraordinary piece of the world.**

88. **Let's be balanced in our approach. We are built from the resource sector, but we have learned from past pros and cons to ensure we do this right.**

89. **I moved here for all the things this town has to offer and this project would certainly have changed my mind! Enough said.**

90. **They are spending far too much of their limited time trying to micromanage something that is beyond their level of expertise.**

91. **The value of industry can be calculated and it's benefits are mediated by other consequences. The value of a healthy environment is priceless, positively impacting health, economic opportunities and quality of life.**

92. **That the way of the future is green energy and fracking and exporting LNG is unlikely to bring much benefit to our community or province. Lots of risk with little chance of reward unless the price is just right and nothing goes wrong... that sounds like anything but a sure bet to me.**

93. **I am also very concerned about the impact to the foreshore marine environment from construction on the LNG site.**

94. **I fully support the LNG plant coming to Squamish/Woodfibre. I think there are risks, but there are risks with everything. Fortis has been doing this for a long time and wouldn't want to be a part of something that would tarnish their reputation.**

95. **I feel Howe Sound is a gift to us and we need to take care of the life within it. Protect the marine mammals. Have you read the EA? WF's marine mammal management plan is to avoid running into the marine mammals. How will they see them? The LNG tanker is so large that the captain can't see for 1.2km ahead (and it takes 8 km to stop the tanker). Even if the LNG tankers have super modern radar, whales etc are mostly made of water (as we are) so wouldn't show up as different against the ocean.**

96. **I am extremely concerned about the negative impact Woodfibre LNG and the accompanying Fortis pipeline construction in the estuary will have on our marine and freshwater ecosystems.**

97. **Because I'm a tax payer and you are a voted-in politician serving my interests.**

98. **If I place before you a glass of fresh clean water and a glass of liquefied natural gas which is the one you cannot live without! (Or, if you're being obtuse and still believe LNG is money then again I ask you to look at the glass full of water and a wallet full of money - but you're on a desert island - which is it that you need to survive!) Think about this as you make your decision!**

99. **We can't keep everything as is and see jobs and economic growth proceed. This goes for any development whether it is dying, housing, industry. We can be better off if we use some revenue from economic growth to improve other environmental concerns in the area. For instance, can we invest in protecting forests or in an estuary rehab program with revenue generated by the WLNG project?**

100. **We are ruining our beautiful, clean sound after so many years of industrial pollution. How embarassing this will be to us when our children/grandchildren understand that we went backwards for $$$$$**

101. **Our Sound has taken years to return to health after the Britannia mine left it poisoned. To even consider allowing the Woodfibre LNG plant to be built is folly. You've read enough to know the harm that will be caused by their use of water from the sound for their industrial purposes, and the noise from their vessels and operations will create an...**
unsafe environment for marine animals.

102. I am a gas fitter and a refrigeration mechanic. I work with commercial and industrial natural gas appliances all day long. I know the risks with natural gas and that isn't my concern with this project. My concerns are with the process to create liquified natural gas and the shipping containers. The second we introduce more marine traffic into the sound we increase the risk of a spillage. Liquid natural gas leak isn't a major concern but leaking oil and gas is. I feel that the risks are too high. There is more marine life coming into the sound than hasn't been seen in a while. I feel that more increased marine traffic will have an effect on this. The process to make liquid natural gas is going to involve a refrigeration plant of some kind. This will again have a few different refrigerants that will make a cascade system. I am not sure on the types they will be using but a major refrigerant leak can have serious environmental and safety effects as well.

103. Since Sukanto Tanoto is behind this project and his companies have been charged with environmental crimes, have a terrible environmental record AND are leaders in rainforest destruction it should be a no-brainer to say NO, we don't want to do business with him.

104. I live in the downtown area and walk in the estuary daily. I love the place and its animals, birds, plants, and waters. Running a pipeline through it would be lunacy. We are fortunate to have it. Why would we choose to risk it like that?

105. Byng Giraud stated at the first WFLNG public meeting that the area around the site would not ever support life again. This is patently untrue. What else are they saying that is untrue? A great deal unfortunately.

106. Leave our waters alone!

107. Face the scientific facts.

108. We have a large under 5 population in Squamish. Lots of parents who want their children and future generations to enjoy the marine environment, along with everything else Squamish offers. Council should care because unhappy parents (and let's face it very few parents want LNG here) don't vote for councils that introduce unpopular, polluting industry that drains our taxes (yep we all know about Harper and Christy's tax breaks to the industry) and offers zero employment or benefits for the majority of its residents.

109. There are not enough benefits for this project to outweigh the potential risks.

110. I live here because Squamish has the best of the mountains and the ocean. We need to value and respect Howe Sound, the focus should be on how can we help the ecosystem recover not mitigating industry. I moved here because I thought this was a community heading in that direction and held the same values and priorities as I do. I doubt I will stay here if LNG goes through, it feels like too many steps backwards.

111. You will have massive tankers going up and down Howe Sound!!! Really how does that fit with the Outdoor Recreation Capital of N. America?! Focus on that, not creating an opportunity for an inevitable natural disaster due to a tanker or facilities issue.

112. Aside from that, I feel that water is our finest and most precious resource, salty or fresh. We need to protect it first and foremost. We can't drink LNG. The impacts of rising oceanic temperatures are happening in real time right beneath our eyes and we need to heed warnings. Let's not put off developing green energy any longer. Let us lead the way in CREATING CHANGE!

113. Howe Sound has recently recovered from years of pollution being dumped into it from chemical, mining, and pulp/paper activity. Let's not go backwards by allowing a greedy and shortsighted industry to compromise the health of these waters. As well, consider our participation in the upstream consequences of fracking on BC's fresh water resources.

114. I feel very strongly about protecting the estuary and the fresh and marine waters around our community. The effects of underwater noise worry me the most as it may be easy to overlook the impacts and could prove difficult to study.

115. I had trouble picking only 3 items from the list. Disruption of pollution/sediment during construction and
operations is also a bit concern for me.

116. Squamish is a beautiful lustrous community and we should be looking towards protecting and preserving not destroying and degrading.

117. That My feelings and those of our community in the whole Sea to Sky corridor matter more than the profit of industry, and my feelings are to preserve and conserve our beautiful vibrant land teeming with lifeforce. It is horrific to think that our government can waltz in and take over against the majority of citizens. It feels like an invasion on our homefront!

118. In addition to above, I am afraid we'll lose more jobs in the tourism industry than we would gain in Woodfibre.

119. I worry that my coffee shop that I just opened will be negatively impacted by the associative loss of tourists in town.

120. i am deeply concerned that the ecosystem will experience a temperature shift which will decrease food sources for fish and mammals while increasing the ability of disease microorganisms to thrive.

121. I do NOT want this to go through for many reasons!

122. Howe sound is an amazing area and should be protected as a National Park increasing tanker ships loaded with LNG is not something that fits in such a beautiful and important area (affects on tourism, reputation, wildlife especially marine life in Howe Sound).

123. Protection of clean and undisturbed waters in the Estuary and Howe Sound is way more important than hypothetical economic gains from the LNG project. Waters are common and communal values to be here for generations, corporation profits benefit small group of individuals on short-term bases only. There's no doubt that we are obliged to protect our waters!

124. SQUAMISH CAN LEAD on the topic of enabling a healthy marine environment in our local area, Howe Sound. Squamish is not alone. We are part of a growing awareness on many levels in North America and beyond, whose influence is strengthening, that our very survival depends upon having enough clean water. The marine environment is an integral part of our overall environment. However, it is very understandable that citizens whose life experience has been in the old Squamish industries could find Woodfibre LNG a familiar sounding company and be comfortable with their public relations people, who seem to me to have been hired because they are quite similar. This is a complex issue for Council.

125. Our marine life in Howe Sound appears to be thriving. Why should we even think of putting it at risk in order to line people's pockets?

126. I believe this is a step backwards in returning the howe sound area to the jewel it was before heavy industry. The mine at Britannia beach is a prime example.

127. I moved to Squamish 10 yrs ago, and at 54 years of age feel for the first time in my life at home. Presently, I daily commute to Vancouver as a self employed trade and will continue to do so to maintain the status quo of my life style here in Squamish. However, if the long term goal of Squamish is the same old fossil fuel industry development, than I will have to reconsider whether or not I want to be part of this community.

128. As a long time environmentalist and Squamish Streamkeeper I am satisfied that there should be minimal risks to aquatic habitat from pipeline construction, underwater noise, water intake / discharge removal of existing pilings. I am satisfied with the efforts and stated intentions of the project proponents.

129. To me, there is no compromise for clean and safe water. Mitigation and safety plans are not enough.
130. I value a clean environment in Squamish, it is one of the reasons we moved here 10 yrs ago, and one of the reasons we have chosen to raise a family here. There are so many unknowns about the marine environment, please do your due diligence before making any big decisions.

131. I will do everything in my power to protect Howe Sound. It is my home.

132. Howe Sound is finally recovering from old industrial activities. It is a magnificent fjord that needs protection and it is one of Squamish's most important assets.

133. The environment is important. Estuaries are the cradle of life and should be protected.

134. Fresh water and sea water should be protected at all costs. Laws should be made to protect water. It is an essential element that humans and other earthlings need for daily survival. Water polluters should be taken to the highest courts and punishment should be severe. Our current lack of respect for an element/ product essential to our life is just ludicrous.

135. I think the water intake for cooling should be changed to an air exchange cooling system. Although more expensive, it has a less harmful impact on the environment.

136. Let's not miss this opportunity.

137. only profits for big industry and foreign co. with some local bents but do the benefits out weigh the pollution and the risk to locals.

138. If the LNG site is going ahead, I believe that Squamish and Howe Sound will be negatively impacted to an extent that we can not foresee at this time. For us as a family, we have moved here from Europe for healthy living and the breathtaking beauty of this place. We make the daily commute to the city happily as the benefits far outweigh the long commute. If the LNG site goes ahead, we will be forced to uproot our family after living here for almost 10 years in the search for 'another Squamish'.

139. I'm not an expert on matters of the estuary, but from my understanding the Squamish Estuary, like all estuaries, is a unique and fragile ecosystem, kept in balance (thriving) only if left undisturbed. I can't imagine that drilling and maintaining a pipeline in this critical zone would have negligible disturbing effects. We must consider it likely that we'd seriously, perhaps irrevocably harm our estuary through this activity. Would it be “worth it?” for the number of longterm jobs and proposed tax base increase accruing from this project?

140. I am a tax payer a home owner and I like Squamish the way it is. We should be promoting our town and getting tourists to come and visit and stay in the long run that will be better for business and the environment. LNG is not the answer its a pipe dream.

141. How can we say that periodic tanker will be harmful but the expansion of ferry traffic and pleasure boaters as part of developing a tourism based economy will not have an impact? I remember hearing all the arguments against the Sea to Sky Gondola based on the impact it would have on wildlife and the natural scenery. I haven't heard from these people in a while. Just like the Gondola, if done right with input from all stakeholders, the negative impacts can be minimized in order to attain net benefits.

142. Our town is special because it is beautiful. We already balance industry and nature based recreation really well. I respect that we need things like forestry to boost our local economy but another industrial plant at Woodfiber is not sustainable. Remember how much better the air was in our town when the air no longer reeked of bleach? Squamish is special for what it already has, it doesn't need any more industrialization.

143. I have little trust in the government's ability to monitor and enforce adequate environmental standards to protect our estuary, rivers, ocean and marine life from the negative effects of this facility.

144. I want council to be at the table, to ensure that best practices are being up held, and improved.

145. We are the outdoor recreation capitol - we should be protecting our outdoors and keeping Squamish as an
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>146.</td>
<td>Estuaries being unique and fragile habitats, it should be essential that projects with possibly detrimental, or worse, devastating effects on our estuary be scrutinized with the utmost care, and objective scepticism. Otherwise we risk losing this irreplaceable resource forever. It provides us a vital link to sustainable food sources, natural beauty, tourism, healthy living.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147.</td>
<td>Building an LNG plant in Squamish is environmentally irresponsible, both globally &amp; locally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148.</td>
<td>Destroying our natural ecosystem for a foreign billionaire is unethical and stupid. My job depends on the beauty of our natural environment NO LNG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149.</td>
<td>The marine environment in the sound is of very high value. The estuary is the largest intact, or semi-intact in the lower mainland. Burns Bog and the Fraser River area may be larger in size but highly fragmented. We need to really keep it - also the road to the spit needs to be narrowed... Too wide, too fast and too much dust into the estuary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.</td>
<td>You probably aren’t smart enough to understand the engineering process, which make you blind to your lack of awareness, therefore, making you completely unqualified to make any decisions for or against the proposed WLNG plant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151.</td>
<td>I am in favour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152.</td>
<td>I am confident in the provincial and federal EA process in respect to concerns about water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.</td>
<td>I am a new kite surfer and after living in Squamish since 1998 only this past year have I actually had the opportunity to enjoy the Ocean and appreciate the beauty the precious jewel Howe Sound is for our community. Let’s not risk damaging it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154.</td>
<td>I am convinced that there will be positiveness responsiveness to the challenges that will arise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155.</td>
<td>It is time to take concerted steps to turn Howe Sound into a marine sanctuary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156.</td>
<td>In the last 14 years that I have lived in Squamish, I have personally witnessed the revival of marine life in Howe Sound. As an avid kite surfer, I spend a lot of time on the water, and it is incredible to see all of the life that is just now coming back to Howe Sound. I see harbor seals chilling out and watching kiters almost every day that I kite from the spit. I have had salmon jump on my kiteboard during salmon runs. I’ve hung out with river otters, and several kiters have reported seeing humpback whales and dolphins while kiting. I haven’t been that lucky yet, but I hope that one day I will have that opportunity. In the past, Squamish has been very disconnected from the ocean, but this has changed in the last 10 years, and more and more people are walking the trails along the oceanfront, and hanging out at Nexen beach despite the lack of facilities there. Last year, on a rainy day in March, I also witnessed hundreds of locals and tourists standing in the pouring rain as they watched a pod of orcas hunting dolphins. People from all walks of life were oohing and aahing and our community really came together to celebrate the return of marine mammals to our waters. The possibility that all of this will be lost makes my heart ache. It’s one of several reasons that I have taken several months off work to volunteer full-time to raise awareness about the key issues with Woodfibre LNG and the proposed Fortis pipeline. I love this community, and I don’t want to see it destroyed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157.</td>
<td>This sort of industry is short sighted and environmentally insensitive. Years ago due to pollution, the Howe Sound was ecologically dead, which was a national embarrassment. Now we boast a clean ecosystem, and are a good...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
example of what can happen when we make our environment a priority. We should not make the same mistake twice. Our ecosystems can not sustain more assaults like this, it's a blessing that fish and aquatic life have returned to our waters, and that it's now safe to swim in our estuary and inlets.

| 158. | Let the LNG build with the understanding that if there is a problem (within guide lines predetermined) all operations cease till repaired judged by our council in a one day vote.... No Vote... Stop Operations |
| 159. | We are custodians of the land. LNG will destroy it. The great gift/value we have in Squamish is the natural beauty that people from all over the world admire. Please be that rare organization with foresight for future generations and preserve our water and land. Nothing is worth destroying it. |
| 160. | I don’t agree that this is a suitable location for this particular project. The pipeline through the estuary concerns me. |
| 161. | we need to have a diverse economy and can not rely on one industry to support our community |
| 162. | The impact of this project is far more reaching than just Squamish. I am against fracking at the extraction point, and the affects on ground water contamination. |
| 163. | Sea life is thriving again in Howe Sounds, it is absurd to think that pumping heated, chlorinated water back in will not have a negative effect. We have lived in Squamish for almost 15 years for the natural, untouched beauty and fresh, clean air. If this LNG project goes through, sadly, we may look for somewhere else to put down roots. |
| 164. | I watched the killer whales and dolphins for hours from the log sort last year. It seemed half of Squamish was there. The water is once again habitable for our marine life. This is a huge tourist draw. How can we even consider an LNG plant? How can we risk losing this amazing environmental comeback? |
| 165. | In over 75 years of LNG being moved by bot there has not been one accident that has caused LNG to be leaked into the air. Council needs to stop telling stories about LNG risk as it relates to shipping and concentrate on how it will truly benefit Squamish |
| 166. | I believe that environmental and social concerns are intertwined. With more and more people moving to Squamish, there are increasing strains placed on the environment. People move here to connect with the environment and because they see their healthy lifestyle values reflected in the community. These healthy lifestyle values must be reflected in the economy as well. |
| 167. | The council needs to know that I believe our society is built on the need of constant growth, and that stagnation is bad. This constant growth is not sustainable! Why do we keep growing and growing for economic purposes without any, or limited foresight of environmental impacts of this constant growth. My feelings are that the environment should be a top priority, because without that we have nothing. |
| 168. | Preserve out beautiful area! |
| 169. | We have wind here we should be using it as a clean energy the amount of $$ being spent on LNG. |
| 170. | I am against LNG coming to Woodfibre |
| 171. | I have a lifetime exposure to all facets of International Marine Transportation and was the last Harbour Master in Squamish for more than 9 years. |
| 172. | Absolutely we are against the LNG project for a variety of reasons. We do NOT want to have tankers traversing our waterways. We have see a resurgence in sea life, and we do not want it jeopardized in any way (for the sake of big business making money.) |
| 173. | I love fishing the squamish river, the fish stocks are just starting to rebound after the logging companies messed up |
the spawning grounds and know this?

174. I hope that an option that presents less impact can be employed for cooling - I trust that council will ask that this is implemented - beyond that I do not believe the LNG project presents any significant risks and welcome this to our community

175. My feelings and values are based on growing up here in Squamish and seeing firsthand the damage industry has done to our estuary and Howe Sound. Things are just starting to come back to our waters and I hope that new industry truly protects and our environment.

176. if the arriving ships were to interfere with a salmon or herring run, then perhaps there could be a postponement of shipping for the duration, subject to monitoring.

177. Please I beg you stop LNG in Squamish. Makes no sense upstream with fracking and no sense downstream for environment, economy and First Nations

178. Too many unknowns and risks associated.

179. I, like many people that have moved here did so for the outdoor recreation that this beautiful city provides. Most of which is spent in the water. I have been windsurfing and kiteboarding at the spit for 11 years.

180. How do you sleep at night knowing that the water temp will be one of the biggest factors of the whales not coming back because everything they feed off of is going to be dead.

181. I have lived on Howe Sound for 40 years - my entire life. I spent my youth in Lions Bay and over the course of 8 years, never saw a whale, dolphin or even a seal. Howe Sound was for all intensive purposes a dead zone.

After a monumental clean-up effort and at great financial cost, Howe Sound is finally returning to its former glory. I have watched whales and dolphins in the Sound on more than one occasion with my son. This is what will make Squamish great. We need to fight to protect this incredible asset. We almost squandered it once...let's not do it again.

182. Do it, we need this project. I enjoy natural gas in my home and the outdoor gas fireplaces. Don't treat nature as a god, respect it, care for it, put protections in place, but trees grow back.

183. See above comment. My family, friends and the people of Squamish I have spoken to, do not want this project in this beautiful land.

184. LNG should not be welcome anywhere, we need to be investing in new sources of energy and getting off carbon fuel.

185. I bought a Columbia 30 sailboat 11 years ago and moved aboard as this was the most affordable way to learn to sail. Since having purchased the boat, I have lived aboard on and off for approximately 4 years interspersed with time on land as I have since purchased a lovely little duplex. The high cost of living in Squamish often necessitates taking on roommates to help with paying the bills and boat life provides a much needed sanctuary. Frankly, even if I won the lottery, I would still choose to spend my summers staying on the water! I love waking up to the sound of the otters playfully banging on the bottom of the hull. It's still such a novelty to me to open the hatch and watch the otters run laps down the dock before they leap playfully back into the water to tease my dog by banging on the hull again. There is nothing more serene than being surrounded by porpoises and/or dolphins (sorry I'm not sure which) while boating in Howe Sound. To watch them swim, within arms' reach, on their side at the bow of the boat so that they can make eye contact with you with such a seemingly intelligent eye for several boat lengths at a time before swimming off to display their amazing acrobatics in the water and then return to swim at the bow once more. Unfortunately I was away at school doing an apprenticeship when the whales and dolphins visited Howe Sound last year but apparently my boat was surrounded by them, and I would dearly have loved to have shared that experience. I can only hope that if we don't disturb their habitat, they will return again.

186. I personally feel that the Provincial government needs to invest money or encourage economic development in non-fossil fuel based industry. Also, why support multi-national companies with tax breaks and bad environmental
track records when we have a skilled labour force in our collective backyard.

187. I do not believe the project will benefit water. I believe the project will harm the water. I believe there can be future initiatives that continue to improve the health of the water if LNG is declined.

188. Because it could have a lasting negative effect on the quality of life of my children’s children while the plant is still active. Perhaps even longer.

189. Having lived here 45 years and seeing only a recent return of marine mammals to the sound, I find it incomprehensible that we would do anything to jeopardize their well being.

190. We are better than this. We have other options for economic growth here - If we lose our marine/wildlife we lose a huge part of our economy (and why I live here) and future generations will look back at us and wonder what we were thinking.

191. Coming mostly from gut feelings here. This project seems too risky at this point as we creep ever more closely towards global climate change. Anything substantial such as LNG that could further risk our environment needs to be put on hold. All Canadians have commented on what an unusual winter this has been. From the snow-less BC to the extreme late winter/spring storms in Nova Scotia. We must listen with our hearts and not our heads when it comes to such critical matters.

192. Preserving biodiversity for future generations is crucial. We do not have the right to deprive future generations from the wealth of living things that we take for granted.

193. I do not support an industry that will change the water chemistry (temperature, salinity, pH, etc).
I do not support an industry that will increase aquatic noise that will impact marine life
I do not support an industry that has so many uncertainties around the potential for marine spills and impacts to the marine environment.
We need to study this site far more than this very short period that has been required by the EAO until we have addressed each and every concern.

194. Squamish recently spent a lot of money and time on a branding campaign. That campaign is aimed at attracting not only tourism but high tech and new-tech. My feeling is that an LNG plant and all that it encompasses from tankers to compression stations (right in our town!) and pipelines though our fragile and still recovering ecosystems goes completely against that branding. It’s obvious that the vast majority of voting and active residents are in favour of moving Squamish away from short sighted resource-based dependency to long term tourism, eco-tourism and adventure tourism in conjunction with clean tech-based and intellectual industry partners. LNG has no place within that model.

195. Whales, orcas, and dolphins have just returned to Howe Sound in recent years after decades of pollution from heavy industry on the proposed site. We can’t let heavy industry ruin our fragile ecosystem again. This is one of the most beautiful areas in the world. Isn’t it worth protecting? What benefit does LNG have? A few people will make money? Who cares. Is that relevant compared to damaging a critical natural habitat for wildlife and for humans to enjoy?

196. We moved to Squamish 17 yrs ago, and much industry has changed Economic diversity is important, and we would like economic development to focus on more environmentally friendly industries... If power related, why not wind, solar, tidal...?

197. Whales and dolphins are just coming back. With climate change bringing disasters all over the world I can’t believe we’d even consider taking a **** in our own well so to speak – not the least of which our reputation as an eco-friendly tourist destination. It’s going to ruin everything pristine about our area and compromise the safety of the sailing and kiteboarding community, chase away or harm wildlife, pollute the water, add to smog in the valley contributing to asthma (my asthma improved when I moved to Squamish, this could directly impact me). I also think it’s going to be super ugly, right in front of the super-successful Sea to Sky Gondola view. This is insane that it’s even being considered. I don’t care how much money it might bring (trivial or not), it’s short-term gain for an
already risky long-term environment given run-away climate change.

| 198. | I feel very strongly on this issue and feel we need to protect our marine life and oceans. I do not support this project. |
| 199. | People talk about jobs, jobs, jobs. We have to have jobs and can't sacrifice the economy in the name of the environment. But I disagree. There will be no jobs or even life without a clean healthy environment to live in. If they want to conduct their business in our community then I believe they should remediate any effects they have on the natural environment. I am all for new business in Squamish, but it cannot have a negative impact on the natural environment. |
| 200. | I have faith in the regulators to monitor this project to ensure WLNG is operating within and beyond the required guidelines. |
| 201. | see above. I can't express myself enough. Environmentally this is a sham. Ethically, it is wrong. The people in charge of this are misguided. It would make me so sad if this comes through. But you know, I will chain my body to a tree if I need to, and I know for a fact I am not the only one. There will be a massive MASSIVE uprising of good people standing up for the earth. We are not the owners we are to protect what provides for us. We will gather together and stand for what is good. |
| 202. | all the above items are Important. I have included my submission to WLNG project. I would hope that Howe Sound and this project area would be protected from industrial destruction because this is a means for financial gain and there are now world class activities here to employ citizens in non-polluting industries. |
| 203. | I am in favor of the project as long as they mitigate the impacts to the environment |
| 204. | Council needs to lobby that this project is developed as a best-in-class facility. |
| 205. | We have natural attractions that bring people to our town. Wood fiber has too much environmental risk and not enough positive gain for our community. It is taking us steps backwards, |
| 206. | There is so much that can change the land, air, water and us. What is wrong with sun energy, wind power!? |
| 207. | We have finally seen Howe Sound begin to heal, to bring healthy marine life back. As one of the most beautiful pristine jewels in the planet, our Howe Sound is truly a gem. How could we consider putting this at risk? What are we trying to portray as our community values to the rest of the world by scarriing this pristine wilderness? Our geographical location alone is a draw to expanding our town and to bring innovative thinkers with clean technology instead of fossil fuel reliant technology. Its taking a step backward. We are doing just fine right now without the addition of (the small number of jobs really) the LNG will offer in the long term. |
| 208. | 1) I am opposed to the re-industrialisation of Howe Sound. Considerable efforts and investment has been made in the last decade to remediate the polluting of our Howe Sound:  
- remediation of mercury contamination of lands and proximate waters of Nexen chlor-alkali plant site in Squamish (1999 – 2003);  
- closure of Woodfibre pulp mill in 2006;  
- water treatment centre at Britannia to remove heavy metal contaminants in 2006 (beginning of a 20 year process).  
- Thousands of volunteer hours to the rehabilitation of our Squamish estuary;  
- Thousands of volunteer hours to the rehabilitation of habitat for herring spawning in Howe Sound;  

Heavy industry is not the right choice for the pristine body of water that is Howe Sound not to mention the fracking required to extract natural gas.  
I am concerned about the cooling system used and the fact that the water will return to the fjord warmer than it
normally is. That is contributing to the warming up of our oceans.

2) Howe Sound, an ecosystem as an economic asset
Let’s recognize the value of Howe Sound’s land and marine ecosystems as an economic asset. I fully support the arguments found in the David Suzuki publication which states that the recovery of Howe Sound could be short lived if we allow the industrial projects which are currently at different stages of approval and under review to go ahead, Woodfibre LNG being one of them.

« This report conservatively estimates the value of 11 services across land and marine-based ecosystems at approximately $800 million to $4.7 billion per year. The results are compelling. If we were to treat the regions’ ecosystems as an economic asset, providing a stream of benefits over 50 years, the present value would range between $15 billion and $91 billion, using a five per cent discount rate. If we were to translate this into the value per household, the value ranges between approximately $500,000 and $3 billion. This demonstrates the tremendous value of natural systems to Howe Sound residents. »


3) Undervalued spectacular scenery
Our family has enjoyed Howe Sound for recreation for the last 10 years. We have sailed in the BC waters for a number of years as far north as Desolation Sound and Toba Inlet. Every time, we came back home to Squamish, we marvel at the incredible scenery visible for the water (Atwel Peak, Diamond Head, The Chief, Shannon Falls, to name a few). The development which will take place in the next decade on the Squamish Oceanfront will capitalize on these unique geographical features. I consider the Woodfibre LNG plant and the tankers as visual pollution which jeopardizes the aesthetics of our environmental surroundings. We cannot change the past but we can choose our future.

209. We’re just getting away from that past of environmental degradation….why would we go back? We’ve started down a beautiful, concerned road of environmental concern, tourism and outdoor lifestyle that we all moved or stayed here to enjoy. How absurd to take one of the most beautiful places in the world and try to destroy it!

210. You cannot put a price on a functioning ecosystem. We need to work toward improving our environment, including water, air. This is extremely important, a crucial building block for our ecosystems both terrestrial and marine.

211. My concerns are around usage of water and whether they will be charged for use of the water.

212. So incredible that this are is finally being restored- and people are moving to Squamish to be in Nature - seems like a huge mistake to risk that and return to industry and pollution

213. I have children and this is the main reason I moved to Squamish. We can’t eat, drink, or breathe money which is the only real benefit to this project. I moved to Squamish for the beautiful natural environment, it’s family friendliness, and it’s excellent outdoor recreation. If this project goes ahead, I know many families that will leave, the environment IS at risk, and outdoor recreation will be negatively impacted.

214. Even if parts of the pipeline are underground, the construction process of the pipeline under and along the estuary would be ecologically disruptive. The areas where the pipeline is planned to go underneath are areas I go to regularly for peace and connecting with nature. It would just not be the same knowing there was a pipeline running underneath, even if I couldn’t see it.
Any economic benefits and environmental clean up and mitigations proposed by WLNG are not sufficient to justify the damage the project would due to Howe Sound and the estuary. It’s not worth it.

We need to think about Howe Sound water as a whole system, learn more about it. How do the current work? Would contaminants from WLNG move around with currents?

215. Our values as a community are about healthy living and growing as a community. Families first. Something our own provincial government dropped the ball on. So many in Canada and other countries know the destruction, risks and contamination from these practises. It’s as a council and community we must unite and be true to what is right for us. Not what the federal government wants to push through. I’m proud of our council and my vote that truly gave residents a voice! Let’s continue to do what’s right even if it means we have to stand up to big companies and courts. It’s our community, our water, our back yard and our children’s legacy we are protecting with each vote. Squamish has the support of so many districts and we need the council we voted in to speak for us. To vote with us in saying NO to LNG

216. Maintaining a healthy environment and protecting natural ecosystems are very important to me. It’s fantastic to see the return of the herring, dolphins and whales to Howe Sound.

217. I DO NOT believe that WLNG has anything close to "best practice" design plans. If they did, they would certainly not be proposing a plant for Howe Sound in the first place.

To state this as an option in the questionnaire is false and misleading.

218. It’s so important for our community located in one of the most beautiful location left in the world to keep our environment clean as long as possible.

219. Sea water intake is a major concern as all lower food chain is taken in. Constant noise from facility will have affect. Impacts to water quality and cumulative effects of water quality downstream are also a major concern.

220. Water is a critical aspect of our life in Squamish, my kids swim in this water, we eat the fish from here, we kayak and canoe here we take in every molecule of the surrounding water. This polluting project will take all this away. I don’t want to be riddled with cancer. I want clean water for my kids and their kids

221. The seawater cooling system they are proposing has been banned elsewhere due to it’s impacts on the environment. How can it possibly pass our EA requirements?

222. The biggest environmental problem with WLNG is the plant itself (and at this point I’m including compressors located offsite or on site, as well as the pipeline delivering the gas). You cannot view all pieces of the puzzle as separate entities. WLNG cooling system has been described as state of the art, but many parts of the world have banned it, here is why: it is a system that slowly sterilizes everything is Howe Sound. The system intakes everything from below the water’s surface and the “screens out” larger objects. However, everything 4mm and under gets killed. That’s right. Take a look at the schematic drawings. The screen through which objects pass has 4mm diameter holes. Plankton, salmon and fish eggs, small fish, microbes, fish fry, essentially a world of species that feeds other species gets heated to 18 degrees Celsius (killed), and pumped back out at a temperature of 18 degrees. Now WLNG will tell you that it’s a lower temperature within 10 meters – that doesn’t matter. What are you heating the water to? 18. That’s what’s going out. “Sometimes” or more likely often, pipes will be flushed with chemicals to prevent algae growth in the cooling system. While the chlorine is removed from the water, no one knows if this is actual the case, and whether other chemicals are also used in the treatment, and then released in to Howe Sound. This right here is the biggest problem – it’s a killing machine of all species in the water by raising our ocean water temperature. And I don’t need to tell you that this is bad. You already know this.

223. Industry needs to coexist with residents of Squamish. The choice of what industry is important as it may go against the values of most people. There will always be some people who think that they will have some financial gain with the bad guys of industry and will turn a blind eye. Reverting Squamish back to Industry that is going to cause significant damage to the water is not acceptable.
224. I am confident that Woodfibre LNG will exceed the safety and environment concerns around water.

225. Howe sound is a precious asset, WLNG should not be allowed to proceed. We are recovering from the effects of past industrialization, why would we now want to turn back and destroy it again?

226. Howe Sound is a sanctuary not just for First Nation people but for many people who live there. We all are watching with great excitement how this beautiful area is slowly recovering from years of industrial abuse. How could we risk all this? This region has taken a turn and is going in a different direction. WLNG does not fit this direction at all. It saddens me so much to see what this has done to our community, it saddens me that we put greed over the health of this region and over our own health and the health of our children and their children. I am saddened because if WLNG gets the green light to start operations we will be moving away. This is not what we and many other families had in mind when we moved here about 9 years ago. This was supposed to be the place where we grow old and where our kids grow up. We very well knew that Squamish would be going through some growing pains and through some shifts and we were prepared to help carry the load. But we are not prepared to stay here if WLNG start operations. It is sad to give all this up.

Estuary. I actually do not even know where to start. Our estuary has been "abused" for many years. Tons of money and many many countless hours of volunteer work have been put in to help its recovery. It is a sacred place for the Squamish Nation. Putting in a 24" pipeline is insane and a huge insult to everyone who has helped its recovery. Thank you council for not letting Fortis bully and pressure you. I have the utmost respect for you!

227. I am against the risk.

228. Howe Sound is a sanctuary not just for First Nation people but for many people who live there. We all are watching with great excitement how this beautiful area is slowly recovering from years of industrial abuse. How could we risk all this? This region has taken a turn and is going in a different direction. WLNG does not fit this direction at all. It saddens me so much to see what this has done to our community, it saddens me that we put greed over the health of this region and over our own health and the health of our children and their children. I am saddened because if WLNG gets the green light to start operations we will be moving away. This is not what we and many other families had in mind when we moved here about 9 years ago. This was supposed to be the place where we grow old and where our kids grow up. We very well knew that Squamish would be going through some growing pains and through some shifts and we were prepared to help carry the load. But we are not prepared to stay here if WLNG start operations. It is sad to give all this up.

Estuary. I actually do not even know where to start. Our estuary has been "abused" for many years. Tons of money and many many countless hours of volunteer work have been put in to help its recovery. It is a sacred place for the Squamish Nation. Putting in a 24" pipeline is insane and a huge insult to everyone who has helped its recovery. Thank you council for not letting Fortis bully and pressure you. I have the utmost respect for you!

229. These are huge quantities of water which when returned are chemically and thermally comprimized.

230. The environment is very important and the pipeline, compressor process and the LNG Woodfibre plant can be built with due diligence to not affect the environment

231. I have strong feeling and value the regeneration of marine life from toxic legacies of FMC, Britannia Mine and Woodfibre and Squamish as a community. Delighted in the sight of dolphins and orcas.

232. The recovery of Howe Sound is important but is not at risk due to strict guidelines

233. I am vehemently against the Province approving WLNG and the Fortis pipeline expansion

234. I am not in favour of this project if it come ahead make sure to collect from it real money - Taxes.

235. Let us do everything we can to allow Howe Sound to return to a (relatively) pristine habitat for our sea life, including the five species of salmon which traverse Howe Sound

236. After the vast amount of work that has been done on bringing back the herring and the benefits that has brought to Squamish
I have serious concerns about the use of sea water for cooling and subsequent discharge of chlorinated water back into the Sound. Howe Sound is finally coming back to a healthy state. This would be a move in the wrong direction.

Air and Land - Facts |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>&quot;The proposed LNG project site would be powered with electricity to reduce emissions by about 80%.&quot; What does this even mean? Reduce emissions compared to what? Comparing it to being powered by something else? What about comparing it to not being built? And electricity production is not carbon neutral, producing electricity is one of the highest producers of greenhouse gasses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>While I don't know about the increased risk of earthquakes near the project, fracking to produce the gas certainly entails heightened earthquake risks. Gases released from the plant (and however good their system is there will be releases) will contribute to global warming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>It's all about reducing greenhouse impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I like the fact that LNG will power the plant from the current transmission lines, reducing the necessity of a gas/diesel power plant to run the facilities except in times of power failure. My understanding is that the decision to place a facility at Woodfibre is a Provincial decision and ultimately not a municipal decision, but if Squamish is being negative towards this development and the restoration, reclamation does not proceed, will Squamish be able to pay for the bill to clean up this abandoned industrial site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>If we are truly the Outdoor Recreational Capital of Canada, we need clean air to fill our lungs and clean land to keep the wild life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The health of my family is my greatest concern. Anything that may threaten their health or the health of wildlife and the environment is of great concern to me. Nothing is more important than clean air, land and water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I am very concerned with the devastation from LNG in the event of an earthquake. The proposed plant and pipelines are all in an earthquake zone, and should not be allowed to proceed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>LNG will be pumping up to 140,000 tons of CO2, sulfur dioxide and nitrous oxides into the air per year. These are all potent greenhouse gases that will negatively impact our air quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I am hoping Council looks at the work of metro vancouver and advocates for a regional network of air quality monitoring stations around the sound and along the sea to sky highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>They are proposing to put a pipe line through the center of our town, close to schools, extremely close to housing. Not if, but when there is a catastrophic disaster what then?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Compression station in city limits?!?! I am concerned about leaks, noise, accidents. What an insane idea to put this station anywhere in our city limits. Why are we allowing this??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>To encourage the continuance of archaic and environmentally devastating energy practices when alternative, ethical and truly clean energy options are more and more showing themselves as true economic competitors is the wrong path for the &quot;outdoor capital of canada&quot; to take. Let's be a shining example for change rather than another disaster in waiting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities future as a species on this planet is in a precarious position, let’s not add fuel to the fire when we don’t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
have to.

13. poison, poison poison .. why don't we just kill everything now because that's what's going to happen in the very near future No LNG please!

14. Our land here has an amazing ability to self heal very quickly. We need to keep this in mind.

15. Our air quality would suffer from LNG over time. I moved to Squamish 9 years ago and one of the reasons I didn't move here sooner..even though I had wanted...to was the air quality due to the pulp mill. Please don't sully our air with a new form of pollution.

16. construction time must avoid breeding season for birds and animals.

17. Many of these things are important. I find use of the choices above limiting and so again I'll type my thoughts here. I imagine the most substantial air and land issues will be local air pollution and remediation at the project site (but let's make sure that if another industrial user uses this site that they in turn don't leave a mess!)

18. The negative implications on air quality for the entire Squamish Air-shed area. HUGE risk for insignificant return to the people living in the region.

19. "Did you know that the estuaries and coastal wetlands of BC make up less than 3% of our province's coastline, yet provide habitat to over 80% of all coastal fish and wildlife species? Around 500 plant and animal species can be found in the estuaries and coastal wetlands around BC, 70 of which are federally listed as Endangered or Threatened."
http://www.goert.ca/activities/2012/05/restoration-nanaimo-river-estuary/

20. The construction of both the LNG site and the Pipeline will have a very real impact on the wildlife (on land and in the air) that are living near and around these areas. Regardless of whether LNG or Fortis clean up pollution or monitor wildlife, the fact remains that they will be disturbing populations and species of animals that I should not be put at risk.

21. Why compromise our clean air? Most people are in Squamish for outdoor recreation and if the air quality is being compromised than that may impact more people's decision on whether or not to come to Squamish. What happens if there is an accident? All of the surrounding waters, marine and land wildlife and environment would be affected. What happens then? Who cleans it up? Why would be compromise the Howe Sound when it is showing us that it is only now recovering and thriving? The pipeline and facility construction affect a lot of animals and wildlife- never mind the trees that will need to be cut down. Not only is it an eye sore but the trees being cut down are just another way of decimating the environment that we depend on to provide us with clean air.

We already know that we live on/near a fault line (we just had an earthquake last month), and we know that fracking and such can be a cause. Why would we contribute to something we know can have detrimental consequences? And what if there is a large earthquake (which is due at any time) and the pipeline rupture or if there is a leak/spill at the plant?

What happens if there is an accident with the tankers? What if there is an explosion? A fire? And then the whole Howe Sound is affected.

22. Air quality will be greatly affected. No one is discussing the emissions and leaks from vehicles, boats, buses required to transport construction and operation workers, equipment, supplies i.e. Refrigerant . Will WLNG walk the talk and ensure that all these modes of transportation use clean energy - electric, natural gas, or will they settle for dirty diesel, bunker fuel? If not they need to adjust their pitch and realize we have experienced dirty air in Squamish and want the best practices, world standards for air quality just like the political proponents state they want best practices, world standards for LNG"

23. Nil
24. **Woodfibre LNG has been very responsible in their approach to this project. We have to ensure they stick to their commitments.**

25. **Any efforts to clean/remediate the area is a great idea; however, it seems pointless if only to make way for the next hazard. As well what are the impacts to our local air quality?**

26. **More and more people are moving to Squamish and the majority of them are commuting to the city. Over the next 10 or 20 years, if this trend continues, the air quality here will diminish. We need good-paying, local jobs to keep the air quality we enjoy.**

27. **Woodfibre is an existing industrial site that has been heavily used over the last 100 years. It has a lot of the necessary infrastructure in place already. Reusing this infrastructure in my opinion is far better than developing a greenfield site and having to pay to bring new infrastructure in. In my mind this is far more damaging to the environment.**

   Cleaning up the existing pollution on the Woodfibre site is a benefit to the local environment. It will provide learning opportunities for Engineers and Scientists and years of work for companies that specialize in this sort of work. If nothing goes ahead on this site then there will be no funding for the remediation of this area.

28. **Council should consider the industrial noise, vibrations, sounds etc which could be heard across Howe Sound. Council should consider the effects on air quality that any off-gassing, flaring, leaking, etc that may occur.**

29. **Council should realize that the air pollution will be minimal and sea and non-existent with regard to the land. This plant will be far less polluting than the pulp mill was or than the pulp mill at Port Mellon and far fewer SOX and NOX emissions than all the wood stoves and wood burning fireplaces in Whistler or Squamish.**

30. **That the air emissions and effluent discharges will meet all federal and provincial guidelines and this is all you need to consider.**

31. **Having worked in the Oil Sands I’ve seen the effects of site and pipeline construction has on wildlife and it’s really sad. I think all efforts should be made to ensure minimal effect is had on our animal populations for the same reasons I’m concerned about marine animals.**

32. **Woodfibre let off enough pollution, being in a valley pollution isn’t easily lifted.**

33. **WLNG site sits on 2 fault lines with also a significant risk of other natural hazards such as land and mud slides and forest fires. WLNG is responsible for fire safety on their site but the danger of spreading fire to the surrounding forests is very real. There has been practically no consideration of a large forest fire impacts on Squamish, economy and health. Flaring will take place and impact air quality and the proponent cannot guarantee the amount of flaring, they can only estimate it. Fortis pipeline is proposed to go through our sensitive and protected estuary, the impacts of construction and the foot prints around drill sites are significant. The SEMP was intended to prevent further industrial activity in these ecologically sensitive areas.**

   To say that the electric drive choice will reduce emissions by 80% is entirely misleading. The 80% reduction is comparative to using natural gas but if the facility is not there at all, there will be zero new emissions into our airshed. Even with an electric drive WLNG contributes an equivalent addition of 9000 more cars on the highway.

34. **There is no doubt that creating an LNG terminal and pipeline will result in harm to the ecosystem. It its essence, both project will (not may or can, but will) reduce habitat, produce air, water and land pollution, increase impact to the land, destroy wildlife, nests and animal homes during construction. It is considerate that Woodfibre proposes to mitigate potential impacts to elk, the very fact that the terminal will be constructed and then operate on a 24 hour a day basis will negatively impact elk and other species. Also, the chlorination and heating of the water will impact salmon and other fish that in turn impact the land eco system. The risk to animals such as bears and eagles that feed on these fish is high. With decreased food sources do to water pollution and heating coupled with loss of habitat from construction is eminent. Of note with bears, with a decrease of food and habitat, the risk for bears entering residential areas increases. No one wants to see a bear in their garbage, let alone have one put down due**
ultimately to habitat and food loss.

35. The seismic concern is significant. We live in the most seismically active areas in Canada. It is only a matter of time before a large quake hits this region. Although a tsunami from a mega thrust quake is not predicted for Howe Sound, a large quake could still badly damage infrastructure, both pipeline and LNG site.

36. I am very concerned about the effects LNG and construction will have on our air quality - we are so fortunate to have clean air in our community - let’s keep it that way.

37. Electricity was a good choice for the project. and how else will the existing population get cleaned up

38. The focus remains the same...why focus on fossil fuels when we know better?...When we can harness the sun? The wind, especially in Howe Sound/Squamish (the mother of wind)... Spend the money in renewables ...create jobs with renewables...to be a self sustaining community. Why is a foreign investor allowed to extract our resources? Why are the feds selling us off? And do we really have a say in the matter?

39. The north side of Howe Sound and the Squamish river are mostly unpopulated and allow for wildlife such as herds of elk have a habitat. By putting a big industrial project such as an LNG export facility in the middle of this land, we keep wildlife from having an undisturbed place to flourish.

40. Reuse of existing infrastructure and brownfield site are pluses.

In the event of a major earthquake, how prepared is DoS currently and how much more preparation and effort will be required if WLNG and Fortis Pipeline projects go ahead?

WLNG project requires use and storage of hazardous materials on site (for instance, various types of refrigerants). In case of spills, are you satisfied with proposed clean-up and remediation plan (assuming such a plan exists and has been reviewed)?

Is there risk of air borne contamination to surrounding areas from pre-construction site clean up?

41. Using the existing generating station to power the plant would be a bonus for maintaining clean air. As long as the facility is built to modern standards, I have no concerns about the earthquake hazard.

42. Even electric powered plants have to vent and watching a large LNG plant venting into our airspace from the top of the Chief or the Sea to Sky Gondola would be a very negative picture of Squamish for people. We are so lucky to live in a place that has excellent air quality right now due to our estuary, trees and fresh and salt water. Increasing emissions from freighters and other large ships seems like we would be stepping back in time. In terms of land, Fracking is extremely harmful to the stability of the surrounding earth creating unnatural seismic activity, disrupting and endangering wild life and creating toxic groundwater. We have recently seen the return of elk, grizzly bears and wolves to Squamish and we must protect this wildlife. Again, the abundance of wildlife will attract more tourism and people to Squamish and show case us to the world. Poor air quality, polluted ground water, and lack of wildlife will not showcase us. We’ll be in the headlines for all the wrong reasons.

43. no **** stupid. what, you think they are going to burn their profit to make energy? Dumb****.

44. This is a great opportunity to have this site cleaned up and reclaimed to todays standards.

45. We have had improving air quality over the last few years and this is something our community has said is important to them.

46. Targets to reduce emissions globally and locally. Will this project allow us to achieve what’s needed to meaningfully address climate change. Also for coastal communities/developments, sea level rise impacts and to what degree the proponents have addressed SLR in the development plan.

47. There will be off gas from LNG in our clean air space. We live in a geologically active area.
48. Industry pollutes and it's mere presence affects our local ecosystems.

49. The actions that Woodfibre are proposing create additional opportunity to mitigate any environmental impact. These should become conditions of their project approvals.

50. Squamish means, "Four Winds" - we get our winds for all 4 directions, West/South/North/East...you cannot assume anything with this.....we will be harmed, in some way...

51. My understanding is that the LNG plant is going to get a massive reduction in the price of hydroelectric power.

52. The Government and the Project both agreed to use Hydro power to minimize impacts from emissions at the request of Council.

53. It appears as though Woodfibre is committed (on paper) to going about the building and running of the site with their impact in mind. The irony, of course, being that most of these measures would be unnecessary if the project were not also creating the very risks they are attempting to mitigate. Powering a natural gas project with electricity does not negate the fact the gas is being obtained in a way that creates risks for the surrounding land, and is known to contribute significantly to carbon emissions and global warming. The logic of "saving 80%" on emissions, so that we can create more emissions is deeply flawed. The time to consider these things is now.

54. What baseline studies are being used? How did this ever get chosen as a site? We know from our government website that it is located on 2 thrust fault lines with Henrietta Dam above. It's against a forest. No other LNG in the world is sited in a place similar to Howe Sound. The amount of GHG's are continued to be minimized by WF. The cumulative effects of all industry in Howe Sound needs to be considered instead of looking at this as only one pollutant. Based on the carbon tax program, WF will be getting a rebate as they will be under the limit set in place. That is ludicrous when you consider the amount of GHG's they will dump into our airshed. In the end with acid rain, we continue to effect our ocean's.

55. Council should consider that Woodfibre LNG is estimating greenhouse gas emissions to be 142 thousand tonnes of CO2 equivalent every year. This does NOT account for the greenhouse gases produced elsewhere by the consumption of approximately 2.1 million tonnes of LNG exported annually from the Woodfibre site (National Energy Board File OF-EI-Gas-GL-W157-2013-0101).

We know that Natural Gas is comprised mostly of methane which is a powerful greenhouse gas.

Steve Hamburg, EDF Chief Scientist has said: “By emitting just a little bit of methane, we're greatly accelerating the rate of climatic change.” http://www.edf.org/people/steven-hamburg

Emissions from the combustion of natural gas contribute to acid rain and ground-level ozone, both of which can damage forests and agricultural crops.

56. Again limiting this to 3 concerns is inadequate. And again it sounds like the Woodfibre site will only get cleaned up if the LNG plant is approved. As far as utilizing existing infrastructure are we talking about the hydro electric power that was granted to the previous operations as a pulp mill that employed 1000 BC citizens? We should not be exporting power or using it to subsidize heavy industry that provides very little net benefit to this province. Hydro rates will go up as this subsidy exhausts our supply and the site C will need to be added to the give away. Very few are making money on this resource plunder and the majority will be left to pay the real costs.

57. Will long term operation of the woodfiber facility have detrimental health effects for District of Squamish Residents?

58. By building the facility...there is a decommissioning plan that has been stated. With the exception of a decommission schedule agreement and future use plan in place under that agreement. As regulations change will the facility also be required to upgrade to keep in operations. Or will they be grandfathered in with the current engineering.

59. The air and land impacts will be affected for tens of years after the fact LNG are gone. I recently heard the proposed Wood Fiber site is already contaminated how would a new LNG industrial site improve this contaminated site?
In order to have clean air and healthy land, we must strive to use sustainable sources of energy. LNG is not one of these.

Any tanker traffic would contribute to the global warming effect contacting all air and land quality in the surrounding areas.

As per above for Water: It's not just the facts for the local Squamish environment that need to be considered. What about the travesty of the damage fracking causes at the very beginning of the supply chain and the widespread effects that causes? This is just as important! FACT: Supporting the Woodfibre site is supporting the ongoing, wreckless behaviour our province is wreaking on our land through this unsustainable practice. I very much hope council will balance the facts of more sustainable energy projects in the area.

An additional 80,000 tons of CO2 in our air? And they get to pollute our air for free? Just because this common good is still free? I don't agree with this. What is the benefit for the residents from that? A few more dollar of taxes?

We live in an earthquake zone drilling and pushing water through our core base will makes us further unstable.

Squamish is gem whose future success relies on Eco-tourism.

They are using a huge amount of the 'available' renewable energy in our region to fuel a project based on non-renewable energy!! What a waste.

With regards to earthquakes - despite how secure their system may be, putting the oil & gas directly on a fault line is sheer stupidity.

Clean-up is nice, but that should be done anyway. However, the estuary is the nursery for the ENTIRETY of Howe Sound, and impacts on this delicate and recovering part of the ecosystem will have far-reaching affects on all life in Howe Sound. Air quality is a serious concern, as Squamish is at the receiving end of all pollution in Howe Sound. We are a catch basin for all the potential discharge. WFLNG promises and 80% reduction of air pollution, but an 80% reduction of WHAT? They have provided no metrics for this pollution, and if we return to the air quality of old, the livability of Squamish will be no better than that of a third world country.

We do not know how heavy industry will affect wildlife, except that it will be adverse. Our air quality is vastly superior to other parts of the lower mainland because we don't have all of their pollution, let's not start increasing it now.

Throughout the summer months when the whole community is outdoors that's when the winds blow into our community and our air quality will be noticed when all the windows are opened.

Please consider that there has been a sad lack of monitoring from both federal and provincial governments of the air quality of the Sound and that the same is true of the marine life and other plant and animal life in the proposed area. What can we count on for a fair assessment of what the actual impacts to these areas will be? We have no base line.

the use of electricity for both the fotris compressors and WLNG are a great choice and needs to be reconized.

A compressor station in town?

We basically live in a bowl anything that happens in this valley stays in this valley for a long time. Anything released into the air will circulate and accumulate over time.

Most studies of oil and gas industry in Canada comes from open areas like the prairies' where a persistent breeze carries and eventually disperses any emissions away. But, if you look downwind from any of these facilities you see the environmental damage and recurring illnesses. Of course money talks and these companies would rather pay and fine or settle a law suit than admit what damages they really incur.

Here in Squamish Valley it is a different story. Although the wind may blow strong up the valley it is only a low level wind and once it reaches the upper valley it rises up and flows back out only to sink and pass through again. This is what would cause an accumulative affect of any emissions from the LNG.
The noise is another factor from this facility. Where I came from they installed a gas powered electric plant and whenever that plant went to flare the sound could be heard for at least 5 km, was very irritating and would occur at all times of the day. This was in an open flat area, I could only imagine what it would sound like in a confined valley where it could echo around.

What professionals have been brought in to study airflows in the Sound and Valley?? Is there any air monitoring going on now so there is a base study to compare what effect future emissions might be doing to/having on the community/valley??

I have read that LNG has to be purified so where do these impurities go??(flare) I know some of the gasses will be by-products but what happens to non useful gases or vapours?? Flares are proven only to be 95% efficient burning impurities at best, and winds over 5Km/hr render them less efficient. I wonder if they will even be able to light their flare with the winds in the sound blowing.

Most soil on surrounding mountains is shallow, what affect would an acidified rain have on vegetation?? I recall such emissions having a devastating effect in the Sudbury ON region denuding it of almost all vegetation.

Have any scientists been brought in to enlighten the committees on possible air and environmental hazards posed by an LNG plant??

If the plant does have effects on the environment they don’t plan to stop operations they just plan to lessen the effects on the Elk?? what about the people in the Squamish Valley??

74. Don’t want it to smell like it did all those years ago. Let’s be clean.

75. No risks to our air quality are acceptable. Look at the healthy people who live here for that very reason! Cyclists don’t want dirty air. Electricity is just as bad, let’s not encourage more private hydro projects to power another flight industry! What century is this??

76. Any work being done to the site is a positive improvement to a well used industrial site.

77. Squamish is a multi-hazard zone. The pipeline and compressor station are proposed in areas prone to liquefaction from seismic activity. After the Christchurch, New Zealand earthquakes underground infrastructure such as pipelines were severely compromised by liquefaction. Areas of Christchurch will never be built on again due to liquefaction effects, demonstrating that structures cannot be adequately strengthened or designed to mitigate this risk to an acceptable level.

78. humans in general have little understanding, or care, of how much harm they bring on the environment. Squamish brands itself as being an outdoor capital--we should live up to the image we project

79. As indicated above, Council should consider the negative impacts to air quality and wildlife of the LNG project and pipeline construction.

80. The promise of remediation and being good corporate citizens are only given to secure their right to pollute, disturb, and cause environmental damage elsewhere. The last corporate entities should have had to remediate the current environmental problems they left behind. Why didn't Council enforce that responsibilities of those corporate entities? And volunteer groups should not be responsible for Woodfibre's environmental reclamation.

81. The topics are so biased and loaded with unbalanced statements that I am struggling with how to comment on this section so I think I will tackle each offence as I see it:
Statement #1: The proposed LNG project site would be powered with electricity; My comment: HA HA HA!!! Are you fricking kidding me!!!! What about all the residents in Brackendale and Axen that live along this hydro corridor and will now be facing much higher kilowatts of power coursing through a transmission line that was never intended for high power transmission when Woodfibre was in action!! I do not think the proposal to power the site with electricity is the correct course of action and needs to have a separate independent study to see what impacts this will have on residents, property values, and suicide rates (which numerous scientific studies have confirmed go up around active hydro transmission lines);

Statement #2: Impacts to wildlife from pipeline construction; My comment: These are numerous and the lack of proper studies by Tera Consulting or FortisBC at this point is completely underwhelming, in particular regarding impacts to species at risk;

Statement #3: Risk of earthquakes etc: My Comments: We know that in the last century there was an underwater subversion that impacted Woodfibre and that the site itself is on a fault line, not to mention in an alluvial fan fed by Mill Creek and Woodfibre Creek. Nature has repeatedly shown us that industries built on deltas and fans will ultimately be subjected to natural forces, not the least being flooding, debris torrents, or even earthquakes

Statement #4: Woodfibre proposes to work with Local First Nations. My comments: Yes, and Squamish Nation Chief and Council are, once again, showing their true colours by accepting what cannot be construed as anything other than promises of fiscal glory and lined coffers. The Squamish Nation membership will be speaking out loud and clear later this month at the protest scheduled for March 29th for their decision makers to hear!! And as far as generating habitat - are you fricking kidding me!!!! What BS. And if this is the carrot that is being offered then I would say look to our local community to create this important habitat for elk and wildlife similar to what we are seeing with the estuary restoration projects - we don’t need a bloody WLNG to fix the environment - volunteer groups can do this quite well on their own!

Statement #5: Woodfibre proposes to clean-up existing pollution. My comment: WHY IS THERE EXISTING POLLUTION ON THE SITE AND WHY HAS THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT NOT REQUIRED WOODFIBRE OR WESTERN FOREST PRODUCTS TO CLEAN THIS UP ALREADY!!!!! Once again, give me a fricking break!

Statement #6: Impacts to local air quality: My comments: please see response from Sea to Sky Clean Air Society who are in a much more informed position to comment on this topic than I am - suffice it to say we need to review potential air born pollutants generated from the shipping and processing

Statement #7: The proposed LNG project site will utilize existing infrastructure on site. My comments: Well I would hope so. But this would apply to any industry. Not much to comment on here

Statement #8: Impacts to wildlife: My comment: We are only now starting to see the waters of Howe Sound return to a more productive ecosystem that is supporting whales and dolphins. To support the WLNG is to set Howe Sound back into the early 70’s and is not something this Council should be encouraging. There are so many clean industries that could be built or encouraged for this site why are we opting for one that creates spills, takes our fresh water and ocean water reserves and contaminates them into overheated, over oxygenated (look up gas bubble disease please) garbage that will be spewed back into Howe Sound!

82. Council should consider what air they will be breathing everyday, along with the rest of us. Squamish winds will be blowing through our town and beyond everyday. Also what of the gas cloud that can form and blow over our town and possibly ignite?? And we have to just suck it up for $$$$$$

83. I worry about the effect of flares on the local bird populations. When I read recently of several thousand birds being incinerated by a flare at a similar plant in the maritimes I couldn’t help thinking that flares and eagles are a very bad mix.

84. this plant will be a refrigeration plant to cool the gas enough to turn it into lng. refrigerant is heavier then air if there was a massive leak or a reliev blew there is a potential for the refrigerant to displace the air in the area. this can cause sufficantion, the reality of this may be low but it is a posibility. we will be dealing with large amount of refrigerant. also there is a flare burning off, i dont know what type of refrigerant will be used but if burned some can create harmfull gases that have a effect on the nervous systems. this was a mahor problem with old cfc refrigerants but still exists in some of the hfcs and hfc’s. no there will need to be power up grades which means yet more power lines, more logging and more unaesthetic “eye sores”. not great for tourism and not great for a
community that is growing with more of the population moving hear for lifestyle and recreation rather then a job.

85. The environmental and health impacts

86. It may be that Woodfibre proposes to work with local First Nation and organizations to monitor/mitigate impacts on wildlife habitats but in my opinion they are already pushing their way through asking the B.C. Supreme Court to overturn the district of Squamish’s decision to deny a permit needed to conduct test drilling. This shows they already have issues working with the community. I don’t trust they will do their part to protect the health of our community and wildlife habitat.

87. In regards to earthquakes, we have a significant number of earthquakes all the time, so, there is risk of damage to this plant which could cause dangerous poison to be released into our waters. Also, since fracking is used to recover the LNG and fracking has been proven to cause earthquakes and waste vast amounts of water, we shouldn’t have anything to do with the process. We shouldn’t be part of this process at any level.

88. Whether the LNG project will minimize it’s environmental impacts by utilizing existing infrastructure and reduce emissions by using electricity to power the site is irrelevant. Drilling for natural gas conventionally and burning it locally are one thing, but this natural gas is coming from fracking in the north of our province. Fracking is a highly polluting and carbon emitting practise which is increasingly being rejected in many parts of the world. Climate change is a reality and there is no time to waste. Fracking natural gas is not an answer. It’s an escalation of the problem.

89. the proponent claims this debate is not about fracking. It bloody well is! I don’t think nearly enough work has been done to study the effect on our air quality, however, ignoring the debate on fracking and what is happening to air and water in the Northeast is at best disingenuous and at worst cynically irresponsible.

90. This pipeline not only devalues homes in close proximity to it, but it destroys homes of wildlife.

91. Fracking is the base of problems

92. We came to squamish for the clean outdoors living. And now we have to worry about air pollutants in our childrens lungs? We wouldn’t have moved here if the pulpmill was still operational. You want squamish to continue to attract new investors and have new people move here? Keep it clean! Or it’s a sad possibility that people may start moving away.

93. Cleaning up a brownfield site is a good thing in my opinion, but when WFLNG closes shop who will clean up? I know I live in a dream world but wouldn’t an industrial sized damage deposit help clean up the messes that industry continues to leave behind for taxpayers? Who is responsible for any groundwater contamination that may occur during the fracking process that feeds this facility?

94. Risk of earthquakes is my biggest concern however I wouldn’t say we have ‘risk of earthquakes’, they are a certainty when you live on a fault line.

95. The immediate damage and long term damage to the environment. It’s pretty obvious.

96. How much of the current infrastructure will really be used!!!

97. How will the pipeline stand up to natural hazards in the estuary and will it be easy to fix and control any breaks/leaks? An estuary is very critical and sensitive habitat for plants and a diversity of animals. With the variability in the weather lately Squamish may be experiencing an increase in risk of flooding, would this be considered in pipeline construction? The reduction of emissions is a positive measure taken by the company.

98. I don’t think we can ignore broader air quality impacts (beyond Squamish). The large number of construction commuters currently planned will not help air quality, and when the LNG is burned overseas it will also have a negative impact on air quality, especially to the degree that it is used instead of brining solar, wind, geo-thermal or other power options. In it’s full lifecycle, it may be marginally better than goal (still disputed) but there’s no guarantee it will replace coal.
99. Frankly I don't believe that woodfibre will do their due diligence when acting on any of their 'proposed' environmental safety conditions. It's a lot easier to destroy than recreate.

100. Dangerous Industry and factories must be forbidden in a narrow valley where thousands reside. On our infamous cloudy rain days, how will the pollutants in the air affect our health as they have no where to go but down on us? Our whole town was built over a river delta, how will pipelines damage the estuary and affect marine life? If there is an earthquake, will the pipes blow?

101. I do not see any signs of cooperation from the industry side. In fact the upcoming court battle with Fortis over the council decision to decline the permit shows complete lack of respect of the district needs, wishes and concerns. I do not believe that they will work with First Nation and other interest groups.

102. The release of gas during fracking.

103. The electrical source will need to be built. Site C dam proposes to destroy good agricultural land and essential habitat for wildlife. NOT a good trade off.

104. The impacts of flaring, methane and all GHG emissions involved in the ENTIRE process (drilling the natural gas up to the delivery of LNG) should be considered. Is natural gas a 'clean fuel'? Let's have the courage to think outside of our little box of BC. Climate change affects everyone. We are responsible.

105. a) Disturbance caused by construction and operations of LNG has detrimental impact onto landscape and wildlife.
    b) Risk of earthquakes and mudslides along the pipeline and around the LNG site is real, leakage of gas from damaged structures would create pollution and fire danger.

106. Our air and land are cleaner than in many parts of the world. Increasingly people are coming to live in Squamish and to visit the area because they value the clean air and the beauty of the land. The current District of Squamish's OCP, product of many years of thought and hard work, supports and provides guidelines. The Sea to Sky Gondola has newly provided a tremendous spark of awareness around the world of our beautiful physical environment, and provides a direct, clear view of Howe Sound and what is happening there.

107. Foremost, Corporations are in the business of maximizing profits for their shareholders the environmental remedial work to the LNG site is nothing more than PR to entice acceptance for the project.

108. The remediation of the Woodfibre site including shoreline will in my view by far have the biggest environmental impact. It is a positive impact -- if done comprehensively according to best practices -- as it will deliver, in addition to important environmental benefits and reduced risks, a significant long term waterfront industrial land asset of benefit to community of Squamish tax base and economic development.

109. Wildlife impact, deforestation, air pollution.

110. Healthy land and air is vital for healthy humans. Resilience of an area returning to life is not a signal that the area is ready for stressors and destructive projects. Projects that take from the land and leave behind damage is not the way to treat our environment and these resources that support our lives. It is not respectful. It is not sustainable.

111. Use of electricity to reduce emissions - a red herring. You still have the emissions from fracking (which are considerable), you have the emissions when the LNG is burned and the electricity might be put to better use.

112. It's not just the pipeline. In order to lay it, heavy equipment will be brought in that will damage the estuary. See above.

113. In even the Assessment's best-case scenario, increased industrialization in Kitimat LNG project means the city's residents will breathe more polluted air. For example, nitrogen dioxide concentrations are expected to increase by between five and 80 percent, depending on location and how the report authors tallied the emissions. Any increases in emissions increases the chance of asthma attacks and other health risks. This risk cannot be eliminated, since even the best technologies considered in the report lead to increases. source: http://cleanenergycanada.org/2014/08/07/five-things-need-know-british-columbias-lng-air-quality-report/

The wind blows north up the sound right onto Squamish. All the residents and wildlife will be injected chemical
and getting sick from it.

Best-case scenario, the report finds that lakes in the region will further acidify.

The Assessment addresses nitrogen dioxide and sulphur dioxide, but those are just two of a family of damaging air pollutants that are collectively known as "criteria air contaminants." If industry proceeds with its proposed gas-fired LNG plants, levels of three other pollutants—particulate matter, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and carbon monoxide—will also rise. Particulates, for example, exacerbate asthma, bronchitis, and emphysema. Particulate concentrations in Kitimat exceeded federal and provincial guidelines 22 times between 2011 and 2013 near the Rio Tinto Alcan smelter. Without assessing these air pollutants, it's impossible to judge what level of industrial air pollution Kitimat's air can handle.

Once in the atmosphere, air pollutants interact with one another, giving rise to new air pollutants that create smog and particulates.

With the recent earthquake in Sechelt it is vital that earthquakes be considered. What will happen if a pipes break due to the shifts in the earth’s crust. What will happen if a rouge or tsunami wave set off by an earthquake hits the bund pool. How will it be contained? Or a shift in the earth and the bund pool breaks or storage containers crack. We live in a highly seismic region where the experts say we are due for a big earthquake. Containment of chemicals going into the air from fires. The list just goes on

---

114. the site needs significant remediation. Having a new industry assist with paying for this cleanup is a positive for the community and the taxpayers of BC.

115. Would also like to tick the first bullet.

116. I grew up in the area and remember the damage wood fibre and the mess from Brittanian Beach why do it again

117. Squamish is a place of healing, health and outdoor recreation. The LNG site is in direct conflict with what our community is build and growing upon today. Expert speakers have educated our community on the impacts of temperature changes in the water, tanker traffic in the sound, noise pollution for wildlife and all the other 'side effects'. It is in violation of what our community cares about and why we have seen such a boom in people moving here. Jeopardizing wildlife, air and water quality will take this community back to the negative reputation and avoidance of visitors and people as was only 7 years ago. The value for our town is in the preservation and carefully planned economic growth that aligns well with what makes Squamish special. Not by destroying our most precious natural gifts that will have our environment compromised and people leaving this town now that it starts to finally be recognized internationally for its natural treasures that will organically drive prosperity.

118. It is an established fact that we live in an earthquake hazard zone. Memories of the Japanese Tsunami being top-of-mind, it behooves us to consider the potential consequences of pipeline failure in the case of a natural disaster. Surely we can understand there WOULD be consequences to both human and animal health?

119. Pipeline and earthquake big concern. Plants and animals will be destroyed and pushed out of area with pipeline construction. Estuary very sensitive.

120. I think the project is environmentally sound. I have no concerns other than the monitoring we would for any industry to ensure they follow the rules set out.

121. Industrial run off (chlorinated water from the cooling process) will degrade marine life. Is this really worth sacrificing for money? There will be hundreds of tons of airborne pollutants including nitrous oxide release into our skies; Squamish became a much better place to live when Woodfiber shut down and our air stopped stinking.

122. There has been earthquake activity in our area and I would have grave concerns over the safety of building this facility on this site. I do not have faith that the company and major shareholders would be help accountable to remediate the site adequately either prior to the LNG facility, nor during operations and especially after the facility is past its economic usefulness or in the event of a major disaster.
123. There is simply no benefit!

124. We live in an earthquake zone. Pipeline failure consequences must be considered as a likely scenario; rather than as the "hysterical projection of well-meaning but poorly-informed tree-hugging protesters".

125. I value clean air to breathe.

126. The prevailing wind goes straight towards town, an explosive fog of leaked LNG would drift into squamish. As would normal pollution. International shipping laws forbid the transport so close to roads and other vessels for a reason NO LNG

127. The fact that LNG will be using electricity (at a very reduced rate!) to conduct its energy is a disgrace!!!! Such stupid actions only transfer the burden of costs to outside our jurisdiction. It should be using natural gas and the costs should be consumed where the benefits are accrued (i.e. Singapore, but also a little bit locally... ) It is not a 'green powering' by any stretch of the imagination. The

128. Again, remediation should not be considered a benefit with this plan. It should have been cleaned up years ago by previous owner.

129. The footprint of the plant will not exceed the already established footprint left from the previous occupants.

130. concerned about the greenhouse gases emitted each year (80,000 tons) even when using hydro electricity to run the plant.

131. No change at all to air quality. No to LNG

132. It's a brownfield, well suited to the proposed new use.

133. Focus on green energy and non noxious contributors to atmosphere.

134. RE: AIR QUALITY

Last year, Woodfibre LNG heavily promoted the fact that it had chosen to use electric power to reduce local air emissions. While this is a win, there will still be significant air pollution emissions that will directly impact Squamish's air quality, and will also impact visibility within the Howe Sound and Squamish due to smog-forming compounds that Woodfibre LNG will be emitting.

Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG's environmental assessment application).

Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2) is a reddish-brown gas with a pungent, irritating odour. It absorbs light and leads to the yellow-brown "smog" pollution haze seen hanging over cities. It is known to irritate the lungs and increase susceptibility to respiratory infections. In combination with either ozone (O3) or sulphur dioxide (SO2), nitrogen dioxide may cause injury at even lower concentration levels.

Sulphur Dioxide (SO2) is a toxic gas with a pungent, irritating, and rotten smell. Current scientific evidence links short-term exposures to SO2, ranging from 5 minutes to 24 hours, with an array of adverse respiratory effects including bronchoconstriction and increased asthma symptoms. These effects are particularly important for asthmatics at elevated ventilation rates (e.g., while exercising or playing). Studies also show a connection between short-term exposure and increased visits to emergency departments and hospital admissions for respiratory illnesses, particularly in at-risk populations including children, the elderly, and asthmatics. The addition of these air pollutants in Howe Sound is of particular concern as recent research has shown that the Howe Sound airshed and
Lower Fraser Valley airshed are connected. Emissions from Woodfibre LNG will add to the pollution in Howe Sound, exacerbating the existing air quality conditions, particularly in the Squamish-Brackendale corridor.

Recent research (by MSc student Annie Seagram, studying under Professor Douw Steyn, Department of Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Sciences at the University of British Columbia) has shown that the Howe Sound airshed and Lower Fraser Valley airshed are connected. Emissions from Woodfibre LNG will add to the pollution in Howe Sound, exacerbating the existing air quality conditions, particularly in the Squamish-Brackendale corridor. Note that Metro Vancouver annually issues several Air Quality Advisories due to high concentrations of ground-level ozone. This pollution also impacts the Howe Sound and Squamish, and exposure to these pollutants are of particular concern for infants, the elderly, and is directly linked to health issues such as lung or heart disease and asthma.

It is important to note that additional reductions in air quality are cumulative, and only add to existing air pollution.

A new study published in the scientific journal, Climatic Change, estimates the true social costs of air pollution that aren’t accounted for in the cost of fossil fuels and other pollutants. Social costs include the health impacts of air pollution as well as impacts from climate change. The study found that sulfur dioxide costs $42,000 per tonne, and nitrous oxides cost $67,000 per tonne.

Source: http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10584-015-1343-0

RE: GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

This is of critical importance. Woodfibre LNG is now estimating greenhouse gas emissions to be 142 thousand tonnes of CO2 equivalent every year. These annual emissions of CO2 equivalent from Woodfibre LNG is equal to adding over 18,000 cars to the highway, driving to Vancouver and back, every day. This is more than six times greater than current highway traffic. It is irresponsible to approve this kind of polluting industry at a time when we need to transition away from fossil fuels to mitigate the risks associated with climate change, and to reduce the economic and health impacts of air pollution in general.

Climate change is amplified in Canada:

Canada has experienced about double the average global temperature increase during the past century. Climate change, including temperature increases, tends to be amplified in Canada because we’re a northern country and global warming is magnified at or near the North and South Poles. This intensification in temperature increase near the poles is largely the result of the loss of ice and snow cover. The IPCC report has information for Canada by region on temperature increases, precipitation trends, drought possibility, snow cover and more.

Natural disasters estimated to cost Canadians $5 billion per year by 2020:

There is evidence from around the world that natural catastrophes such as floods, storms, drought, heatwaves, fires, and earthquakes are on the rise. This is a serious issue for society, as these catastrophes can destroy homes, disrupt businesses, and take lives. According to TD Bank's Chief Economist, this increase in natural catastrophes is estimated to cost Canadians $5 billion per year by 2020, and $21-$43 billion per year by 2050. Source: http://www.td.com/document/PDF/economics/special/NaturalCatastrophes.pdf

According to 350.org, right now we're on track to blow the 2 degrees celsius global carbon budget in less than 18
years. We can't afford to keep supporting these fossil fuel industries. They are unsustainable, economically unviable, and seriously threaten the future survival of the human race on this planet.


Given that Squamish will be spending millions of dollars to upgrade our dike protection systems as a direct result of climate change, it seems foolish to support an industry that will increase the amount of greenhouse gas emissions in Squamish, BC, and the world.

RE: EARTHQUAKES AND OTHER NATURAL HAZARDS

On February 15th, 2015, a 3.4 magnitude earthquake hit Vancouver’s coast that was felt throughout Howe Sound. The Woodfibre LNG proposal is located within this zone of moderate to high earthquake risk, on two known thrust faults. A seismologist from Natural Resources Canada has warned that “the big one” is just a matter of time. Do you think it is smart to site explosive Class A hazardous material on a site that has a history of landslides?

http://www.empr.gov.bc.ca/Mining/Geoscience/MapPlace/Documents/faults_bc_dd.zip

Fjords are frequently subject to landslides and debris flows and the Woodfibre site has a history of slope failure. In 1955 a wharf and three warehouses collapsed into Howe Sound at the Woodfibre site, causing $500,000 – $750,000 in damages (). The Woodfibre site is not a safe location for a hazardous LNG facility.

A recent, but unreleased, geotechnical study by Knight Piesold supports this conclusion. The report identifies that approximately 46% of the study area was mapped as having rapid mass movement. This means landslides and slope slumpage... including existing natural landslide hazards as well as terrain where construction activity may increase landslide initiation.

Source: Section 5.6-16 Geotechnical and Natural Hazards of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application.
http://a100.gov.bc.ca/appsdata/epic/documents/p408/d38525/1421092382872_KQQUJ0PjSG1cH9LDD8L1J0CQhQw7NgD32kZQsvPHxwWNdyq1qGCG13783384551421086505978.pdf
Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4
https://books.google.ca/books?id=rL7g-kyWNN4C&pg=PA85&ots=hX_15yNTyf&dq=Bornhold%2C%20B.D.%2C%201983%2C%20Fiords%2C%20GEOS%2C%20no.%2C%201%2C%20p%2C%201-4&pg=PA85#v=onepage&q=Bornhold,%20B.D.,%2C%201983,%2C%20Fiords,%2C%20GEOS,%2C%20no.%2C%201%2C%20p%2C%201-4&f=false

135. The fact is that any amount of environmental management associated with this project will only reduce the massive impact on our lands. Let their be no illusion, this type of project is massive and aggressive.

136. Air Land and water...if it’s not within levels that coexist with the valley dwellers...shut it down...or blow it up
137. Destruction of the natural habitat is inevitable if this project continues. We do not need this - the impact on the land, water and air far outweighs any money that comes from it.

Squamish is world renowned for it's natural beauty, do not be the ones to approve it's destruction. Be the wise "city fathers" who have the wisdom and courage to safeguard this habitat for future generations. Please!

138. See above

139. Natural disasters like earthquakes mud slides.

140. LNG will be 100% better than the old wood fibre plant and that is to say the least.

141. Again, the way that this questionnaire is structured is very questionable. Sure they mention risk to air quality under specific health guidelines, but what about smell. Will this bring with is a bed smell that will remind us daily for the next 25 years about the bad choice we were forced into as a community? How well are you working with First Nations peoples? I noticed on the website that they were advertising how they would use "Indigenous Knowledge" in their operations. After asking what this entailed and receiving a response from John French I now believe Indigenous knowledge refers simply to the fact that formerly the Squamish nation travelled through the fjord to trade. Why to use the consultation process to your advantage LNG? Why keep the impacts to wildlife questions separate? I also am worried about the risk of earthquakes, but I cannot fit all of my concerns within the confines of this survey.

142. There will be more habitat lost. We live in a earthquake zone. Lets keep Squamish Green.

143. The existing Gas pipeline has operated about 25 years very successfully and have improved air quality in the corridor. LNG is the latest in Marine Fuel choices due to burning cleaner and costing less overall.

144. Again I see more benefits to having the LNG than negatives. Historical contamination to be remediated. The pipelines disruption will be minimal and sites to be restored. Less impact than hydro lines and a gondola

145. Please consider the affect of stack flares on Avifauna especially migratory birds such as our wintering Eagles. 7500 birds were fried instantly by a stack flare in New Brunswick. What will WLNG be doing to protect the Avifauna?

146. Prevailing southerly winds in summer will blow any emissions from normal activity or accidents directly into downtown Squamish. It's also a constricted valley that would concentrate any emissions.

Earthquakes are a very big risk factor. We are concerned about a 1 in 10,000 year event in the case of the Cheekeye Fan yet other seismic activity that could potentially cause an accident to a pipeline or plant are way more likely.

I am concerned about the impact to wildlife in the estuary. Estuaries are very fragile environments and crucial to many land and sea animals. Disturbance of mercury and other contaminants in the sediment is also an issue.

147. Regardless of what avenue they take to process the LNG there will be added air pollution being put out by this plant and the tankers that will be involved in the transport of it. I'm wondering if those involved with this project are aware that the wind blows straight into our city everyday of the summer from 10:00am till 8:00pm. That means the fresh is that we have all become a custom to will now be affected.

148. There is undeniably a risk of natural hazard, such as earthquake, as well as human error in such a project. The implications of such an event would be catastrophic, and it really isn't a question of if something will happen, but when. I do not believe the benefits outweigh the risk involved to our natural habitat, a habitat that relies heavily on the health of plants and air quality, just like other animals in the area.

149. We have already had an earthquake that was felt February 15th, 2015 and we know that the plant is built on two fault lines. Are we ready for the impact that will have on the environment?

150. Woodfibre Lng’s own newsl/info letters states that the plant will reduce its C02 emissions by using electricity to
80,000 tonnes per year. I went online to the United States EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) site to get an idea of what this means. Putting 80,000 tonnes in their emissions calculator came up with these quantitative comparisons; 80,000 tonnes is equal to the ANNUAL greenhouse gas emissions of 16,842 passenger vehicles OR the CO2 emissions from 9,001,913 gallons (34,075,931 Litres) of gasoline consumed!!!! I remember when I lived in Vancouver in the mid 1990’s and driving through Squamish to go to Whistler, how when passing through Squamish I noticed the smell acrid smell of the pulp mill - and was glad to pass by it. My concern here is that the Howe Sound winds travel up the sound and blow over the town. Are we ready for 80,000 tonnes of CO2 blowing over our town? What about the Health effects? Many people I know chose Squamish because of its clean air, away from large cities and urban centres. We chose and invested our money and livelihoods in this beautiful area, to raise new families. Also I believe the information coming from Woodfibre LNG, Fortis BC and the Government, represents the "best" possible scenarios in their favour.

151. the amount of energy used from bc hydro to produce lng is far too much, making it a dirty fuel. We need to focus on non carbon fuel sources for our children and future generations to come. The methane releases happening upstream during the hydraulic fracturing process are harmful and we should not allow any more greenhouse gases to be added to atmosphere. Lng is dirty.

152. That the company is listening and prepared to make the needed changes to ensure this is the cleanest LNG project world wide.

153. Although we could only check three boxes, I think air quality is another critical issue in this debate. I lived in Squamish while Woodfibre was operational in the past and due to the regular inflows, the scent of the mill was often strong in town and it is undetermined, at least to me, whether or not there were any impacts on citizen's health as a result of the emissions.

154. I don’t think that WLNG will bring any short or long term benefits to anybody. To engage FN to remediate lands that were once theirs and pristine in way that modern day society can not understand or appreciate is a completely ridiculous concept.

155. While the wlng plant may produce 80% less emissions there will still be a release of green house gases, and that does not consider how the electricity is generated, perhaps by burning fossil fuels?

156. I would like to know more about this and who is overseeing, regulating? What are the standard acceptable amounts of contaminant?

157. A gas pipeline running through a sensitive estuary...a gas pipeline running though a town prone to earthquakes...the possibility of disaster is very real.

158. The Fortis pipeline construction will basically destroy most of the existing habitat of the West Delta of the Squamish River Estuary. Although the habitat will likely recover within a few years, the impact will be significant because this intertidal habitat is known to be the most productive habitat in the estuary. I believe that the Estuary is probably marginal in its functions so that even a relatively small and temporary impact could result in the extirpation or near extirpation of important species, such as chum or coho salmon. Charles Darwin observed that being few in number is the stage immediately prior to extinction.

159. I live in Brackendale along side a hydro transmission line that will be used to service the Woodfibre site. When Woodfibre was in operation as a pulp mill there was a very low wattage of electricity serviced through these lines which was augmented on-site by a generator at Mill Creek. As a resident along a Hydro R/W I want to understand what the electrical needs of the proposed WLNG are and how that will affect my health, property values, and community as we have a good understanding that large megawatt power lines increase disease and rates of suicide in residents that live adjacent to active lines. As well, property values are affected by active Hydro R/W. When I purchased my house it was with a full understanding that I live adjacent to a Hydro R/W but the power running through the single line was quite minimal. The concerns and impacts of all the residents in Brackendale and Axen need to be considered before any decisions are to be made if the proposed WLNG is to be powered by Hydro;

We have historically been inundated with chemical clouds of fumes brought along winds heading north on Howe Sound from the days of the FMC Chlor-alkali Plant and more recently by Western Forest Products Woodfibre pulp and paper mill. Consideration much be given to Squamish residents regarding the potential for yet new clouds of
gas and poisonous chemicals once again becoming air borne and impacting community health;

We know that Woodfibre is at the base of two active watercourses (Mill & Woodfibre Creeks) and is on a delta as well as on an earthquake fault. We also know there was a subterranean earthquake in the past century and that we are well overdue for a significant coastal earthquake. Why on earth would we even consider placing a heavy industry such as a refinery in an area that could result in a catastrophic event! We already have the gas pipeline in this area which creates a certain level of risk. It is not acceptable to add to this risk level but increasing the pipeline and creating an industry that needs a stable environment.

160. The eco-systems we all coexists with in Squamish are just now recovering from heavy industrial abuse. That's is documented. It's a fact that introducing more heavy industrial at the scale proposed would set our environmental recovery back decades.

161. We need to consider the impacts long term on air quality and land conservancy. We need to keep impacts to plant and animal life at a minimum.

162. The most important facts for Council to consider is the emissions from the plant. They need to burn off certain impurities in the gas before they can liquify it and Council should consider the effect of these emissions before making any decisions.

163. increased air pollution equal to an increase of 6 times the amount of traffic currently on the sea to sky area. Have you ever walked along the highway? Cars stink. To make this smog a permanent fixture to our air quality is UNACCEPTABLE.

We can't even walk in areas of the estuary and yet you want to build a pipeline through it? When will this madness stop? Use green methods. not a method proven in other countries to have failed!

164. There is a fault line at the WLNG site! Eoin Finn has a presentation that should be given hours of consideration.

Protect! Protect! Protect!

165. Although utilization of existing infrastructure may seem like the best option, it isn't always possible - safety, environmental protection, reliability

166. No wind speed or direction data collected at Woodfibre site. Dispersion models are based on mesoscale models using only four wind monitoring station from far away places like the airport and Pam Rocks. The application even acknowledges this:

"Due to the complex nature of the terrain within the assessment areas, meteorological conditions, specifically wind speed and direction, will have localized patterns. The complex topography and the land-water interface within the Howe Sound results in terrain-induced meteorological conditions and coastal flow conditions. As a result, it is expected that available meteorological stations (i.e., Environment Canada, MOE, and BC Wildfire Management Branch) within the LAA and RAA will not be representative of the meteorological conditions at the Project location."

We need to insist on wind data from the Woodfibre site. The Mill creek valley experiences very localized wind patterns that are not reflected in a mesoscale meteorological studies. We need to insist on microscale monitoring data, specific to the Mill Creek valley.

The same winds that brought the smells of the Woodfibre pulp mill to Squamish will be carrying the NO2 and SO2 emissions from the mill site towards our town, further decreasing the air quality in Squamish. There is also the concern of the volatile gas they would carry towards Squamish in a catastrophic situation.

We need better data on which to base the dispersion models.
167. There are too many environmental risks to have this facility in our backyard. We need to focus on how we can improve our air and water rather than allow greed and hope for industry destroy it.

168. Its BC's problem to clean up what Wood fibre left behind. There is more damage to the ocean that can't be seen from above and far away. LNG plant can try to help initially, but will damage long-term.

169. 142 thousand tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions is unacceptable.

Woodfibre LNG is now estimating greenhouse gas emissions to be 142 thousand tonnes of CO2 equivalent every year. These annual emissions of CO2 equivalent from Woodfibre LNG is equal to adding over 18,000 cars to the highway, driving to Vancouver and back, every day. This is more than six times greater than current highway traffic. It is irresponsible to approve this kind of polluting industry at a time when we need to transition away from fossil fuels to mitigate the risks associated with climate change, and to reduce the economic and health impacts of air pollution in general.

170. While land remediation is good and will hopefully happen regardless, this site is not that far removed from residential areas and the future oceanfront development. Air quality has to be considered as a major factor.

171. Woodfibre LNG is located on fault lines and that is a concern. What would happen if an earthquake damaged the equipment and caused leakage on the land, water and air?

172. Squamish and Howe Sound are in the corridor of outdoor pursuit. Fresh Air is an asset to people and animals. The land is an asset to the well being of humans and people.

173. Increased air pollution will likely have a health cost that would literally cost tax payers thousands.


How would this increased air pollution interact with our current tourism industry and other tax base? A socio economic study is needed.

174. Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG's environmental assessment application). Too many! (regardless of what the models say about guidelines)

Woodfibre LNG is now estimating greenhouse gas emissions to be 142 thousand tonnes of CO2 equivalent every year. These annual emissions of CO2 equivalent from Woodfibre LNG is equal to adding over 18,000 cars to the highway, driving to Vancouver and back, every day. This is more than six times greater than current highway traffic. It is irresponsible to approve this kind of polluting industry at a time when we need to transition away from fossil fuels to mitigate the risks associated with climate change, and to reduce the economic and health impacts of air pollution in general.

175. Plants & animals yes, BUT marine life is more of a concern.

176. With myself having asthma it's a concern. I would have to move and leave a community I love. Risks of earthquakes in our area causing a crack in the pipelines are a real concern. We have not enough coast guards let alone safeguards to watch every inch of the pipeline. The risks are not worth the benefits.

177. Concerned about overall ecological health of Howe Sound and potential impacts from LNG construction and operations, both in the marine and terrestrial environments. 'Reducing emissions by 80%' is a red herring. NOT going ahead with the project would reduce emissions by 100%.

178. What legal actionable guarantees do we have beyond promises from the foreign LNG company do we have to fulfill the above mentioned proposals to work with First Nations, or clean-up existing pollution.

179. LNG and fossil fuels are old news and hydraulic fracturing WILL NEVER BE CLEAN. Despite any efforts- we've been down this path since the industrial revolution and evidence is clear that isn't working. Change is difficult, common
Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO₂) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG's environmental assessment application). Emissions of NOx and SO₂ interact with other compounds to form fine particles, which can affect both the lungs and the heart. Exposure to these particles is linked to increased risk of respiratory symptoms, such as irritation of the airways, coughing, or difficulty breathing; decreased lung function; aggravated asthma; onset of chronic bronchitis; irregular heartbeat; nonfatal heart attacks; and premature death in people with heart or lung disease. A new study published in the scientific journal, Climatic Change, estimates the true social costs of air pollution that aren’t accounted for in the cost of fossil fuels and other pollutants. Social costs include the health impacts of air pollution as well as impacts from climate change. The study found that sulfur dioxide costs $42,000 per tonne, and nitrous oxides cost $67,000 per tonne. Sources:


On February 15th, 2015, a 3.4 magnitude earthquake hit Vancouver's coast that was felt throughout Howe Sound. The Woodfibre LNG proposal is located within this zone of moderate to high earthquake risk, on two known thrust faults. The Woodfibre site also has a history of slope failure. In 1955 a wharf and three warehouses collapsed into Howe Sound at the Woodfibre site, causing $500,000 – $750,000 in damages (Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4). A recent, but unreleased, geotechnical study by Knight Piesold identifies that approximately 46% of the study area was mapped as having rapid mass movement. This means landslides and slope slumpage...including existing natural landslide hazards as well as terrain where construction activity may increase landslide initiation. Why hasn't the geotechnical study by Knight Piesold been released?

Sources:
Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4
B.C. Ministry of Energy and Mines

Baseline studies on the following are either missing or are inadequate as they do not conform to any recognized scientific standards: birds, air quality, atmospheric sound, and the cumulative impact assessment. Proper studies need to be completed before any decisions can be made regarding this project.

impacts to wildlife, risks of earthquakes:

Impacts to wildlife (including plants and animals) from LNG site construction and operations. are also a major concern.

Air quality is major. My daughter who is 4 has weak lungs, the fresh air we breathe helps her survive and hopefully live a healthy life. I don’t want to see this change for her. Our children are vulnerable and as parents we must protect them from harm. As a voting citizen in this country I want to see us d good and better things like make this land and air a world heritage site. It would make more sense than bringing back polluting industry. Let's think outside of the monetary box that has trapped us and really see what's important. Please councillors keep the air clean and the land free of toxicity

There are no benefits. The pollutants being released (even with electric power) are still equivalent to 18000 extra cars on the S2S highway every day.

To begin with the most glaring issue, Howe Sound was industrialized for over 50 years, maybe longer, which saw a decay of its environment. Species of all marine life disappeared, fish stocks dropped, and the industry which we relied upon dried up. Efforts were made to bring back Howe Sound environment to a state where marine life has
started to come back, orcas, dolphins, humpback and grey whales, herring as we as salmon have rebounded. It has taken considerable effort, so why take steps back. This relates directly to not only the polluting nature of the WLNG facility, but also the LNG tankers, which are significantly large than shipping tankers. The frequency of these tankers and the noise and disruption which this will cause has not been proven to be negligible, and therefore WLNG cannot go ahead until it can be shown without a doubt that the thousands of species will not be affected by the tankers. This is an aside to the dangerous nature of having these tankers travel up and down Howe Sound, disrupting recreational boating (because of the huge right of way) and creating a horrid eyesore for all visitors and residents.

I bought a house in Squamish and the last thing I want to see is my and other's property value affected by an industrial export facility in our waters. We bought into a community without this, and this is how it should stay.

---

**186.** As citizens in Canada, do we have the right to clean air, our primary need for life? Why would we want to sacrifice this so that Government may make some tax money. When is our health and the health of the planet going to take priority? In Canada we still need fossil fuels but the way of the future is coming - alternatives. Why ramp up production now for China who may well be storing NG? It is a fact that producing NG comes with an enormous contribution to GHGs. When one assesses the entire process some scientists have claimed that burning coal is not worse than fracking. I am very concerned about the vast number of fracking wells that will be constructed for this project. It is an act of rape to our land, air, and water.

**187.** Forest fire hazard could be significant here and WLNG is only responsible for their own property. If fire spreads from this site, which it can, it can put Squamish in jeopardy in many ways and annihilate our tourism industry for a long time.

Flaring will cause air and light pollution as well as visual impacts. The Fortis pipeline through the estuary will destroy ecologically sensitive areas.

WLNG is located on 2 fault lines and also has a compromised Henriette Lake Dam above it. This facility is in a wrong location and in an earthquake could permanently damage Squamish. Why would we allow highly flammable and explosive gas processing facility in such a place?

**188. The Woodfibre site is not a safe location for a hazardous LNG facility**

On February 15th, 2015, a 3.4 magnitude earthquake hit Vancouver’s coast that was felt throughout Howe Sound. The Woodfibre LNG proposal is located within this zone of moderate to high earthquake risk, on two known thrust faults. The Woodfibre site also has a history of slope failure. In 1955 a wharf and three warehouses collapsed into Howe Sound at the Woodfibre site, causing $500,000 – $750,000 in damages (Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4). A recent, but unreleased, geotechnical study by Knight Piesold identifies that approximately 46% of the study area was mapped as having rapid mass movement. This means landslides and slope slumpage...including existing natural landslide hazards as well as terrain where construction activity may increase landslide initiation.

Why hasn't the geotechnical study by Knight Piesold been released?

**189. The Woodfibre site is not a safe location for a hazardous LNG facility**

On February 15th, 2015, a 3.4 magnitude earthquake hit Vancouver’s coast that was felt throughout Howe Sound. The Woodfibre LNG proposal is located within this zone of moderate to high earthquake risk, on two known thrust faults. The Woodfibre site also has a history of slope failure. In 1955 a wharf and three warehouses collapsed into Howe Sound at the Woodfibre site, causing $500,000 – $750,000 in damages (Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4). A recent, but unreleased, geotechnical study by Knight Piesold identifies that approximately 46% of the study area was mapped as having rapid mass movement. This means landslides and slope slumpage...including existing natural landslide hazards as well as terrain where construction activity may increase landslide initiation.

Why hasn't the geotechnical study by Knight Piesold been released?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Paragraph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>190.</td>
<td>GHG emission will be major. We have some of the best air in BC. Breathing healthy air is so important and many studies have confirmed the importance of clean air. We need to drastically reduce GHG emissions, yet fracking expansion and LNG export facility will cause sky rocketing GHG emissions. WLNG sits on two fault lines, the risks involved with the location are very clear. What about Henrietta dam? It is not up to current standards, who will monitor the outflow study that still needs to be conducted? WLNG? Why was this not part of the EA? Pipeline construction will have significant impacts on the marine life in the Estuary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191.</td>
<td>Having all that extra tons of air pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192.</td>
<td>GHG emission will be major. We have some of the best air in BC. Breathing healthy air is so important and many studies have confirmed the importance of clean air. We need to drastically reduce GHG emissions, yet fracking expansion and LNG export facility will cause sky rocketing GHG emissions. WLNG sits on two fault lines, the risks involved with the location are very clear. What about Henrietta dam? It is not up to current standards, who will monitor the outflow study that still needs to be conducted? WLNG? Why was this not part of the EA? Pipeline construction will have significant impacts on the marine life in the Estuary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193.</td>
<td>There are know thrust and fault lines in the area of the Woodfibre site. There has also been a submarine slide at the site in 1955. The earthquake on Feb 14, 2015 had an epicentre about 20 KM northwest of the Project site. A request for the geotechnical assessment was denied by W-LNG. I was surprised (and concerned) to read NRC's comments on the EAO website that the Geotechnical Assessment Report by Knight Piesold was initially also unavailable to the Working Groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194.</td>
<td>Air pollution will impact Howe Sound as a whole but especially Britannia Beach and Squamish. 80% lessening of pollution still leaves 20% that was not there before. The phrase tolerable levels is always silly. Tolerable as described by whom for who is not described by me for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195.</td>
<td>Electrical power use is less disturbing to atmosphere than gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196.</td>
<td>Health and safety particles formed from ?? and SO2 interact with other compounds to form fine particles. The particles can cause all sorts of respiratory symptoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197.</td>
<td>Construction and operations are closely monitored to limit impact on environment as much as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198.</td>
<td>The site is compromised by the debris flow hazard. What happens to the non-condensable contaminate gases that have to be sequestered from the liquefaction train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199.</td>
<td>Monitor the air now before construction as to get a reference. Monitor the air permanently after construction and during operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200.</td>
<td>A different route for the pipeline must be considered. This pipeline and compressor station should not be near residential areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201.</td>
<td>After years of Woodfibre smell and impacted views through clouds from the plant there will be clouds again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202.</td>
<td>We need to be concerned about the near 142,000 tons of greenhouse gases emitted annually - as well as the flare stack that will be necessary and sulfur dioxide released.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>As per Water. We do not live in isolation anymore or in fact anywhere. The world is connected for better or worse more then it ever has been. The economy is truly global. Climate change is global. Therefore it makes sense that in order to reduce green house gas and replace it with cleaner alternatives we all need to participate. We send cleaner fuel to places that depend now on less clean fuels. And we improve the economy as a result. Nothing in life comes without risk. Separating fact from hearsay and hype from deliberate thought will be a challenge. Hype after all is part of the problem not part of the solution. I am always mystified by those who would like to participate in the benefits of a global economy without taking part in any of the byproduct of said economy. Minimizing that risk is the key. From an environmental and economic standpoint this project makes sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The meetings that I have attended, I was encouraged by the presentations and the steps that were being taken to reduce any environmental impact. The closed system would, except for start-up, not have any flare-up. The mercaptan would be removed and not cause any environmental odour. The clean-up to the existing industrial lands would be a great benefit, even visually from the perch of the new Gondola.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>If the air quality of Squamish is compromised by this project, we will leave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I value clean air but also a provincial government that shows some leadership on upstream impacts to air and water. For years the province has said we live in the best place on earth we have to take leadership to demonstrate that we can balance economic and environment and have best practices and regulations on earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Air quality is a concern for me. We are the lungs for the lower mainland. We are talking about a minimum of 20% increase in emissions. That is going to affect our overall quality of life. The construction of the pipeline and the facilities on the old Woodfibre site are going to disturb a significant amount of habitat for amphibians, mammals, and songbirds. If this project goes ahead, and it feels like we have no say or voice in this, Woodfibre can promise clean-up and monitoring but who will actually hold them accountable? We can talk about benefits to make a bad deal taste less sour, but &quot;benefits&quot; or no benefits, it is still a bad decision for Squamish and Howe Sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I live in the 'kill zone' of the pumping station in Dentville. I can't believe Squamish as a community is even considering bringing this through town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Though WLNG promises concern for the environment, it is clearly fluff to get their way, or they wouldn't propose this preposterous site in the first place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Horrible ... unbelievably horrible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I feel we need to work together with LNG in a supportive way. Clearly this is going to happen. We will have a better chance of monitoring their impact if we can leave all the fear and negativity behind us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I feel strongly our natural habitat and healthy environment are our strong suit LNG has nothing to offer Squamish in the long term.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. trail network should not be impacted

13. This project poses too great a risk to the air quality for all residents, it is not worthwhile for Squamish

14. I feel we should protect the estuary and rather than have the impact of more industry in the are Squamish should investigate what can be done to improve the natural viability of the area. It would be valuable for Squamish to work toward protecting this land and preserving it for future generations. What a legacy this Council would have. What a gift to leave for our children!

15. Once again, why are we not protecting our environment, our land, our air so that it can continue to live and thrive and keep us healthy for years to come. Why not protect the reasons why everyone is here, why the community is doing so well? Why not look for other solutions?

16. We all the breathe the air. Let us keep the momentum on keeping our own backyard clean before we lecture about other provinces and countries dismal regulations regarding air quality. You can forget the "Hardwired for Adventure" brand which is initiated due to healthy outdoor activities - it will be more like "Don't breathe in Squamish " brand and people will move away.

17. Push it forward they are fracking and thats a fact of life wheather the plant goes here or not wont curb fracking

18. This site is zoned industrial and has been used for years as an industrial site. Building a project of this type on an existing site with existing infrastructure actually minimizes environmental effects. If we don't re use our industrial sites and infrastructure then new greenfield sites will be developed. These projects will be built if they make economic sense and it makes no sense to me to develop remote greenfield sites rather than re use what we already have.

19. Council needs to know that I feel very strongly about the air, water, scenery, and recent recovery of marine health ie herring/dolphins/orcas, and that protecting this trend of improvements is also very important to me as a resident.

20. We need this industry. Do not be the council that bankrupted Squamish.

21. That people who worked at the pulp mill have an understanding of how employees and management can work together to make it a safe and environmentally responsible plant. I worked on the environmental committee at Woodfibre as a union rep, we had a good working relationship with the company on environmental protection. The plant met the air emission and effluent discharge guidelines and so can this plant. We saw whales, we caught fish and seafood off the dock. Each spring for two years before the mill shut in 2006, we had a grey whale visiting us for weeks at a time while the plant was operating.

22. That there must be employers for people in the community, if they are to remain in Squamish and develop a diverse region

23. I didn't move here to see pipelines, I moved here to be with nature. If I wanted to be rich from dirty energy, I would have stayed in Alberta!

24. My family has suffered so many allergies as a result of the pollution... now that both mills have been gone for some time we are seeing a significant improvement in health. we want to keep it that way.

25. Howe Sound holds a significant meaning and value to our communities. To see re-industrialization of the Sound will have a deep and damaging psychological impact on the residents and visitors. We ought not discount the visual impact alone and its potential effect on people. As a community we value our environment as an integral part of our being, I fear that the impacts of WLNG will not only damage our airshed, marine environment, water, wildlife and estuary but it will have an unknown large impact on the community psyche.

26. I value a Squamish that values nature. The recent rebrand tagged Squamish as hardwired for adventure. Not: habitat loss, deforestation, water pollution, fish contamination, and climate change. I do not want to hike the Chief with friends from out of town and show them views of beautiful Howe Sound and point to a big LNG terminal and tanker. Recently I have been hiking the Sea to Summit trail to the gondola and have shared with hikers along the way about the proposed project. Every single person I spoke to was deeply upset about this. Many said that is doesn't make sense and why would someone want to come to Squamish anymore if there is an LNG terminal/tanker to look at. It doesn't make sense.
27. I have chosen to live/raise my child in this area for its comparatively clean air and am concerned about how this will change. As a geologist I also understand the seismic risks of the area. This latter area concerns me greatly about how both pipeline and LNG site would be affected by a large quake. We live in a society where we are complacent about such natural disasters, but as we all know they do happen.

28. Where else can you see 15 eagles perched on the tree tops during your morning walk. I'm worried if the export facility is built, we will not longer have that beautiful sight.

29. Woodfibre would be a prime site for a plastic to oil refinery. Such a project would likely have similar water, land and air impacts, but different ethos, better aligned with Squamish brand.

30. Corridors for pipelines, transmission lines and highways are created all the time out of necessity for the movement of commodities that allow for the functioning of our society. Besides, this pipeline is a twinning of an existing one and the corridor has been established already. We need gas as much as anyone and to say we don't is ignorant.

31. I am concerned that many of the concerns/benefits in this survey are very loaded. They are written in a way that seems to support WLNG.

32. I am absolutely opposed to this "project"!

33. you are thinking with your asses.. dumbasses.

34. I'm concerned that some of the options I've been asked to choose from in this question are already part of the project (e.g., the fact that the proposed LNG facility will be powered with electricity). It seems like it would be more relevant to be discussing issues that are unknowns or up in the air. If we all choose electricity as a main concern/benefit because it's important, it removes council's attention from what we would like them to focus on in terms of wins for the community.

35. Proponents focus on utilization of existing infrastructure and remediation efforts at the Woodfibre site (former industrial, brownfield development) and that this is consistent with past use and has rationalized as preferred site over others; however despite this, the disruption to shoreline/marine environment can result in loss of critical ecosystems services (intact, they provide nutrients, clean water, resiliency from climate/disasters, tourism etc).

36. People live in Squamish to live a healthy outdoor lifestyle. LNG goes against the grain of why people live here.

37. I believe development can be done in a way that is responsible to protection of the environment and deliver economic benefits.

38. We need to keep our Lands alone, let it continue to 'heal'...LNG, somewhere else..NOT here in Howe Sound Waters!!!

39. I feel that this is another betrayal from our provincial government who are happy to make rules for foreign energy concerns that us "little people" would never be allowed to live by. Cheap power? Sure. Come on in and use our power.

40. This is a project with will at best have a minimal impact, not likely to even be measurable.

41. As for working with local First Nations groups, I believe this is a two-way street, and that local First Nations groups are more interested in protecting the wildlife and land in the area, than in mitigating the impacts of unwanted industry. I value a municipality that makes decisions based on listening to its citizens, and considering the impact on them, both present and future, not unnecessary proposed economic benefit.

42. There is no benefits.

43. If may manage to mitigate the impact in our region but the environmental devastation elsewhere is inevitable. We need to look beyond our region and see the whole picture.

44. Who wants to move to an ocean view property that looks out at a refinery for exporting gas? If this project is approved and goes ahead thousands of properties directly across the Sound will be much less desirable home sites and consequently lose value. Has anyone tried to put a cost on that? It effects Britannia Beach with the new Taicheng development, the expansion of Furry Creek and the future of the Porteau lands. The very thought of this is insanity.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Access to clean air, food, and water should be a basic human right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>I moved my family here for clean air and land property not industrial property or a job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>The five pillars cannot be considered separately because everything is connected in the web of life; and we live in a finite biosphere with limited resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Industry in the past and future has always contributed to negative any impacts to the environment. There are better solutions then industry at this time of age to drive the economy. I do not want my children having to clean up the environment when they grow up and ask why we did nothing when the LNG project was proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>If there is no stopping this beast - of course the plant should be powered by hydro. It was hard to leave that off the list. That's just 1 part of the bigger issue of air quality though so I chose the bigger picture value. And looking at the bigger picture.. Woodfibre may make promises to clean up and reuse whats there already but what about the damage being caused elsewhere through the site and pipeline construction and operation? Isn't that robbing Peter to pay Paul? Except of course that the robbing operations are ongoing, not 1 off like these benefits. Council, how do these benefits weigh up against the negative impact of this site and pipeline? and again, it goes without saying that if there is no stopping this beast, of course everything should be done to ensure environmental impacts are minimised (such as through hydro).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>No one should be allowed to pollute our air, at least no for free. Have them at least offset their emissions though e.g. offsets (they offset the olympic games in 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Like most people who are my neighbors here, we value our clean air and land, and are not willing to risk any threats to them (particularly when the proposed benefits are shrinking in the face of global prices, and more evolved options are available).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>We'd be selling ourselves short if we fuel this fire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Like the previous section one environment, this is a great opportunity. Most importantly, what is not working now? What can be changed for the better? What can this project help us with? The fact that there are existing issues and this is an opportunity to make some real change with important stakeholder groups like First Nations, local environmental groups and local industry organizations. It has been incredible how much public consultant has come from the company in an effort to inform the public of all the factors of a very complex proposal ... this is unheard of in my opinion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>We moved here many years ago to live a life connected to nature and live in a clean outdoor environment. Why would Squamish risk what it is known for; its outdoor recreation for a business that has dubious benefits for Squamish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>The fault lines under the Woodfibre site are of great concern to me. We've had two significant tremors in 2015 already. The people who plan to operate the LNG have zero experience - so far as we know they haven't built or operated one in the past and we haven't heard what their safety plan is in the event of an earthquake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>I moved from an area close to a chemical valley in Sarnia the air quality is always ranside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Again, I repeat that I cannot make any sense of this type of plant at this time in our history. We have the most scenic recreational area of almost anywhere in the world. At the top of the gondola you are awestruck by the beauty of our area. Why ruin this by allowing huge tankers, LNG storage units etc. to dominate this panorama?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>council should support this use of energy and the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>I think it is insulting to say they propose to work with first nations who have boldly stated their stance against these projects. We continue to destroy the land that they once believed could not be &quot;owned&quot; until the white man showed up and relocated them onto reserves. I'm also gravely concerned about what a catastrophic earthquake would do to such pipelines and the further mess that they have the potential to create. Human kind is biting off more than it can chew. When do we recognize and stop the madness? Or should we leave it until our children are grown up and stuck with an irreparable mess?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>This industry is based on the harmful practice of fracking. What value can you put on clean water and air to breathe?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>My wife has respiratory problems, we moved here for the clean air and low humidity. Since doing so, her health has improved greatly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Any documentation I have read about the gas industry states it is a high contributor to respiratory illness and cancer. Who wants to bring that to their community.

62. Let's move forward but with the highest levels of land/air protection.

63. Sukanto’s environmental record speaks for itself. Why would we allow him to operate a business in our town?

64. They should be appreciative of the fact that the proponent is trying hard to remediate the sight to a high standard.

65. Effects from the environment are some of the most severe risks of this project and yet they are outside the scope of the proposal. This seems an extraordinary gap in the environmental assessment regulations. The idea that such hazards are 'acts of god' and cannot be mitigated through sound planning decisions is not supported by modern disaster and emergency management knowledge or practice. Large earthquakes occur several times around the world every year and we are playing Russian roulette with our futures if we make decisions that are blind to the risk under our feet. With modern building codes earthquakes are very survivable, but large clouds of LNG gas and explosions are not. A risk with a low/medium probability but catastrophic consequences must be demonstrably mitigated or projects set aside. No one can wring their hands afterwards and say, "but we didn't think it would really happen."

66. I also feel that a hazard around the plant could have devastating effects on our community.

67. I fully support the LNG plant coming to Squamish/Woodfibre. I think there are risks, but there are risks with everything. Fortis has been doing this for a long time and wouldn't want to be a part of something that would tarnish their reputation.

68. Woodfibre LNG needs to release the Knight Piesold report they reference countless times re earthquakes etc, so the public can know what's going on. It’s not honest otherwise - the BCEAO needs to require that - they are supposed to be neutral after all.

I really value Squamish’s reputation for being the outdoor capitol of the world. Having increased air pollution is totally contrary to that carefully built reputation.

I feel very concerned re having a LNG plant built right where there are major faults. LNG is a Class A hazard. It's not safe.

Did you know that at the Furry Creek small group meeting June 17, 2014, pg 11 of 16, the transcript says, to do with safety, answer by Alex Brigdon: "We also have other passive elements, like fire protection on steel columns, which prevents the steel from becoming soft, that protects the integrity of the structural steel and prevents collapse."

And they are telling Squamish WF is totally safe for Squamish.

69. As above, I am deeply concerned that the LNG project and pipeline will have a negative impact on air and land.

70. We have a slow, steady tax base increasing with new people and businesses taking an interest in our beautiful area. These companies are coming here for the outdoor recreation what we are known for. Their businesses are based on our natural beauty. Its unbelievable that we are allowing this monster to be set up on our water. What a view from the Gondola that will be. A Slow and steady tax base is the one that lasts. Not the fly by night, LNG money grabber, who’s known reputation is appalling in other parts of the world. It makes me sick to my stomach to support this in any way. I believe it will actually repel businesses from coming here now.

71. If there were to be an accident, the explosion would cause immense damage.

72. What safety precautions are we taking for disaster? explosion? etc.

73. Let's be leaders. BC has committed to reducing its climate changing greenhouse gas emissions by a third by 2020 from its 2007 rates. It is impossible for the province to live up to these commitments and build a giant LNG industry at the same time.
74. "Greenest LNG operation in province" is oxymoronic to begin with, and ALL BC operations should adhere to same standards i.e.: cause least harm!

75. I believe we have a responsibility to curb the slash and burn mentality of the resource sector in this province and in our wider world. The people who ignore the science of climate change are no better than those who oppose the theory of Evolution. These projects exact a considerable toll on our natural of which we are a part. Ignoring these facts are what the dinosaurs in our government and in our society do. Of course we need to exploit natural resources to maintain a Western standard of living, but do we really need to whore it out for pennies on the dollar at our children's expense. Let's choose a more enlightened path folks.

76. Pressure in the 25 year old 10" pipe is currently at 2160 lbs. The increased compressor power at Eagle Ridge will result in a significantly increased pressure. How safe can this be!!!!????

77. alternative incentive for solar and wind and water power..not fossil fuels..

78. I don't want to subsidize WFLG with my hydro rates going up.

79. I feel if this project goes through it is only a matter of time before an accident or natural hazard takes place and Howe Sound pays for it.

80. The way this survey is framed does not permit us to weigh the risks and benefits of the entire proposal. Instead, it misleadingly teases out particular elements in isolation, and steers survey responders to pre-determined "concerns" and "benefits."

81. See above!

82. The route of the pipeline concerns me especially where it runs through the estuary. Fully supportive of denying Fortis the drilling permit at this time.

83. WLNG is only remediating the site to an industrial standard ... it's not fully being, "cleaned up". This is one of the possible answers in this survey that is a bit problematic. Given the source of this questionnaire, many will assume the options are accurate.

84. To enforce tougher laws and regulations about what LNG is doing to our environment.

85. I feel invaded already, how can any industry have the right to take over against our will? We have finally rehabilitated the ocean and estuary and now there is the threat of damaging it all over again for the greed of money and profit, which is now questionable due to changing energy sources. We already have natural gas, this is of no benefit to 'us' as it is endangering our environment to send overseas to a country with more billionaires than anywhere, let them take care of their own mess and leave us to preserve what we have left.

86. Protection of landscape and wildlife is critical to further development of Squamish as a highly desirable outdoor and eco-tourism destination.

87. I think the timing is excellent for SQUAMISH TO LEAD in saying NO to Woodfibre LNG. The effects of this potential industry run counter to Squamish's OCP. The OCP made significant changes which I believe are positive and were needed. I think that we have a very capable Council. The bright spark provided by the Gondola is providing a brief window of opportunity, by giving more reason for Squamish to stay the course in making choices that support a sustainable environment, of which our air and land are important parts.

88. We have clean air in our sound. Why ruin it or put it at risk to line the pockets of business types. Workers bees can find work in clean renewable energy solutions.

89. I would not be supportive of an LNG plant that was not electricity powered.

90. My heart sinks when I see the piles upon piles of rusting pipe laid out in the Squamish train yard. Think of the kilometers upon kilometers of land that will be torn up to lay this pipe which will then be left to rust and leach chemicals into the environment. Unacceptable.

91. I value clean air to breathe, especially for my children, i also value a community that thinks outside the box and realizes
the larger impacts that may affect wildlife, and its surrounding environment.

92. I am not in support of projects that leave behind environmental destruction on land, in air or sea. I will do everything in my power to encourage healthy and sustainable environments.

93. We have been entrusted with land and water to preserve in a healthy state. To sacrifice them for short-term gain is wrong. The supposed economic benefits are doubtful at best and not worth the risk to the environment.

94. Protect the air we breathe. If your not improving the air quality than it should not be done.

95. partnerships with the proponent will help provide mitigation benefits for the environment in the WLNG area.

96. Remember, virtually no human endeavour has zero environmental impact.

97. see above

98. I don't want it in our back yard. Its not a good investment.

99. Clean air and water is a value that we should not sell for any price.

100. Our family enjoys sailing and we spend much of our summer on the water in front of Squamish and the Woodfibre site. I fear for my family's safety, and their health- not just by being on the water and close to the site and in tanker transit zones (with associated risks of accidents), but from changes in air quality.

As a nurse who works with patients who suffer from chronic disease and also as a person who lives with asthma- I do not take air quality for granted. Woodfibre LNG will emit pollution emissions of nitrous and sulfur dioxide. Emissions of these gases interact with other compounds to form fine particles, which can affect both the lungs and the heart. Exposure to these particles is linked to increased risk of respiratory and cardiac symptoms.

Since the pulp mill has gone, we have enjoyed the fresh air and freedom from unpleasant odours that we previously endured.

101. That the company is listening to and addressing the concerns of locals. I do believe that there needs to be oversight to this project, to ensure the ongoing best practices are adhered to and improved upon.

102. Meaningful partnerships need to be formed on the part of industry with First Nations communities. Focus on the positive - make sure environmental protections are there and encourage industry. We need it.

103. What is the advantage of the destruction... there is no advantage.

104. Put the health and safety of our community first.

105. NO LNG

106. Clean water and air for marine and land animals is more important than a handful of jobs.

107. Other than some steam from the processes, most people will not even realize that it is there.

108. I am confident in the provincial and federal EA process in respect to concerns about air and land.

109. also concerned about the requirements for increase hydro projects to create additional electricity to provide energy for LNG projects in BC. Seems that the tax payers will be subsiding the LNG producers.

110. Cannot assume zero industry. We must be able to use our land base for purposes that give benefit.
Air polluting industry not appropriate for this eco, outdoor, tourism oriented area.

As a scientist that works every day with government, policy makers, and decision makers, I am personally terrified that it's too late to stop the impacts of runaway climate change. I have seen other scientists in tears. I've been in tears of despair, rage, and frustration myself at the stupidity of our elected officials and those companies that act as if the economy is their god, and greed is a value to be prized above all others.

We can't keep doing this. We can't keep allowing industry to pollute and destroy our environment for the sake of a few tax dollars and a handful of jobs. The costs to our environment, our health, our communities, and our society as a whole are too great.

We need to stand up and say ENOUGH!

It is industry. There will be some compromise. But the limitations begin with the environment and it's wildlife...by the same token don't expect the Orcas to be cuddling up to the suppertankers.

China does not need this fuel. Fracking is being banned in many places around the world because of it's pollution. Do not support fracking - why destroy our beautiful interior BC and Howe Sound so China can be less polluting? Look at France that made into law that all new business buildings being constructed must have solar panels on the roofs. That is wisdom.

What would happen if beautiful Stanley Park were slated for industrial development, which would bring in huge amounts of money but destroy one of the reasons why Vancouver is so high on the world's list of the best places to live. Quality of life.

I don't agree that this is a suitable location for this project. The pipeline through the estuary concerns me.

see above.

Terrorism...why are the us waters, tanker escort provisions so more stringent than Canadian laws/rules?

For the long term advantage of Squamish as it relates top employment and consideration to work with LNG our council needs to think outside of the box and get real about building Squamish up to be a modern town and not living in the past. We cannot change the past but we can effect the future if we work towards progress and not staying the same for years to come.

I believe that the impacts far outweigh the potential benefits.

I am firmly in opposition. I believe my views are inconsistent with those of the BC liberal party, and corporations that can sever to profit from these initiatives. The only thing that could shift my opinion would be knowing that these groups were coming from the same perspective (the same desire to protect the environment and benefit people, not big business), and they still believed this to be the best option, and could prove this.

We should be pushing for tourists that want to come and enjoy our green space fresh air and small town charm.

I have not seen or heard that buried gas pipelines impact wildlife and I have not registered accidents since it was introduced here in SQUAMISH.

abuse of the environment

I am an absolute estuary groupie - please don't enshrine this jewel to the point that none of us can experience this.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>wonder. Squamish has been and will continue to be clear about how much we value the estuary - I have no doubt that fortis will be ultra respectful in test drilling and perhaps if we are fortunate a pipeline carefully placed under the estuary and river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I am actually concerned about the health affects this may have on our city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I haven't yet expressed my thanks to the city councillors and Mayor for voting no on the Fortis BC application on test drilling etc. I believe you represent the majority of our small city y doing so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I urge you to explore the US EPA’s site and input Woodfibre’s emission figures. Input the emissions from one LNG Tankers round trip in the sound, and thats quite alarming, plus 3 to 4 tug boats per trip guiding it. At the end of the day, the world at this time is looking to reduce its greenhouse gases. Fossil fuels are not the answer, reseach and dollars spent into clean technology is. And yet we are hearing no of this from our Provincial and Federal Government. The sense it seems is coming from our local governments, like in this recent quote by West Vancouver Councillor, Nora Gambioli: &quot;We need to invest in tourism and renewable energy sources, which would create far more jobs, and would be far better for our kids, not to mention the planet.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Canada should be a global leader like Germany and reducing our carbon footprint and greenhouse gases. What are we showing the world by allowing an lng facility to be built here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I want our council to be at the table to ensure that best practices are being maintained and exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Sukanto Tanoto - really? Why support the 5th richest man in Singapore at the expense of our undervalued resources that we could sustain in perpetuity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>i believe the air and land will benefit greatly from opposing the LNG project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Air quality now and for generations is crucial for the planet. 60 years for now i don’t want that generation says &quot;how could they have allowed wing to happen&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>i feel council needs the power to shut down operations if standards are not being met. A third party environmental assessment needs to happen regularly. Transparency is crucial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I am afraid. How will you evacuate 17 000 people from Squamish in case of emergency? A compressor station so close to us is too scary to consider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>The biodiversity that the Squamish Estuary once contained has already been diminished. While people tend to think of wealth in terms of money, some forms of wealth, such as biodiversity, are irreplaceable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I do not support an industry that may increase hydroelectric power along a Hydro R/W that bisects a heavily populated area (Brackendale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I do not support a heavy industry built on an earthquake prone site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I do not support an industry that increases risk to environmental hazards and impacts to wildlife should the pipeline be ruptured during an earthquake, debris torrent or earth tremor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Pipeline construction is a known problem to both flora and fauna, and takes years to recover from. In addition to the construction stresses, maintenance is an existing damaging factor of the life of the pipeline. So building testing and maintaining are already going to damage our ecology here. That damage will be completely pale in comparison to what would happen should there be an industrial accident along the pipeline or a rupture. Why would council consider any proposal from Woodfiber that was depending on volunteers to repair and remediate? Any proposal from Woodfiber should have 100% responsibility on Woodfiber to monitor, report, respond and repair when needed. Woodfiber’s inability to do any of the above for themselves is an excellent reason they need to find a different site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local air quality and wildlife habitat are far more important than a few individuals profiting from selling our resources to Asia.

I am concerned about the long term impacts of air quality, underwater-sound and and water pollution and the catastrophic impact of super taker traffic – whether boat-fuel spills or massive, high temperature explosions. I am also concerned about climate change. I see huge benefits for the billionaire behind this and all risk for Squamish. Also our amazingly beautiful sound is going to be **** ugly with all those super takers.

I feel very strongly this is not a good project for the air, land or ocean. The impacts are too great. We need to protect what we have that makes this area such an amazing place to walk, ride, live and breathe!

A big part of why I live in Squamish is the air quality. I don't want some company coming in here and polluting the air all in the name of making money. The air we breathe is a necessity for life. Money is not.

I have faith in the regulators to monitor this project to ensure WLNG is operating within and beyond the required guidelines.

I need clean air to breathe. I need clean water to drink. PERIOD. SO DO YOU and so do your children and their children. The fish and animals that live there, they don't have a voice. but i am pretty sure they need what we need. a healthy environment.

My WLNG submission to the EAO:

I will first draw on the expertise of others:

1. SAFETY: Siting an LNG facility in Howe Sound violates international safety standards and practices, putting Howe Sound residents at risk

As LNG tankers transit Howe Sound, there is a high-danger zone for 1,600 metres (1-mile) on either side of the LNG tanker. If an accident happens, people within this zone risk death by asphyxiation, or death/injury by fire or explosion. Every time a tanker travels through Howe Sound (approximately 6-8 transits a month according to Woodfibre LNG) several Howe Sound communities will be in that high-danger zone, including: Bowen Island, Bowyer Island, Anvil Island, Passage Island, Porteau Cove, West Vancouver, and parts of the Sea to Sky highway. The Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) LNG Terminal Siting Standards states that LNG terminals should not be located in narrow, inland waterways with dense local populations and significant commercial, recreational, and ferry traffic. Why would that guideline not apply to Howe Sound? The proposed siting of the Woodfibre LNG terminal and associated transit of LNG tankers through Howe Sound poses an unacceptable risk to safety of people in communities along the shores of Howe Sound.

Sources: Sandia Report, 2004 and SIGTTO LNG Terminal Siting Standards

2. ENVIRONMENT: The once-through seawater cooling system proposed by Woodfibre LNG is outdated

Woodfibre LNG is proposing an outdated and damaging cooling method to help cool the LNG facility. They propose to extract 17,000 tonnes (= 3.7 million gallons, or 7 Olympic-sized 50-meter swimming pools) of seawater from Howe Sound, chlorinate it, heat it, and then spit it back out into the sound every hour of every day for the next 25 years. This method has been banned in California and several other places as it is very damaging to marine life such as juvenile salmon, herring, and plankton which are the building blocks for all other life in Howe Sound. If the herring are impacted, the dolphins, orcas, and humpbacks are also impacted as they no longer have a food supply. The impacts of increased water temperatures and the addition of chlorinated seawater will likely reverse the recent revival of marine life in Howe Sound, which is just now recovering from the toxic legacies of previous industries. This is unacceptable.
3. HEALTH: Social costs and health impacts of air pollution

Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Emissions of NOx and SO2 interact with other compounds to form fine particles, which can affect both the lungs and the heart. Exposure to these particles is linked to increased risk of respiratory symptoms, such as irritation of the airways, coughing, or difficulty breathing; decreased lung function; aggravated asthma; onset of chronic bronchitis; irregular heartbeat; nonfatal heart attacks; and premature death in people with heart or lung disease. A new study published in the scientific journal, Climatic Change, estimates the true social costs of air pollution that aren’t accounted for in the cost of fossil fuels and other pollutants. Social costs include the health impacts of air pollution as well as impacts from climate change. The study found that sulfur dioxide costs $42,000 per tonne, and nitrous oxides cost $67,000 per tonne.

Sources:

4. SITE SUITABILITY: The Woodfibre site is not a safe location for a hazardous LNG facility

On February 15th, 2015, a 3.4 magnitude earthquake hit Vancouver’s coast that was felt throughout Howe Sound. The Woodfibre LNG proposal is located within this zone of moderate to high earthquake risk, on two known thrust faults. The Woodfibre site also has a history of slope failure. In 1955 a wharf and three warehouses collapsed into Howe Sound at the Woodfibre site, causing $500,000 – $750,000 in damages (Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4). A recent, but unreleased, geotechnical study by Knight Piesold identifies that approximately 46% of the study area was mapped as having rapid mass movement. This means landslides and slope slumpage... including existing natural landslide hazards as well as terrain where construction activity may increase landslide initiation. Why hasn't the geotechnical study by Knight Piesold been released?

Sources:
Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4
B.C. Ministry of Energy and Mines

5. ECONOMY: The requested socio-economic study has not been provided

During construction, only 4.3% of jobs (=38.5 out of 895) will be for locals living in the Squamish/Whistler corridor (See Table 6.2-8 of the Labour Market section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Why are there so few jobs predicted to be filled by workers in the Squamish/SLRD area? The EA application is also very unclear about how many of the 100 full-time jobs will be filled by residents of Howe Sound once the LNG terminal is operational. What are the benefits to Squamish? What are the costs? There is still no clarity around how much in municipal taxes will be paid to the District of Squamish. How will this project impact existing small businesses and existing industries in Howe Sound?

6. CLIMATE CHANGE: 142 thousand tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions is unacceptable

Woodfibre LNG is now estimating greenhouse gas emissions to be 142 thousand tonnes of CO2 equivalent every year. These annual emissions of CO2 equivalent from Woodfibre LNG is equal to adding over 18,000 cars to the highway,
driving to Vancouver and back, every day. This is more than six times greater than current highway traffic. It is irresponsible to approve this kind of polluting industry at a time when we need to transition away from fossil fuels to mitigate the risks associated with climate change, and to reduce the economic and health impacts of air pollution in general.

7. GOVERNMENT REGULATION: Inability of government to monitor, enforce, and respond to issues

There are no regulations adopted to regulate this LNG industry from a technical standpoint. Any of the current standards are not applicable to the LNG industry. Do the regulators have the knowledge and the expertise and the capacity to oversee this industry or will they be relying on the proponent to monitor themselves and report to the regulator? Self-monitoring industries have created several examples of accidents with resulting environmental destruction in recent years, including the Lac Megantic rail disaster and the Mt Polley tailing pond spill.

8. ENVIRONMENT: Removal of water from Mill Creek unsuitable for fish life

Woodfibre LNG has secured the water license to extract water from Mill Creek, which flows through the Woodfibre site. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans has objected to this because the amount of water that WLNG is proposing to remove will reduce water levels in Mill Creek to levels that will no longer support fish life, especially in the summer months. Woodfibre LNG needs to source water for this project from somewhere else to protect this important stream habitat which is home to several native fish species.

9. ENVIRONMENT: Missing baseline studies

The following baseline studies are either missing or are inadequate as they do not conform to any recognized scientific standards: fish, birds, marine mammals, air quality, shipping, water quality, marine sound, and atmospheric sound, marine life near the Woodfibre site, and the cumulative impact assessment. Proper studies need to be completed before any decisions can be made regarding this project.

10. VIEWSCAPES: BC Hydro clearcut of two 64 metre swaths of forest at the Woodfibre site will impact viewscapes from the Sea to Sky highway and the gondola

BC Hydro is proposing to clearcut two 64 metre swaths of forest at the Woodfibre site which will create visible scars in the Howe Sound viewscape which will be very visible from the highway and the gondola. This information was only made available during the recent BC Hydro open house held on 19th March, near the end of the public comment period. This information is not included in the cumulative impact assessment of the Woodfibre application and it should be. This late release of information pertinent to this project and the timing of the BC Hydro open houses is unsatisfactory.

11. ENVIRONMENT: 9000 year old glass sponge reefs endangered by tanker traffic

LNG tankers do not have enough clearance to get over the 9000 year old reef if they go off course. These 9000 year old glass sponge reefs have been called “Living Fossils” by National Geographic as until recently this species was thought to have gone extinct over 60 million years ago. MLA Jordan Sturdy recently made a statement in the House about the importance of this discovery in Halkett Bay near Gambier Island, and to support the proposal to expand the Provincial
Park Protected Area to ensure these reefs are protected.

Sources:
http://jordansturdymla.ca/bcltv_videos/mla-sturdy-halkett-bays-glass-sponges/

12. ENVIRONMENT: Will there be smog? Will there be a smell?

Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application).

Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2) is a reddish-brown gas with a pungent, irritating odour. It absorbs light and leads to the yellow-brown “smog” pollution haze seen hanging over cities. It is known to irritate the lungs and increase susceptibility to respiratory infections. In combination with either ozone (O3) or sulphur dioxide (SO2), nitrogen dioxide may cause injury at even lower concentration levels.

Sulphur Dioxide (SO2) is a toxic gas with a pungent, irritating, and rotten smell. Current scientific evidence links short-term exposures to SO2, ranging from 5 minutes to 24 hours, with an array of adverse respiratory effects including bronchoconstriction and increased asthma symptoms. These effects are particularly important for asthmatics at elevated ventilation rates (e.g., while exercising or playing). Studies also show a connection between short-term exposure and increased visits to emergency departments and hospital admissions for respiratory illnesses, particularly in at-risk populations including children, the elderly, and asthmatics. The addition of these air pollutants in Howe Sound is of particular concern as recent research by MSc student Annie Seagram (studying under Professor Douw Steyn, Department of Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Sciences at the University of British Columbia) has shown that the Howe Sound airshed and Lower Fraser Valley airshed are connected. Emissions from Woodfibre LNG will add to the pollution in Howe Sound, exacerbating the existing air quality conditions, particularly in the Squamish-Brackendale corridor.

Note that Metro Vancouver annually issues several Air Quality Advisories due to high concentrations of ground-level ozone. This pollution also impacts the Howe Sound and Squamish, and exposure to these pollutants are of particular concern for infants, the elderly, and is directly linked to health issues such as lung or heart disease and asthma.

In addition: the BC government needs to ensure the protection of the 9000 year old glass sponge reef at Halkett Bay off Gambier Island.

About Glass Sponge Reefs: http://www.eao.gov.bc.ca/pcp/forms/Woodfibre_LNG_form.html

Glass Sponge Reefs in Halkett Bay off of Gambier Island

MLA Jordan Sturdy spoke in Legislature about the glass sponge reef at Halkett Bay off Gambier Island.
http://jordansturdymla.ca/bcltv_videos/mla-sturdy-halkett-bays-glass-sponges/

Tankers do not have enough clearance to get over the 9000 year old reef if any off course action happens.

Transport Canada Dangerous Goods Dept. is not at all ready for LNG. In fact they now have a task force for rail and road.
I have been a member of 2 Stakeholder Teams focused on the protection and restoration of salmon habitat. I include information and links for your convenience and ask that a similar project be implemented for the WLNG and Fortis BC applications.

2005 SALMON RECOVERY PLAN
Entire Salmon Life Cycle
$250,000 Pacific Salmon Foundation

$2 million
5 year plan
Cheakamus Salmon Recovery
Squamish Nation and Stakeholders

CERT C
Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Technical Committee

The Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Technical Committee (CERTC) website, provides information on Cheakamus ecosystem restoration activities.

CERTC was formed in August 2005 in response to a train derailment and subsequent spill of sodium hydroxide into the Cheakamus River. CERTC’s mandate is to understand ecosystem-level impacts and develop restoration and monitoring strategies for affected species to accelerate the return of the Cheakamus ecosystem to a pre-spill state as quickly as reasonably possible. CERTC Terms of Reference (pdf).

CERTC recommends programs for implementation to the Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Steering Committee based on input from experienced professionals, external specialists, interested parties and the public.

Both committees include representatives of:
CN
District of Squamish
Fisheries and Oceans Canada
BC Ministry of Environment
Squamish Nation

Thank you for your interest in Cheakamus ecosystem restoration.
Comments can be made to CERTC at comments@certc.ca

Fish Assessment

Following the spill, B.C. Ministry of Environment (MoE) fisheries biologists, technicians and contracted staff documented
fish survival and compared fish density information to available previous data.

Fish mortalities were collected from the Cheakamus River downstream of the spill, with activities including:
- Recording mortalities by species and location;
- Collecting length data to determine age classes of impacted fish;
- Collecting scale samples to further supplement brood year identification; and,
- Freezing and storing of samples for further examination, if required.

Fish Impact Assessment (MoE and DFO) (pdf)

MoE Estimated Impacts on Salmon and Trout Populations:

**Chinook**
- 25% of juveniles from 2004 spawning population
- 50% of 2005 spawning population

**Chum**
- Juveniles not affected
- 2005 spawning population not affected

**Coho**
- 50% of juveniles from 2004 spawners
- 2005 spawning population not affected
Pink
- juveniles not affected
- between 3 - 10% of 2005 spawning population

Steelhead
- 90% of mainstem juveniles from 2003 to 2005 spawners
- 2006 and 2007 steelhead spawning populations not affected

Estimated Impacts on Other Fish

Ninety percent of resident fish in the mainstem Cheakamus River may have been affected by the spill including:
Dolly Varden/Bull Trout
Rainbow Trout
Lamprey (2 species)
Sculpins (bullheads - 2 species)
Sticklebacks

Juveniles rearing in tributary streams at the time of the spill were not affected.

Benthos Recovery Presentation - Triton Environmental, 2008 (pdf). New!
Benthic Invertebrate Recovery Monitoring Program 2005 Final
Report (pdf) New!
Appendices (pdf) New!

Ecological Assessment

A screening level qualitative assessment of ecological effects has been conducted for CN to understand the potential effect the spill could have had on receptors other than fish in order to identify and target the need for ecosystem
restoration activities.

Given the broad scope of the project and the limited amount of available data (i.e., exposure data, such as concentration of NaOH in environmental media, NaOH ecotoxicity toward specific species) it is not possible to conduct a comprehensive ecological risk assessment for each species present in the ecosystem. The screening level assessment focused on the functions of populations and communities within the ecosystem. This recognizes populations are less sensitive than their most sensitive individual member and some effects may be observed at the population level without impairing the functions of the ecosystem as a whole.

Qualitative methods using subjective ecological effects ranking categories, such as high, medium and low, were used to describe the likelihood of adverse effects rather than providing a numerical estimate of effects. To minimize subjective influence, the interpretation of ecological effects contain a clear explanation of the lines of evidence leading to the conclusions, including a description of the uncertainties and assumptions used. Additionally, matrices were used to provide a structured framework for the characterization of ecological effects. The assessment used existing information from baseline and monitoring reports and from previous scientific literature.

This screening level assessment of ecological effects consists of three main steps: problem formulation, analysis and characterization of the likelihood of adverse ecological effects. Results from the ecological effects assessment will be used to determine the direction of future recovery efforts for other components of the Cheakamus River ecosystem.

For more details, view the

Ecological Final Report (pdf) New!
Amphibian Assessment – October 2007 (pdf) New!
Study Design: Screening Level Assessment of Ecological Effects (pdf)

[ Back to Top ]

Water Quality

River Sampling

Water quality professionals tested and monitored the following:
Water quality in the Cheakamus and Squamish Rivers, August 5 - 8, 2005
Water quality in the Cheakamus during site remediation activities, August 10 - 26, 2005
Water quality in the Cheakamus after rainfall events, August 17 - October 28, 2005
Monitoring was conducted over a variety of meteorological conditions and river levels. The parameters monitored included: pH and conductivity, sodium, total dissolved and total suspended solids, total and dissolved organic carbon.

Results
The Cheakamus River was cleared for recreation after 24 hours by Vancouver Coastal Health on August 6, 2005. Water quality downstream of the derailment site was determined to be similar to that upstream.

Well Sampling

Forty-eight wells within 100 metres of the Cheakamus River were sampled on August 6 and 7, 2005. The parameters monitored included pH and conductivity, sodium, total dissolved and total suspended solids.

The sampling was coordinated by Environment Canada, Vancouver Coastal Health Authority, Triton Environmental Consultants Ltd., and Quantum Environmental Services.

Drinking water from wells was cleared for drinking by the Vancouver Coastal Health Authority after 48 hours on August 8, 2005.

No additional detailed water quality sampling is required.

Water Quality Report – September 2007 (pdf)
Water Quality Report Appendices – September 2007 (pdf)
http://certc.ca/recovery_fund.shtml

CERT C Stakeholder Team

The Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Stakeholder Team (Stakeholder Team), established by CERTC, is a public advisory group comprised of representatives from interested organizations and individuals with local knowledge of and experience with the Cheakamus River.

Meeting Notes

September 30, 2010 (pdf) New!
June 24, 2010 (pdf)
March 25, 2010 (pdf)
October 29, 2009 (pdf)
June 17, 2009 (pdf)
March 5, 2009 (pdf)
November 27, 2008 (pdf)
September 25, 2008 (pdf)
May 27, 2008 (pdf)
March 27, 2008 (pdf)
January 24, 2008 (pdf)
December 6th, 2007 (pdf)
September 27, 2007 (pdf)
June 21st, 2007 (pdf)
April 25th, 2007 (pdf)
February 28th, 2007 (pdf)
Presentations

Overview of the Cheakamus River Large Woody Debris Stream bank Protection and fish habitat development project, June 2011 (pdf) New!
Update on Cheakamus River recovery strategies and monitoring programs, March 2009 (pdf) New!
Update on Cheakamus River recovery strategies and monitoring programs, January 2012 (pdf) New!
Cheakamus River Sculpin Recovery Presentation to CERST - Fall 2010 (pdf)
Adult Wild-and Hatchery-Origin Steelhead Returns to the Cheakamus River in 2009(pdf)
Cheakamus River Bull Trout Radiotelemetry and Enumeration Program, 2007-2009(pdf)
Cheakamus River Side Channel Re-watering Projects, March 2010 (pdf)

Role

The Stakeholder Team provides input into the development and implementation of monitoring and restoration programs for the Cheakamus ecosystem.

The Team helps coordinate and communicate comments and recommendations from interested parties to CERTC, and also receives updates on CERTC activities, as the information becomes available. All input from the Stakeholder Team is considered advisory in nature and final decisions regarding monitoring and restoration programs rests with CERTC and the Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Steering Committee. Stakeholder Team Terms of Reference

CERTC Communication to the Stakeholder Team

CERTC Responses to Dec 6 2006 Stakeholder Team Questions (pdf)
http://certc.ca/public_events.shtml Events and Brochures.
http://certc.ca/monitoring_programs.shtml
http://certc.ca/recovery_plan.shtml to 2012

SQUAMISH ESTUARY MANAGEMENT PLAN

[PDF]Skwelwil'em Squamish Estuary Wildlife Management Plan

Howe Sound has also been improved because the Fraser Basin Council has successfully restored the waters at Britannia...
Beach on Howe Sound BC.
http://www.fraserbasin.bc.ca/about_britannia.html

Clean up after industry pollutes is never complete and restoration actually takes centuries.

The economy here in Howe Sound no longer depends on big polluting industry. What is evolving is self-employment in businesses that depend on "the scenery". Like the film industry. Also tourist activities because HOWE SOUND NOW HAS WHALES! DOLPHINS! HERRING!

Eagles and salmon have always drawn the public to the wilds of Howe Sound. People stay to live in a healthy environment and to co-exist with nature. There are economic benefits to all aspects from the sea, keeping the wild fishing industry to the sky where Whistler/Blackcomb are world class ski resorts with a growing population in what was once a village. Our proximity to Vancouver BC, also a source of employment, allows those who live in the Howe Sound area to park the car and enjoy recreating without it when not commuting to work elsewhere.

The LNG Project needs to be assessed as a having a negative impact on a recovering Howe Sound.

Many have written who have been able to study and report on the negative impact of the WLNG project, the Fortis BC pipeline and the gigantic tankers.

For me this is a forced endeavor. I feel quite intimidated by the fact that the WLNG company can afford $250 million dollar fines for environmental atrocities elsewhere.

It brings to mind that Woodfibre had 600 pollution violations that could have been charged against the owners and the government would not allow that to happen in 1983.

When in 2005 Woodfibre was closed, there was a statement from the government that the Woodfibre site would never again be used for industry. The re-zoning never took place and now this is a legal application with deadly consequences. Global warming could have been avoided had alternative energies been used these last 40 plus years.

I have lived here since 1977 and I have enjoyed the transition to a Howe Sound that is recovering. Those moving to Squamish now, afford to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars to buy a small accommodation here. This isn’t so as to return to dirty industry and the putrid polluted smell of money when industry has an "accident".

Sincerely

XXXX

14 I like that they are re-mediating the site from previous contamination

5.

14 Council needs to lobby that this project is developed as a best-in-class facility.

6.

14 My family opposes LNG. There isn’t an Emergency clean up crew...environment Canada fired them. Who can act quickly in the event of an explosion or earthquake. No one. The public will wait...and LNG owners will be hiding from the truth.

7.

14 I dont think there should be any volunteer and first nations doing remediation. A huge company like LNG, if allowed to be here should be 100% responsible for all the labour and costs of doing this.

8.

14 Will WLNG walk the talk and ensure that all these modes of transportation use clean energy - electric, natural gas, or will they settle for dirty diesel, bunker fuel? If not they need to adjust their pitch and realize we have experienced dirty air in
9. Squamish and want the best practices, world standards for air quality just like the political proponents state they want best practices, world standards for LNG.

15 0. Low air pollution is a reason why people move to Squamish.

These other 2 points are also very important: Risk of earthquakes and other natural hazards occurring on or near the proposed project locations.

The proposed LNG project site would be powered with electricity to reduce emissions by about 80%. Even so it still emits a significant amount of air pollution.

15 1. Whatever mitigations the proponent proposes, and regardless what the EA modelling says about air pollutant levels in relation to guidelines - the amount of project air pollutants are too many. Not worth any project benefits.

While its great that WLNG proposes to clean-up existing pollution at the site, that is not a reason to support the Project. Its unfortunate that earlier laws weren't strict enough to ensure industries cleaned up their own messes rather than abandoning them. We shouldn't need to accept yet another polluting industry in order to finance the clean up of the last one.

I lived in Squamish when the Woodfibre mill was in operation. The poor air quality and stink from that operation often left a pall over the community. I now really appreciate the clean air we have. My friend's father recently moved here from Vancouver - where he had serious problems with the air quality in the city. He finds the air remarkably better here. That said, we do already still suffer from air pollution from the Fraser Valley. We need all the buffer we can have. Adding a bunch of industrial air pollutants does not help our tourism promotion, and local quality of life.

That's great that using electricity to power the site would reduce emissions. But there would still be a lot of emissions - too many!

Regarding the pipeline - I don't want to live near a compressor station! (I live in Dentville).

15 2. I see very little value what so ever for Squamish.

15 3. Our rich environment can not speak. I know I sound like a tree higher but the whales, dolphins etc not to mention birds and other estuary habitats are at risk. When I moved here 5 years ago I did so believing Squamish had a vision to grow, with safe and family centred communities that were healthy and the goal was to revitalize the area. Not go backwards into the Industrial Age. There is so much science and examples of why this LNG project is not in alignment with our vision and waterfront dreams. The most important thing is our children's health. If that's at risk you'll see people leaving. Do the right thing and stand up for the majority of us screaming NO!

No perks are worth the risks and we are so capable to find better solutions.

15 4. I believe Squamish should be pursuing 'clean' industries.

15 5. What legal actionable guarantees do we have beyond promises from the foreign LNG company do we have to fulfill the above mentioned proposals to work with First Nations, or clean-up existing pollution.

15 6. I am not convinced that WLNG would follow through on consistently using electricity to power the plant.

Cleaning up the site is great, but would not in the least make up for the damage that this plant would cause.
SAFETY: Siting an LNG facility in Howe Sound violates international safety standards and practices, putting Howe Sound residents at risk.

As LNG tankers transit Howe Sound, there is a high-danger zone for 1,600 metres (1-mile) on either side of the LNG tanker. If an accident happens, people within this zone risk death by asphyxiation, or death/injury by fire or explosion. Every time a tanker travels through Howe Sound (approximately 6-8 transits a month according to Woodfibre LNG) several Howe Sound communities will be in that high-danger zone, including: Bowen Island, Bowyer Island, Anvil Island, Passage Island, Porteau Cove, West Vancouver, and parts of the Sea to Sky highway. The Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) LNG Terminal Siting Standards states that LNG terminals should not be located in narrow, inland waterways with dense local populations and significant commercial, recreational, and ferry traffic. Why would that guideline not apply to Howe Sound? The proposed siting of the Woodfibre LNG terminal and associated transit of LNG tankers through Howe Sound poses an unacceptable risk to safety of people in communities along the shores of Howe Sound.

Sources: Sandia Report, 2004 and SIGTTO LNG Terminal Siting Standards

ENVIRONMENT: The once-through seawater cooling system proposed by Woodfibre LNG is outdated.

Woodfibre LNG is proposing an outdated and damaging cooling method to help cool the LNG facility. They propose to extract 17,000 tonnes (= 3.7 million gallons, or 7 Olympic-sized 50-meter swimming pools) of seawater from Howe Sound, chlorinate it, heat it, and then spit it back out into the sound every hour of every day for the next 25 years. This method has been banned in California and several other places as it is very damaging to marine life such as juvenile salmon, herring, and plankton which are the building blocks for all other life in Howe Sound. If the herring are impacted, the dolphins, orcas, and humpbacks are also impacted as they no longer have a food supply. The impacts of increased water temperatures and the addition of chlorinated seawater will likely reverse the recent revival of marine life in Howe Sound, which is just now recovering from the toxic legacies of previous industries. This is unacceptable.

HEALTH: Social costs and health impacts of air pollution.

Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Emissions of NOx and SO2 interact with other compounds to form fine particles, which can affect both the lungs and the heart. Exposure to these particles is linked to increased risk of respiratory symptoms, such as irritation of the airways, coughing, or difficulty breathing; decreased lung function; aggravated asthma; onset of chronic bronchitis; irregular heartbeat; nonfatal heart attacks; and premature death in people with heart or lung disease. A new study published in the scientific journal, Climatic Change, estimates the true social costs of air pollution that aren’t accounted for in the cost of fossil fuels and other pollutants. Social costs include the health impacts of air pollution as well as impacts from climate change. The study found that sulfur dioxide costs $42,000 per tonne, and nitrous oxides cost $67,000 per tonne. Sources:


SITE SUITABILITY: The Woodfibre site is not a safe location for a hazardous LNG facility.

On February 15th, 2015, a 3.4 magnitude earthquake hit Vancouver’s coast that was felt throughout Howe Sound. The Woodfibre LNG proposal is located within this zone of moderate to high earthquake risk, on two known thrust faults. The Woodfibre site also has a history of slope failure. In 1955 a wharf and three warehouses collapsed into Howe Sound.
at the Woodfibre site, causing $500,000 – $750,000 in damages (Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4). A recent, but unreleased, geotechnical study by Knight Piesold identifies that approximately 46% of the study area was mapped as having rapid mass movement. This means landslides and slope slumping... including existing natural landslide hazards as well as terrain where construction activity may increase landslide initiation. Why hasn't the geotechnical study by Knight Piesold been released?

Sources:


Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4

B.C. Ministry of Energy and Mines

ECONOMY: The requested socio-economic study has not been provided

During construction, only 4.3% of jobs (=38.5 out of 895) will be for locals living in the Squamish/Whistler corridor (See Table 6.2-8 of the Labour Market section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Why are there so few jobs predicted to be filled by workers in the Squamish/SLRD area? The EA application is also very unclear about how many of the 100 full-time jobs will be filled by residents of Howe Sound once the LNG terminal is operational. What are the benefits to Squamish? What are the costs? There is still no clarity around how much in municipal taxes will be paid to the District of Squamish. How will this project impact existing small businesses and existing industries in Howe Sound?

CLIMATE CHANGE: 142 thousand tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions is unacceptable

Woodfibre LNG is now estimating greenhouse gas emissions to be 142 thousand tonnes of CO2 equivalent every year. These annual emissions of CO2 equivalent from Woodfibre LNG is equal to adding over 18,000 cars to the highway, driving to Vancouver and back, every day. This is more than six times greater than current highway traffic. It is irresponsible to approve this kind of polluting industry at a time when we need to transition away from fossil fuels to mitigate the risks associated with climate change, and to reduce the economic and health impacts of air pollution in general.

GOVERNMENT REGULATION: Inability of government to monitor, enforce, and respond to issues

There are no regulations adopted to regulate this LNG industry from a technical standpoint. Any of the current standards are not applicable to the LNG industry. Do the regulators have the knowledge and the expertise and the capacity to oversee this industry or will they be relying on the proponent to monitor themselves and report to the regulator? Self-monitoring industries have created several examples of accidents with resulting environmental destruction in recent years, including the Lac Megantic rail disaster and the Mt Polley tailing pond spill.

ENVIRONMENT: Removal of water from Mill Creek unsustainable for fish life

Woodfibre LNG has secured the water license to extract water from Mill Creek, which flows through the Woodfibre site. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans has objected to this because the amount of water that WLNG is proposing to remove will reduce water levels in Mill Creek to levels that will no longer support fish life, especially in the summer months. Woodfibre LNG needs to source water for this project from somewhere else to protect this important stream
habitat which is home to several native fish species.

ENVIRONMENT: Missing baseline studies

The following baseline studies are either missing or are inadequate as they do not conform to any recognized scientific standards: fish, birds, marine mammals, air quality, shipping, water quality, marine sound, and atmospheric sound, marine life near the Woodfibre site, and the cumulative impact assessment. Proper studies need to be completed before any decisions can be made regarding this project.

VIEWSCAPES: BC Hydro clearcut of two 64 metre swaths of forest at the Woodfibre site will impact viewscapes from the Sea to Sky highway and the gondola

BC Hydro is proposing to clearcut two 64 metre swaths of forest at the Woodfibre site which will create visible scars in the Howe Sound viewscape which will be very visible from the highway and the gondola. This information was only made available during the recent BC Hydro open house held on 19th March, near the end of the public comment period. This information is not included in the cumulative impact assessment of the Woodfibre application and it should be. This late release of information pertinent to this project and the timing of the BC Hydro open houses is unsatisfactory.

ENVIRONMENT: 9000 year old glass sponge reefs endangered by tanker traffic

LNG tankers do not have enough clearance to get over the 9000 year old reef if they go off course. These 9000 year old glass sponge reefs have been called "Living Fossils" by National Geographic as until recently this species was thought to have gone extinct over 60 million years ago. MLA Jordan Sturdy recently made a statement in the House about the importance of this discovery in Halkett Bay near Gambier Island, and to support the proposal to expand the Provincial Park Protected Area to ensure these reefs are protected.

Sources:
http://jordansturdmala.ca/bcltv_videos/mla‐sturdy‐halkett‐bays‐glass‐sponges/

ENVIRONMENT: Will there be smog? Will there be a smell?

Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application).

Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2) is a reddish-brown gas with a pungent, irritating odour. It absorbs light and leads to the yellow-brown “smog” pollution haze seen hanging over cities. It is known to irritate the lungs and increase susceptibility to respiratory infections. In combination with either ozone (O3) or sulphur dioxide (SO2), nitrogen dioxide may cause injury at even lower concentration levels.

Sulphur Dioxide (SO2) is a toxic gas with a pungent, irritating, and rotten smell. Current scientific evidence links short-term exposures to SO2, ranging from 5 minutes to 24 hours, with an array of adverse respiratory effects including bronchoconstriction and increased asthma symptoms. These effects are particularly important for asthmatics at elevated ventilation rates (e.g., while exercising or playing). Studies also show a connection between short-term exposure and increased visits to emergency departments and hospital admissions for respiratory illnesses, particularly
in at-risk populations including children, the elderly, and asthmatics. The addition of these air pollutants in Howe Sound is of particular concern as recent research by MSc student Annie Seagram (studying under Professor Douw Steyn, Department of Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Sciences at the University of British Columbia) has shown that the Howe Sound airshed and Lower Fraser Valley airshed are connected. Emissions from Woodfibre LNG will add to the pollution in Howe Sound, exacerbating the existing air quality conditions, particularly in the Squamish-Brackendale corridor.

Note that Metro Vancouver annually issues several Air Quality Advisories due to high concentrations of ground-level ozone. This pollution also impacts the Howe Sound and Squamish, and exposure to these pollutants are of particular concern for infants, the elderly, and is directly linked to health issues such as lung or heart disease and asthma.

To begin with the most glaring issue, Howe Sound was industrialized for over 50 years, maybe longer, which saw a decay of its environment. Species of all marine life disappeared, fish stocks dropped, and the industry which we relied upon dried up. Efforts were made to bring back Howe Sound environment to a state where marine life has started to come back, orcas, dolphins, humpback and grey whales, herring as we as salmon have rebounded. It has taken considerable effort, so why take steps back. This relates directly to not only the polluting nature of the WLNG facility, but also the LNG tankers, which are significantly large than shipping tankers. The frequency of these tankers and the noise and disruption which this will cause has not been proven to be negligible, and therefore WLNG cannot go ahead until it can be shown without a doubt that the thousands of species will not be affected by the tankers. This is an aside to the dangerous nature of having these tankers travel up and down Howe Sound, disrupting recreational boating (because of the huge right of way) and creating a horrid eyesore for all visitors and residents. I bought a house in Squamish and the last thing I want to see is my and other’s property value affected by an industrial export facility in our waters. We bought into a community without this, and this is how it should stay.

I moved to Squamish to live in a healthier environment. When Woodfibre closed I felt for the families who lost their source of income but it was an instrumental move forward to creating a cleaner airspace. People suffered from the affects of the toxic air and now had a chance to heal. WLNG is a step backward. Even if Giraud tries to downplay the GHGs from the plant there will be significant changes to our air quality.

we have one of the youngest populations in BC. Kids are way more vulnerable to the effects of air pollution, clean air just like clean water should be a top priority. How can we do this to future generations. How could we allow clean, healthy air to be polluted this majorly by just one company? The price is way too high.

I do not want extra pollution in our valley

Air and pollution will be less affected by far than the old Woodfibre timber plant

Winds blow into Squamish from Howe Sound and I do not want to get ill from inhaling particles. Also why has the geotechnical study by Knight Piesold not been released?

Re-using an existing industrial site is far better than establishing a new site.

I am not in favour of this project - I don't trust any government regarding inspection, monitoring and financing (taxes) of WLNG

I felt alarmed when I saw the sign posted in the estuary about the proposed pipeline
### Response

**1.** Fracking is one of the most destructive acts the energy industry has brought to our planet. We have a duty of care to do everything in our power to stop it.

**2.** Consider where this natural gas is coming from. It’s extracted via fracking. This is about the most horrible thing you can do to the water system.

**3.** I have no faith in Government’s ability to police the proposed activities - there are too many departments involved, and departments are notoriously unable to co-operate on complex issues.

**4.** It’s all about reducing greenhouse impact.

And and local environmental footprint.

**5.** The Province touts LNG as a transition fuel from conventional very dirty fuels such as coal, towards renewables, like solar, run of river or wind. Council should ask the Province to commit a portion of LNG revenues to research and development of these alternative energy possibilities.

**6.** As this industrial site will be visible from Highway 99, the waters of Howe Sound and from nearby mountains such as the Chief and the foothills of Mt Habrich at the Gondola, cleanliness and ascetics is important, as is the need to limit light pollution, while maintaining a safe work environment.

**7.** Fracking should be banned in Canada. Howe Sound should be made a world heritage site with all the protection possible. Industry does not have to be the only way to support infrastructure etc. We do not live in Squamish because of jobs, we live here because of the natural and cultural beauty.

**8.** How can we say with absolute certainty that the pipeline won't be repurposed for oil? it is my understanding that LNG pipelines out east have been repurposed for oil. How can we say with absolute certainty that this will be the cleanest LNG facility in the world? The primary stakeholder in this WLNG venture has an appalling environmental track record.

**9.** Fracking all by itself is reason enough to stop this assault our atmospheric life support system. Anthropogenic CO2 is enough reason all by itself to say NO thank you to these to assaults on our community and Global atmosphere.

**10.** What studies have been conducted to determine impacts of the greenhouse gases and other pollutants released annually from this project?

**11.** Lack of Baselines and cumulative impacts are a bc issue as well as in this region. Again a big picture approach for example if we look at pipelines and oil what are the cumulative impacts of pipelines, crude by rail and crude by truck.

**12.** Why are we still looking at fossil fuels? I think this is archaic thinking. Instead of trying to make a pretty dress for a dragon, I think we should be looking for a less dangerous solution.

**13.** BC should be focusing on clean energy, real clean energy such as a wind, solar or hydro. Squamish has so much potential to be wasted on this project.

**14.** If, and when, there is an accident, there is absolutely nothing our government nor the company can do to prevent devastation, nor efficient clean up of said disaster, once damage is done.
15. No No No LNG!

16. We need to know where we are at so we are not pointing fingers and shattering communications.
   We also need to know what the response plan is in the unlikely event of a disaster.

17. The government has in recent years cut the budgets of departments who are responsible for monitoring our lands and water to the point where it would be impossible to be fully aware of the sullying of our environment. The Federal government has discouraged scientists from reporting/commenting on "bad news" to the point of eroding my trust in their safe guarding the planets future.

18. Emergency measures in place prior to any construction.

19. I'm very concerned how this project will increase GHGs and will support further fracking and related impacts in the NE of the province. Further, the project locally will add to the cumulative effects on Howe Sound. I think it is important that impacts on the Sound are thought of in terms of their cumulative contribution to all that is affecting Howe Sound, and so I don't think you can separate choices 4 and 5 above.

20. Burning massive amounts of fossil fuels is not sustainable for the planet. Corporations and governments may profit from the revenue but planet suffers and LNG is sustaining the unhealthy global addiction to fossil fuels.

21. Fracking uses and incredible amount of water resource to extract gas.
   - Fracking is linked to earthquakes.
   - Fracking destroys the environment.

22. Both of these projects stand to bring more work and money to our economy but they also have the ability to demolish the natural state of beauty that we have all chosen to live in. The birds, marine life and animals on land can't speak but I believe we need to speak for them.

23. If we look at it on the board spectrum, we need to start thinking about the future and the environment and the impacts that pipelines and these facilities will have on our lives and our children's lives in the long term. This type of industry is not viable in the long run so should we suffer the consequences of a compromised environment on the short term? I just don't think the benefits outweigh the negatives.

24. **BROADER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS**

   Firstly - I would like to speak to the fallacy of the obviously "benefitting" ideas.
   1. gas to oil pipeline. - Anything is possible or we would not be having this discussion. As in 2. Below, you will see that coal and oil can be processed to be called synthetic natural gas, which in turn can be liquefied.
   2. "Natural" gas being used to reduce emissions. - The term natural is folly. There is nothing natural about this gas. I suggest you do some research.

   There is:
   - Fracked gas – what the gas is that WLNG presently wants to liquefy and export. Uses many chemicals and amounts of water to process. Claims of recycling the water are for PR purposes and actually amount to less than 20% of water usage.
   - Synthetic natural gas – made from coal or oil shale. China is building 30 of these plants. The carbon footprint of SNG derived from coal is comparable to petroleum products.
   - Both can be altered to be Liquefied.

   3. The cumulative impact ....Howe Sound. - Yes this in an important consideration, but you only allow 3 choices.
   4. Baselines –Whoever rants on about not having any, is full of BS.

   Air – there are hourly readings which are posted on a BC website.
   Water – there are numerous organizations which do numerous studies.
Land – there are over 100 files about the Squamish estuary in the public library, if anyone cares to look.

Having said that, WLNG certainly has not done any work towards providing any substantial current baselines.

5. Proposed LNG project would be cleanest in the world. This is a sales pitch at most, political rhetoric at worst. Even suggesting this is folly and short sighted.

25. This is not a renewable resource we are talking about so in long run is this the best way to go? We know our methods of extraction and use of fossil fuels is damaging our ecosystems. It is increasing seismic activity and contributing to global warming. Looking to the future Howe Sound is a giant wind tunnel is this not the form of energy we should try to harness?

26. The global energy budget is ever increasing. The needs will be met in some energy form or other. It makes sense for LNG to be used relative to coal. Yes there is a CO2 impact, but pollution is more than green house gases.

Fracking is a completely different issue. We have been fracking for many years in our province and I don’t recall there being an outcry when Natural gas came to Squamish. While there are impacts from fracking, these issues need to be dealt with from a Provincial and Federal level.

The proponent has declared that they will build the cleanest LNG facility in the world. Why can’t we make this the example for how all LNG facilities should be built? I envision a centre for excellence in this industry close to our major Universities and an opportunity for an educational centre.

27. Recently the State of Florida officially banned the use of phraseology such as "climate change" and "global warming". Are we going down that path too? For not looking at the ethics of fracking, and for turning a blind eye?

28. Whistler has a far greater negative impact on climate change than this plant would.

It's great that we got off of coal years ago and are breathing better and now the Chinese, Indians and others have a right to do so as well. How dare we tell them that they can't use LNG because it is a fossil fuel and they need to burn coal. Hundreds of thousands of Chinese are dying from respiratory diseases.

29. That when burned, natural gas is a cleaner fuel than coal and we need it as a transition fuel towards renewables. The IPCC confirms this.

30. We know that fossil fuels are a limited resource. If we want to be an energy super power in the future we need to look at developing future clean energy sources, not selling off our limited resources as fast as possibly can. We need to consider the financial and energy security of our children and our children’s, children, not just trying to get rich for ourselves.

31. Again, the questions contain a lot of assumptions and spread false or incomplete information to the survey participants. Natural gas pipeline can be converted to oil: Fortis will have 2 pipelines so it can still deliver natural gas to its customers via the existing line while delivering oil to WLNG site. Additional pipeline can be feasibly added through Indian Arm (not Coquitlam watershed) and BC government has only put forth a regulation, not law in terms of this conversion. Regulation can be changed by the Minister, it does not go through a legislative process unlike what was done with the generous tax regime for LNG facilities.

As a community we have made commitments to reducing our carbon footprint and our OCP vision places priority on enhanced livability and sustainability. These priorities and values cannot be separated from the larger environmental impacts such as increased GHG emissions, impacts of fracking on water and environment and the very damaging whole lifecycle of LNG.
The cumulative impacts on Howe Sound and Squamish could be considerable, the District has influence over this project but not many others beyond its boundaries. The District should look at WLNG holistically within the context of its entire policy framework and a community vision and not be afraid to take a strong stand for the community and its values.

32. There is no question that these projects would lead to increased climate change. That is one of the consequences energy extraction. Fracking is an extremely polluting method of energy extraction documented by several industry experts and leading environmentalists. From my understanding recent cuts to local coast guard stations, reduction of funding and staffing of DFO and limited local resources to monitor and respond to issues is a real threat. Wood fibre is owned by a privately held company overseas that has a history of not dealing with environmental issues effectively, timely and with care. We are playing with fire.

33. The climate is changing of that we cannot deny. They say LNG is a transition fuel. If this gets up and running and the province is making money from it, I see no impetus or hurry to invest in greener alternatives.

Also, the environmental footprint of exporting the LNG to another country must negate some of the savings of a supposedly 'clean' fuel. LNG is not clean as is touted by the proponents. It may be cleaner, but it is not clean.

A sustainable world cannot be achieved with economic growth as the main driver.

34. Is this the right thing to do for our environment? are we directly

35. It is a delusion to think natural gas is a 'clean energy' and that by selling it to China we are doing anyone a favour. (expect maybe a corrupt millionaire in Indonesia) The extraction process, the infrastructure to liquify and then de-liquify, the shipping and the fugitive methane that escapes during this whole process makes natural gas environmental impact comparable to coal.


37. We have had the warmest winter since I've been here (10 years). This is just a harbinger of what's to come due to global warming if we don't make drastic changes. People here love snow sports, and if we continue with fossil fuel extraction projects like this, there won't be much snow to enjoy.

38. All of these points are relevant and important, difficult to pick just three.

Energy and water intensive processes like fracking for NG must be considered when assessing whether an LNG project is clean or not. If alternative energy sources (wind, solar, tidal) were used to extract the resource instead of NG and potentially coal power, then perhaps we could boast about a clean LNG project from a life cycle perspective.

There is no indication that Canada’s NG will displace the use of coal for power production in China. Canada still has coal fired power plants. If we're seriously interested in cleaner energy, let's eliminate our own coal fired power plants and those in the USA. The clean fuel argument is a distraction from the real driver: economics.

The rate at which NG is being extracted (and hence water being consumed and polluted, and energy required) to support LNG exports is what concerns me. What does our clean water security look like if fracking continues at the proposed rate?

39. A baseline study of the surrounding environment is a good idea in order to properly monitor effects of this project. Natural gas is clean burning and the best option we have to-date. Should we be burning coal instead?

40. I would say that the environmental considerations are rooted in the air/land/water concerns/benefits statements. Pretty much everything I have said above in the water and air/land section has environmental considerations.

41. really? **** you are stupid.

42. Council should also consider the broader consequences of climate change on our community (e.g., increased costs of dikes due to climate induced sea level rise). Supporting a fossil fuel industry means we are contributing to our own
demise (strong words, I know...) through allowing the province to contribute more significantly to climate change through further development of our oil and gas sector. Moving to renewable energy is a policy issue, not a technology issue and I believe that local governments (including Squamish) may want to ask why they will have to bear the brunt of costs related to provincial and national (not just in Canada) policies supporting the fossil fuel industry. While we have been asked to focus on the local community, the local is impacted by the global and by considering these bigger picture issues, council will be doing its due diligence to make good local choices.

| 43. | Agency capacity to address even small spills in MBC (+ derelict vessels) and enforcement/compliance is limited. |
| 44. | We need to know with certainty the current quality of our airshed. This needs to be a 3rd party, not someone from EAO or Woofdfibre. What impacts would this project have on the long term health for Squamish? As Canadian citizens we have a duty to protect out environment. |
| 45. | Burning natural gas as a fossil fuel is a very specific qualifier and is misleading. Natural gas is in fact a dirtier fossil fuel. Methane that escapes during fracking and transport is more harmful than carbon dioxide. The only way that LNG proponents are able to label it is clean energy is when they look only at the burning fossil fuels which is a small part of the big picture. |
| 46. | Fracking is bad. LNG isn't as clean as it purports to be. |
| 47. | Council should recognise that climate change is a global and not local phenomena. Woodfibre is using electricity as its primary energy resource and will have to meet all local air quality control requirements, and therefore will have little if any impact on local air shed. But exporting natural gas to other jurisdictions that use dirtier fuels does help to reduce global carbon dioxide emissions. |
| 48. | Fracking has come to the forefront, we need our Youth or we need to put more $$ to find better solutions then 'frackening'...to find a 'better solution to replace 'coal' in China...WE need to 'stop' the 'taps' of gas/liquified or not, to other countries...find better solutions.. |
| 49. | I have yet to see anyone address the issue of the "aromatics" that are distilled and captured as part of the liquification process. These chemicals -- primarily benzene and toluene -- are highly carcinogenic in ppb amounts. |
| 50. | This is a good project, Providing LNG to Asia is a much better alternative than burning thermal coal. Do you really think that if this project doesn't proceed there will be any change to the process globally? Not likely, better to have a facility built to high standards here. |
| 51. | The idea that natural gas is the cleanest burning fossil fuel says absolutely nothing about the damage that is done during the extraction process. Fracking has been banned in many places around the world (France, for example), and for good reason. Its impact on greenhouse gas emissions is substantial and dangerous for the future of the planet. |

Again, the acceptance or rejection of this project will serve as an example to many such projects throughout the province. The Council, the province, and, most especially, the planet, cannot afford to make the wrong decision here. The stakes are significantly higher than the short or long term economic impact of development on the communities in Howe Sound. Like it or not, Council is in a position of environmental stewardship with this decision. The ripple effect, and greater impact of this decision should not be underestimated.

| 52. | Please have Sandia Labs doing an independent evaluation for Transport Canada and the Coast Guard. The reality is it doesn't matter what WF says about having 3 tugs, etc. If we are to have the highest regulations in Canada, that means adopting the US standards set out by Sandia Labs and following SIGTTO. WF has not applied for Termol and it won't happen until April. Termol says it will take 6 - 10 months, long after the 180 days are over. This is a huge issue. We should have all the regulations in place as a Country before we engage in this industry. |
| 53. | The United Nations has recently held an Emergency Summit on climate change because of the urgency of reducing greenhouse gas. Scientists warn us that climate change is about to accelerate beyond our control, threatening so much of what we value and love. Elsewhere in the world governments are heeding these desperate calls and are taking action. For example, the European Union has made a unilateral commitment to reduce overall greenhouse gas emissions from its 28 Member States by 20% compared to 1990 levels which is one of the headline targets of the EU 2020 strategy. By |
reducing emissions since 1990 while expanding its economy, the EU has successfully shown that economic growth and emission cuts are not contradictory. http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/g‐gas/index_en.htm

54. FRACKING FRACKING FRACKING FRACKING. Why are we not listening to the rest of the world on this subject? Blinded by the lure of a few dollars? Fracking is ecocide. It is one of the most capital intense dirty resource extractions only topped by our tar sands industry. The cumulative long term consequences are already revealing this as a catastrophic mistake. It is not sustainable in any way. Short term grab and go profits with the real costs to be borne by those that never share in the revenue extracted. To then even consider leaving the day to day environmental monitoring of the site to this specific proponent is simply stupid. Why should we trust someone with such a dirty track record?

55. Does the Provincial Government have a concrete plan to leverage the tax dollars obtained from the export of LNG towards transitioning our province to a more sustainable economy? (Renewable energy investment, GHG reduction strategies, green transport plans?) If so what (if any) binding commitment has been made by the Province to ensure they do so?

56. If our product is being sold, stockpiled to sell back to our future generations.. I will not support the project. If LNG Industry is looking at long term forecasts of the Industry. Why is the public also privy to that information to help formulate a more stable feeling on the future of the industry.

57. No more industrial development in Howe Sound! Period. Ever. As evidenced by the return of cetacean species, its just starting to recover after a century or more of abuse. It is ignorant, arrogant and ego-centric to think that further industrial development will not cause harm. Remember, the environment is not something separate from us. We are a part of it and dependent upon it for our survival. We must preserve wild, beautiful places like Howe Sound.

58. There is still no federal funding for environmental cleanup from a any type of spill from a tanker of any size or material on board the vessel.

59. The accumulated effects on Howe Sound from all those mega projects have to be taken seriously. A recovering ecosystem will be destroyed if all those projects will get build.

60. Relying on fossil fuels is not the way to be green regardless on how the message is spun

61. Earthquakes: We know from the December BC Oil and Gas Commission report that fracking triggers thousands of earthquakes

   Methane: worst greenhouse gas

   General disruption of construction, threat of spill, fire, etc, lasting presence of bad infrastructure.

62. Squamish has the opportunity to be a leader or a slave to energy production. I hope we can stand firm in our commitment to the local, national and global mitigation of climate change.

63. LNG is NOT the cleanest fuel, when you look at the impacts of point production and processing. We know NEXT TO NOTHING about the impacts of fracking on human health, because industry controls access to the worksites. We only have numerous documented examples of serious health impacts in communities where fracking occurs. With the spectre of water shortages, we need to treat this resource with proper respect for the social and economic value it holds. LNG advocates refuse to acknowledge documented fact of well casings leaking at a rate that approaches 25%. These impacts affect local areas, and travel downstream to all areas connected by river or watershed. LNG companies refuse to disclose the chemicals they utilize, while claiming proprietary secrets, and we are using humans as guinea pigs with no understanding of the longterm human health impacts of this activity.

We have many new projects occurring in Howe Sound and in BC, and we simply do not need LNG with the return to health in forestry, and local growth in recreation and tourism, commuter living, and information and technology. We had our first commercial salmon fishery two years ago, and had a spectacular wildlife show of orcas and dolphins. Why would we jeopardize these investments with another layer of industry with a poor track record and unknown impacts that are obscured by industry's refusal to share relevant information?
64. Ultimately, know that climate change is a huge concern. We must change the way we extract and use resources. LNG and Fracking do not fit into an enlightened community.

65. Limited LNG experience is my greatest concern. These plants should not be built so close to human habitation. They should, if they must be, built on the outer coast away from human habitation. Let Squamish Council be at the forefront of a movement to protect it's citizens from dangerous industrial activity and stand up for us and protect our environment as well.

66. Our location near a fault line. The effects on plants, animals and humans in the areas where fracking is done to feed this project. The amount of energy needed to run this plant and those financial costs added to the project

67. How can we trust our current governments, provincial and federal to help us monitor the environment? They have cut back on all of the environmental watch dog/safety regulations we had in place. e.g. Mount Paley. Do we want to have a disaster here and cause irreversible damage to our environment? Do we want to cause the damage by continuing to Frack now that consequences of this practice are beginning to show up in many areas around the world (USA and Australia).

68. get off the linking to fracking it doesn't apply in this project. we should require baseline studies of the environment be contributied by all significant users ie squamish terminals, wing, yaurt club

69. SAFETY. In the event of a chemical fire like the recent event in Vancouver, an LNG fire or leak, what is the emergency response plan and time? There isn't one right now because it's a very difficult situation with the terminal off shore. Since the wind from Woodfibre usually blows into Squamish, we need to be concerned.

70. Fracking is not proven safe, and we are idiots to think we can call it that. We are idiots to think that if we create artificial earthquakes to extract things from the earth, that she will not someday revolt in a similar fashion on a much less convenient time frame for us. I can't call this a fact, but I sure as hell hope we don't try to prove mother nature wrong. In the end, the planet will exist, but we will not if we don't learn to respect it.

71. why wouldn't it be the cleanest LNG facility, or would that be cost prohibitive?? Natural gas burns only half as clean as coal and carries many other toxins. So if you burn four times as much that makes it redundant as far as cleanliness.

When I look at the Gladstone LNG facility in AUS, I see the major flaw mentioned is that the only environmental assessments were done by agents hired by the company for the company.

72. Let's be a model for protection.

73. Why are we assuming all the risk for this project? Why should Canada focus so much on natural gas at all? It's a filthy industry that may have a place powering homes locally but to expand so much for short term economic gains is crazy.

74. An LNG plant is a relatively clean proposal for the Woodfibre site which will have an impact but compared to all the other growth and changes to our area the impact will not be unduly detrimental.

75. The bullet points speak for themselves on this one. The LNG project in Squamish would facilitate more fracking in a seismic zone, exponentially increasing the risk of rupturing toxic underground wastewater from the process resulting adverse effects to drinking water, flora and fauna.

76. I saw what happened with the train derailment at Lake Wabumum, Alberta... it was a nightmare and response was slow... way to slow. It took days just to find out what had leaked and then nobody did anything right away anyway. The way we're treating this earth is despicable. Yes, we nearly all drive cars but rather than investing in uncertain technology to get that last remaining drop of oil let's but our talk and our action towards reducing our consumption of energy and new ways to harness it.

77. Who says the natural gasline cannot be repurposed for oil? We can't control that. Fortis says it won't be, but Fortis can sell it. And the BC government can change any law they make re this.

78. We are seeing massive melting in both Greenland and the Antarctic that cannot be stopped given the 400ppm and growing CO2 in our atmosphere. We've seen many locations around the world ban fracking giving its effects to ground
79. There is a lot of talk and talk is cheap especially when you look at the track record of the company behind WLNG. They can make whatever outrageous claims they like - "WLNG would be the cleanest facility in the world" but we have seen time and time again that the truth shows up these empty promises and outrageous claims. And given the abysmal lack of capacity in government and lack of legislation designed to protect our air, water, and natural resources, let along the ability to enforce what little legislation there is, then these statements become even more hollow!

80. It is proven that Fracking... is the most damaging way to extract from the earth. It leaves a path of destruction, undrinkable water and a toxic, cancer causing environment. How can we support this in any way. Solar, Wind Energy, etc etc is the way to go. I have changed my investment money into renewable energy stocks... As I am sure we will have to go that way, hopefully before all is destroyed and unable to return to a healthy environment. That we have now!

81. Natural gas may be clean-burning, but its extraction is so dirty as to render it perhaps the dirtiest of the fossil fuels. This wasn't the case when sweet wells were still available to be tapped, but the fracking process now necessary is simply not acceptable.

82. Uncertain capacity of government organizations to monitor the effects this project has on wildlife habitat and the health of our community is a very real concern. You cannot trust industry to monitor itself, the bottom line comes first always. The federal government has made substantial cuts to funding for programs related to environmental protection so we cannot rely on them either. Who is left to monitor potential environmental impacts? No one.

83. Again fracking is used to get the NG out of the ground and since fracking pollutes an enormous amount of water and caused earth tremors Canada should not continue to support the growth of this industry.

Since the federal government has chosen to close the Vancouver Coast Guard base, the busiest one in Canada I feel there would be a lack of safety protocols and ability to respond to any emergencies related to the WLNG plant and the the carrier ships. I feel that Woodfibre is to close to a community and an accident there could be catastrophic to Britannia Beach and Squamish.

84. Just what you've already stated. It is very uncertain whether our government organizations have the capacity to monitor, enforce or respond to issues which may arise with an LNG industry. The public sphere is being defunded and deregulation is rampant. Good science is being muzzled and unsupported. There is no reason whatsoever to believe the powers that be when they tell us this will be a safe project.

85. Important to "send a message" that Squamish values maintaining / enhancing the natural environment over caving in to oil/gas industries growing their presence here.

Sukanto Tanoto and Petronas have a very dubious reputation for environmental harm, tax evasion, corporate greed ... do we really want to embrace a company with such a reputation?

86. I pretty much summed this up in previous comments

87. We need to pay more attention to reducing carbon emissions and cleaning up our own environment rather than helping out Asia. 142,000 tones of climate-warming GHG's annually, 150 million tones of hot chlorinated water expelled into the Sound annually, nitrogen oxides (smog) and sulphur dioxides too, not to mention a 377’ tall flare stack with a sulphur smell...how is this benefitting Squamish?

88. No more fracking

89. Chrity Clark needs to invest in developing new solutions to the global energy crisis. She's backing the wrong horse. Besides the market is saturated with natural gas. Let Russia sell it and force Clark to invest in innovative industries that will keep us solvent in the future. Right now we are looking at creating significant environmental damage for an industry that is likely to fail in it's first few years. Terrible strategy.

90. Natural gas is not cleaner fuel alternative when it's entire life cycle is taken into consideration. The environmental costs of hydraulic fracturing must be considered as part of the proposed Woodfibre LNG project. The gas has to come from somewhere. How can an EA be considered complete and comprehensive without taking into consideration the entire environmental impact of this plant from extraction to delivery. Without the plant the gas would not be extracted, you
91. I understand that LNG is cleaner than oil sands operations but that doesn’t make it good, it just makes it less bad.

92. Properly assessing the broader environmental risk requires that we consider the worst-case environmental scenarios. We need to understand the facts about the benefits (how many temporary jobs, how many permanent jobs, how many jobs of both categories for locals, how many jobs that will require new people in the area, how much of a financial benefit to the community, to the region, to the province) and weigh those potential benefits against the risks to the local, regional, provincial, and world environments. Breaking up the "concerns" and "benefits" into pre-packaged categories, some of which read like press release statement, does *not* help us evaluate the merits of the proposal.

One broad environmental fact that has not received much attention is the global glut of LNG (see the Economist, "Golden scenarios," Feb. 28 http://www.economist.com/news/business/21645212-promised-golden-age-gas-arrivingbut-consumers-are-cashing-well-producers) -- and little attention has been paid by the federal or provincial governments to the global market for LNG. Note that Petronas is using Canadian LNG.

93. As above with accidents, there are no guarantees that an accident won’t happen! Why are we not focusing on energy that is less impactful to the environment?

94. How long will this industry be of economic benefit? What are the real impacts (short and long term) on communities and water resources where fracking is occurring? How are we going to setup useful baseline studies for project impacts?

95. Again it was really hard to pick only 3 items. The sufficiency of regulations as well as the capacity of government organizations to monitor and enforce those regulations is highly questionable. We don’t have good systems to objectively monitor and evaluate the impacts of this project (if it goes forward).

96. Our world is rapidly running out of resources that are actually vital to existence such as clean air land and water. LNG although claimed to be ‘one of the cleanest’ has many other alternatives to how we get energy and fuel the way we live our life.

97. Who knows what this project will do to us and the environment? It’s like hey lets build it and worry about the dangers later! Scandalous! There are already too many ships lurking in our waters, giant tankers are horrific in such a narrow fjord accompanied by tugs to boot. The fact LNG argues this will be the ‘greenest’ project leaves room to speculate on what percentage is pollution.

98. This is one of the most beautiful areas in the world (Howe Sound that is). I have heard about and saw pictures of Howe Sound a long time before I have emigrated from Europe to BC. I am shocked that we are going to loose it for money for big corporations. Instead of thinking how to damage it, we should make sure that we preserve it for the future generations and think of green solutions (solar energy, wind power, etc).

99. Is money worth all the devastation

100. Natural gas s NOT the cleanest energy source when considering the impact of its production. This whole project is just too short sites and does not take into account the larger aspects of impact over time and geography.

101. This project does not fit into the Communities’ values. The communities do not want a repeat of the degradation of Howe Sound from industrial projects. Howe Sound is too important, too unique. The financial ‘windfall’ is much too low to even consider this.

102. An increase in usage of ANY fossil fuels (even the cleanest ones) is detrimental to this planet because

a) impact of fracking to environment and people in BC and AB

b) impact of operating LNG in Howe Sound

c) impact of greenhouse gas emissions oversees

103. Your first 3 points summarize my main areas of concern. With the combination of Stephen Harper and Christy Clark in power, legislation promoting the oil and gas industry have superseded commitments regarding climate change and a more sustainable environment.

104. Take the Howe Sound area as a whole and consider all proposed project and there potential impacts. Consider the our
4. The environment (especially marine) has been improving since the Britannia Mine clean up, we need to be aware of the potential for further degradation.

5. We are all connected by water. A healthy environment is my number one priority. Destroying the environment that supports human health and life is a wacky and inappropriate thing to do. Money does not make the world go round. Water does. Clean water.

6. We are being presented with an opportunity to make the shift to renewables which won’t happen overnight instead of increasing the very reasons we are in such climate upheaval. Whether climate change is all human related or not, at this point, we are long overdue to make such a bold move. Other countries are doing it, so can we.

7. We should not be building LNG plants. Climate change is real and we are nearing a tipping point. We may be looking at a temperature change of 4 - 6 C if action is not taken very soon. The fossil fuel industry is well aware of this which is why they spend billions of dollars denying it. The record of the federal government is abysmal; Canada has no energy plan and has blocked attempts of others to contend with climate change. The provincial government is not much better. Neither has the long term vision to act. Do everything possible to get elected. We need a plan to phase out fossil fuels. We need to stop subsidizing the fossil fuel industry and redirect that money to developing alternatives.

8. All such propositions promise to be the 'cleanest in the world' and all leave toxic residues after clean-up. Fracking uses huge amounts of water, returning the contaminated water underground where it will seep into fresh ground-water. We don't have the right to poison resources for future generations.

9. Fracking and oil sands are major contributors of greenhouse gas emissions and are negatively affecting our environment, and climate. These 2 practices are promoting climate change

10. Natural Gas is a cleaner fuel than oil and coal, and should be supported as the planet moves to cleaner fuels

11. Fracking also involves increase in greenhouse gasses, so your second bullet point should also be included in your third bullet point.

12. Fracking is detrimental to the longevity of our earth as it pollutes ground water, de-stabilizes the earth’s crust and causes irreparable damage to our environment. The LNG site is detrimental to our own habitat and the long-term economic opportunities for our town to become a master community for health and well-being.

13. Keep Squamish and Howe Sound clean and green!

14. I think the project is environmentally sound. I have no concerns other than the monitoring we would for any industry to ensure they follow the rules set out.

15. The Provincial government isn't interested in the health of the community in Squamish. They want this project to go through for the lucrative tax revenue it will generate

16. It is irresponsible to approve this kind of polluting industry at a time when we need to transition away from fossil fuels to mitigate the risks associated with climate change, and to reduce the economic and health impacts of air pollution in general.

17. That natural gas is a stepping stone to decrease greenhouse emissions. Natural gas will replace coal and oil as a fuel in Asian countries, the same as it has to a great extent in North America. It's not perfect but we're on the right track.

18. Squamish is currently enjoying an influx of inhabitants who highly value it's natural beauty, healthy lifestyle opportunities and the community’s growing, albeit slowly, reliance on tourism and rec-tec as well as small-scale manufacturing and lighter industry for income. The LNG proposal is 100% at odds with what Squamish is striving to
grow and preserve: a reputation for valuing nature and it's opportunities above all else.

12
0.

There is nothing clean about fracked gas. The future of energy production is not LNG.

12
1.

Stop fracking and look to the future NO LNG

12
2.

It is a typical case of the benefits not being realized in the regions where the costs are being incurred. The companies involved have dubious reputation and council needs to consider the present benefits vs the benefits of clean and functioning Howe Sound in 300 yrs... Look how long it has taken to recover from Britannia mine, and we still have problems. Fracking and shipping LNG to asia is a bad policy at the provincial level anyway.

12
3.

It is ignorant to think that there is no possibility that the pipeline can't one day be used for bitumen. It happens all over!

12
4.

We should not support the raping of our land for international corporations benefits.

12
5.

If you want, we can all go back to burning wood for heat and electricity. Then, when we are back to living in the dark ages, you might have an inkling of understanding of the purposeful need for LNG.

12
6.

Concerned that we don't understand the effects of fracking on our environment. There seems to be a gold rush mentality to extract as much gas as possible through fracking.

12
7.

No concerns. We live in an evolving global world and it is a journey in how we manage. Cannot freeze one project because of impacts elsewhere

12
8.

Council needs clear guidelines in OCP about what industry will be allowed. Guiding principles need to be clear about priorities for protection of environment.

There are 4 issues I want to select here! Baseline studies are also vital. Again, I have a real issue with these questions as they are just repeating Woodfibre LNG’s own propaganda.

RE: The proposed LNG project would be one of the cleanest LNG facilities in the world.

This is a false claim. How do you define "cleanest?" It doesn't take into account the residual impacts from air pollution that will impact our air quality and health. It doesn't take into account the greenhouse gases that are generated through fracking, piping the natural gas to the site, the inordinate amounts of energy required to liquefy the gas, or the GHGs used to ship the product halfway around the world to China. It doesn't take into account the resulting destruction from an outdated sea-water cooling system. These claims mean absolutely nothing. Woodfibre LNG has a fantastic PR company though.

RE: BASELINE STUDIES

This is also vital. The following baseline studies are either missing from Woodfibre’s EA application, or are inadequate as they do not conform to any recognized scientific standards: fish, birds, marine mammals, air quality, shipping, water quality, marine sound, and atmospheric sound, marine life near the Woodfibre site, and the cumulative impact assessment. Proper studies need to be completed before any decisions can be made regarding this project.

RE: GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

This is of critical importance. Woodfibre LNG is now estimating greenhouse gas emissions to be 142 thousand tonnes of CO2 equivalent every year. These annual emissions of CO2 equivalent from Woodfibre LNG is equal to adding over 18,000 cars to the highway, driving to Vancouver and back, every day. This is more than six times greater than current highway traffic. It is irresponsible to approve this kind of polluting industry at a time when we need to transition away from fossil fuels to mitigate the risks associated with climate change, and to reduce the economic and health impacts of air pollution in general.
Climate change is amplified in Canada:

Canada has experienced about double the average global temperature increase during the past century. Climate change, including temperature increases, tends to be amplified in Canada because we're a northern country and global warming is magnified at or near the North and South Poles. This intensification in temperature increase near the poles is largely the result of the loss of ice and snow cover. The IPCC report has information for Canada by region on temperature increases, precipitation trends, drought possibility, snow cover and more. http://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/wg1/mindex.shtml

Natural disasters estimated to cost Canadians $5 billion per year by 2020:

There is evidence from around the world that natural catastrophes such as floods, storms, drought, heatwaves, fires, and earthquakes are on the rise. This is a serious issue for society, as these catastrophes can destroy homes, disrupt businesses, and take lives. According to TD Bank's Chief Economist, this increase in natural catastrophes is estimated to cost Canadians $5 billion per year by 2020, and $21-$43 billion per year by 2050. Source: http://www.td.com/document/PDF/economics/special/NaturalCatastrophes.pdf

According to 350.org, right now we're on track to blow the 2 degrees celsius global carbon budget in less than 18 years. We can't afford to keep supporting these fossil fuel industries. They are unsustainable, economically unviable, and seriously threaten the future survival of the human race on this planet. http://www.theguardian.com/environment/ng-interactive/2015/mar/16/the-biggest-story-in-the-world

Given that Squamish will be spending millions of dollars to upgrade our dike protection systems as a direct result of climate change, it seems foolish to support an industry that will increase the amount of greenhouse gas emissions in Squamish, BC, and the world.

RE: NATURAL GAS PIPELINES CANNOT BE REPURPOSED FOR OIL

This is also a false claim. It doesn't matter that the government has passed legislation declaring that gas pipelines cannot be repurposed for oil pipelines. Our government frequently overturns its own legislation to suit its own purposes. Look at what has happened with Bill 4, the Park Amendment Act:

First up, watch Jordan Sturdy's statement re: LNG

In particular, watch from 2.00 to 2.21 minutes:
"Mr Speaker our government’s aspiration to build an LNG export industry are taking place with steady and concentrated actions to ensure that British Columbia is ready to compete on a global scale. Policy changes, development of legislation and regulation, promotions, training and human resources, and much environmental assessment and protection work is taking place."

Then learn how this statement relates to Bill 4, the Park Amendment Act:
Bill 4 passed the day after MLA Jordan Sturdy's statement. Bill 4 allows for industrial activities within Provincial
parklands including energy extraction, construction of pipelines, and industry-led research related to pipelines, transmission lines, roads, and other industrial activities that might require park land. It effectively undermines the very definition of what a park is, which can be defined as “a protected area managed at the provincial level to preserve a location on account of natural beauty, historic interest, or recreational potential.” Bill 4 undermines 100 years of public participation to establish parks in this province to preserve our wilderness and our heritage for future generations. Why has this bill been pushed through so quickly and with no public consultation? How is this in the best interests of BC citizens?


This is a prime example of our government overturning their own legislation. I have little faith in the security that the BC government is offering that this pipeline won't be converted to an oil pipeline, especially given the changes that Fortis has made both to the size of the pipe (now 24 inches), and the capacity that BC hydro is building into their hydro upgrades. This is all very suspect.

RE: NATURAL GAS IS THE CLEANEST BURNING FOSSIL FUEL

This is an often-repeated soundbite by industry and government that “natural gas is the cleanest *burning* fossil fuel.” That's true if you look at it in isolation. It produces less air pollution than other fossil fuels. BUT the whole truth is that producing natural gas creates more greenhouse gas emissions than any other fossil fuel, which means that instead of reducing our greenhouse gas emissions, we’re making them worse. Natural gas has since been called the most EXTREME fossil fuel, especially when it is produced by fracking. Again, I find it really disturbing that these propaganda statements are being included in this survey.

Sources:
http://link.springer.com/article/10.1023%2FA%3A1015737350552


RE: INABILITY OF GOVERNMENT TO MONITOR, ENFORCE, AND RESPOND TO ISSUES

There are no regulations adopted to regulate this LNG industry from a technical standpoint. Any of the current standards are not applicable to the LNG industry. Do the regulators have the knowledge and the expertise and the capacity to oversee this industry or will they be relying on the proponent to monitor themselves and report to the regulator? Self-monitoring industries have created several examples of accidents with resulting environmental destruction in recent years, including the Lac Megantic rail disaster and the Mt Polley tailing pond spill.

BC has, last year, issued draft regulations covering the operation of LNG facilities. These are, as yet, untested and lack key metrics on allowable emissions, setbacks and other safety standards, emergency plans etc. These are not of the same standard as those used in other jurisdictions (for example, the recently-constructed plants in Cheniere, Louisiana and Gladstone, Australia). For example, it indicates that the CSA standard Z276-11 will apply generally to the plant construction and design, but allows that the de-registered floating storage tankers Woodfibre proposes to use are exempt from this standard. That would seem to allow these vessels to escape both international port state inspection regimes and conformity to accepted Canadian standards. Also, the draft regulations allow any official of the BC Oil & Gas Commission to exempt the facility from any of the regulations, without explanation or further regulatory oversight or review – a power clearly open to potential abuse.

RE: CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

It is vitally important that the government considers the impacts of not only this proposed project, but the cumulative impacts of all of the projects currently proposed in Howe Sound.

12. This plant should be councils call as to how it’s operations continue barring in mind the scope of operations is considered industrial

9. As a country, as a planet, we must stop our dependance on fossil fuels - not just support the "cleanest burning fossil fuel", but all fossil fuels in order to keep the planet safe for our grandchildren and their grandchildren. This CAN be done if the government would only stop subsidizing fossil fuels. This change is happening all over the world.

13. The tradeoff to investment in tourism and rectech vs this controversial investment.

1. See above

2. Fracking!

3. Look around the town and look at all the garbage in and on the streets. People are so concerned about issues that they do not understand fully but with toss their garbage onto the street anyway.

13. The council should envision all of the difficulties they have had in simply making someone remove abandoned, polluting ships from near Squamish. That has been ongoing and almost impossible. There seems to be no power that the council has over what takes place in the water. Why not keep out other possible polluters before we realize that it is too late to do anything about it. I am happy that this questionnaire allows me to connect what is happening in Squamish to larger problems with fracking. This is unacceptable.

13. Fresh clean water is going to be hard to find in the world. Why are we going to use great amounts in fracking process to get gas to send to countrys like China that is adding to major green house gas.

7. Infrastructure already exist and with excess capacity to deliver gas to the Lower Mainland. The new 24 inch line required to make Woodfibre viable is only about 65 km and will follow an already approved transportation corridor.
8. Good project - opportunities to monitor and understand impacts locally

9. Clean water in the future is going to be one of THE most important things to mankind. It is important for all communities to protect the waters in their own backyards.

9. This is a good Global Option.

1. Climate change

2. I think the impact of fracking should be taken into account when assessing the environmental impact of this plant. The "cleanest LNG facility in the world" is misleading.

There is no guarantee that the facility cannot be repurposed for oil despite the reassurance form the government. This policy could easily be reversed at any time.

3. Will I don't think there is anything more important than the impact that this plant and the LNG industry has on our environment. All of which is well documented and not hippy fluff. Water tables are being destroyed, earthquakes are being caused (that's just crazy). All of this is happening for an industry that's floundering. An industry that was subsidized 34 Billion dollars last year. Yet we are struggling with our health care and our educational system. I'm not seeing any benefits to this in relation to the devastation that it is causing.

4. Just because a certain practice or management is considered acceptable today in Canada, does not make it a best practice. Brittania mine operated under the best practice of the day and we're still cleaning up the mess. As for establishing a baseline, of course that's important to ensure things aren't getting worse, but why is it OK to place additional strain on an already taxed environment?

5. There must be studies done that will give us the insight of what is going to happen to our waters even without an accident.

6. The complete lack of a regulatory framework should be of material concern.

7. From what I understand LNG is the cleanest fossil fuel. It seems to me that it is the most sensible economically and environmentally. At least at this time

8. Google "fracking ban" and see how many cities and states are banning this resource extraction method. Howe Sound can be an environment tourism jewel of the world.

I do not believe that the government will be able to monitor and enforce environment protection against this giant company once it is on our shores. Furthermore, I believe all these figures are skewed to mirror the best possible safety and environmental image possible. They say 3-4 tankers a month, who will stop them when that becomes 5,10, 20 a month?

9. Federal and provincial govt of Canada keep removing legislature that protected citizens of Canada and they also continue to back pedal on climate change policies therefore it is up to citizens and municipalities to tell them we will not allow them to continue going down this road of allowing them to aid in carbon energy sectors destruction of our planet. We have to stand up.

10. This is a much cleaner option for a huge population that still burns coal and oil. LNG is a stepping stone to a cleaner world. Council needs to assert any power and influence to ensure that the government orgs maintain and up hold their mandate to monitor industry to ensure they are up holding best practises

11. More concerning, to me, than Woodfibre LNG is the source of fuel and practices involved in obtaining the fuel to service the plant. While the plant itself may end up being comparatively benign, I am extremely concerned by every aspect of
1. The fracking process. At a time when desertification is actively occurring in some communities, water conservation should be at the forefront of politician’s minds. Justifying water usage in fracking by stating that “Metro Vancouver residents flush 4 times as much fresh water down their toilets as our gas industry uses in a year” is unacceptable. Two wrongs don’t make a right! Home owners have just as much responsibility as corporations and government to reduce their consumption, waste and emissions and should be addressed in the appropriate venue as well. Canada is quickly losing the respect of other Nation’s and, embarrassingly, getting a reputation for having “the worst climate policy in the developed world”. It is irresponsible given the irrefutable evidence of climate change, desertification and the link between fracking and earthquakes to continue this process. This is not just about “saying No” to Woodfibre LNG in Squamish, this is about Canadian citizens “saying No” to non-sustainable environmental practices and policies everywhere period.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Baseline measurements are critical to understanding change. They also need to be taken over time, not just once before the project should it proceeded. Also if there is negative impact the facility should reduce operations or cease them altogether.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Same as I’ve stated above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>We have a responsibility to BC and Canada, not just Howe Sound. The need for Fracking to extract the gas is increasingly required in other parts of this province/country. Earthquakes and tremors are rapidly increasing due to fracking. The planet is heating up - why cause more greenhouse gases to be released when we have other energy options and we need to look to those.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The data used by the proponents in their discussion of the environmental focus on current conditions and fail to take historical conditions. For example the data for avian species go no further back that 2003 and the source is some Christmas bird counts done by amateur naturalists. Once a year one or two people would make a trip to Woodfibre and note whatever they could see from the ferry. The conclusions reached is that Grebes, for example, are not much found in Howe Sound and are few in number. This is true, but a study done in 1973 of the Squamish River Estuary was much more extensive and professional. The average number of grebes was in the hundreds. It should be noted that even this study was done after the ecosystems of the lower mainland had already been much damaged by human development. No data is available for the original abundance but who would believe that it was not much greater than anyone alive today can attest to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>We have seen a very poor response from government regulators in the past when there have been spills (i.e. 2005 CN Derailment that sterilized the Cheakamus River &amp; 2006 bunker C oil spill at Squamish Terminals that took over 12 hours for response team to get on site and never did fully clean the oil spill - not charges were even laid…); We have a very poor understanding of the Howe Sound ecosystem and as far as I'm aware there have been no studies on Cumulative Impacts. It would be incredibly irresponsible of DOS to support an industry that could push Howe Sound over the tipping point without understanding what the impacts of an LNG facility will have on the ecosystem, air and water sheds. The fact that LNG comes from fracking and is a significant contributor to climate change cannot be separated out from the WLNG plant. To support the refinery at Woodfibre is to support fracking - in short, by supporting the WLNG our DOS Council is saying this industry contributes to global climate change but they are willing to support it all the same and they realize it draws on the limited fresh water reserves on this planet but that is okay to support the loss of fresh water for the processing of natural gas! A little insane if you ask me!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 15 | Fact: The Canadian Coast Guard has been cut so badly that 90% of the rescue calls on this coast are answered by volunteers. Fact: The DOF are under too much pressure from the government heads to make it look like fish stocks have recovered everywhere along our coast that they are completely ignoring the First Nations experts. (i.e. recent unannounced herring harvest in Haida Gwaii). Fact: Transport Canada and the Coast Guard was completely powerless and took well over a year to remove what was eventually proven to be a toxic and maritime hazard illegally moored just off our beloved Nexen Beach until it actually predictably broke free from it’s mooring and was finally towed away. |
| 15 | I think the most important aspect is the cumulative impact of all development projects for the Howe Sound area. |
8. Fracking is wrong because it pollutes the surrounding water. Water is more important than Natural gas. The source of the natural gas should be considered. Only gas that has been extracted by environmentally friendly process should be accepted by the Woodfiber LNG plant.

9. I am very concerned over the increase of greenhouse gases. Crimes, even the USA is ahead of us in this thinking.

10. Who says that it would be the cleanest facility in the world? This crooked businessman?? Please, don’t be naive.

15. Controversial Indonesian billionaire Sukanto Tanoto has purchased an industrial site in Squamish, B.C., 30 miles north of Vancouver, for the purposes of exporting LNG. The self-educated entrepreneur has been criticized for environmental practices elsewhere in his $12 billion industrial empire, raising questions about his B.C. venture. Environmental watchers say Tanoto’s logging company has a checkered record in cutting down Indonesia’s rainforests and destroying wildlife habitat.

"His company is the leading driver of deforestation in Indonesian peat lands," said Shane Moffatt, a Toronto-based campaigner for Greenpeace. "I would really question what his track record means for his Canadian plans,"

16. Stop WLNG Stop Fortis BC pipeline Stop the Tankers!

1. We also believe that the cumulative impact of all development projects planned for Howe Sound should be taken into consideration to ensure we balance all pillars. Specifically for Squamish we are in need of a Marine strategy/vision.

2. Save our backyards from the money hungry ocean, air, and land destroyers.

3. The following baseline studies are either missing or are inadequate as they do not conform to any recognized scientific standards: fish, birds, marine mammals, air quality, shipping, water quality, marine sound, and atmospheric sound, marine life near the Woodfibre site, and the cumulative impact assessment. Proper studies need to be completed before any decisions can be made regarding this project.

4. The primary business man behind this project has a horrific track record for environmental infractions, and I don’t see the safeguards in place to ensure he doesn’t treat our land the same way.

5. ) Tankers negotiating pristine, narrow fjord

I have concerns about the traffic of tankers in Howe Sound. I would like to see more recreational boats and water-based enthusiasts visit us as a destination. I do not believe that the Woodfibre LNG is going to encourage the further development of an increased water-based tourism. Howe sound is a narrow fjord and recreational boaters and other commercial vessels will be limited.

6. Internationally, LNG industry faces strong competition from exporters of piped gas. Piped gas requires less processing and tankers. Countries shipping LNG export are Australia, Russia, USA, Papua New Guinea, Mozambique, Malaysia, and Columbia, Nigeria. Importers are Japan and China, with South Korea choosing Nuclear energy.

Piped gas exporters to Japan and China are Central Asia, Myanmar and Russia.

Canada is very late to the table, but someone is having fun flipping shares.

16. All the points above are important. Especially:

The cumulative impact of all development projects planned for Howe Sound. A howe sound management plan for the entire watershed is important.

The relationship of these two projects to fracking in northern BC and corresponding implications for environmental and human health and safety.

We need to actively move away from increasing our green house gas production. this project does the opposite.

16. Fracking uses and pollutes a huge amount of water. We need to transition away from using that technology, and from all fossil fuels. We should not be ramping up production for export. Instead we should focus our efforts and financial resources on putting in place renewable energy systems.

Natural gas is not necessarily the fossil fuel with the least environmental impact. Methane (CH4) (about 85% of natural gas) is 105 times worse than CO2 as a greenhouse gas (GHG). When the inevitable leakages along pipelines and LNG systems are taken into account, the result is that natural gas is not so "clean" at all.

Regarding government capacity - two months ago I found an abandoned camp in the estuary, right along the banks of the Squamish River - full of batteries and fuel jerry cans and more. I called the appropriate Ministry agency to see about getting it cleaned up, but that has not happened yet. It seems there is an understaffing, and lack of resources to take care of basic existing issues. All the government agencies and their supporting regulatory teeth have been cut back to the point where their capacity to effectively take care of the environment and public is seriously compromised, even without the addition of a new industry with which they have no experience.

Cooling natural gas to produce LNG takes an enormous amount of energy. We are currently debating how to expand and update our energy infrastructure in BC, including monster projects such as the Site C dam. WLNG would be a huge energy consumer - thus adding to pressure to proceed with extremely damaging energy mega projects. We would be better off using that energy for something else - like using it sparingly as we figure out better renewable systems.

17. Well as an example I was most concerned when a ship was recently left to park and rot in the sound. There was confusion over who had the formal authority to deal with the issue. My concern is with past experience how are we to ensure any matters are dealt with after such display of confusion. Funding cuts to support our waterways and increasing traffic with tankers in areas used recreationally - do these sound like responsible partnerships??? LNG site and people coming from around the world to hike the chief and breathe polluted air? Travel to complete in Iron man bike races, kite surfing etc and be in water that's been effected and polluted by the processing? This isn't fitting the image we want is it?

17. I don't believe that there will be adequate oversight of the industry and its impacts. It's impossible to adequately assess the cumulative impacts of LNG export, without considering implications of fracking and greenhouse gas emissions.

17. I do not believe that the broader issue of fracking can be linked to this project. Good oversight and maximum community benefits should be the primary considerations.

17. .......Natural gas is the cleanest burning fossil fuel and is used in many places to reduce emissions by replacing dirtier fuels. This statement is Greenwashing at its finest and we know you know. As a University student there is not ONE professor I have talked to, not ONE other student I have conversed with and no matter what chain of research I follow that leads to this statement having any credibility. You know the science behind fracking and the carbon cycle.

17. Woodfibre LNG is now estimating greenhouse gas emissions to be 142 thousand tonnes of CO2 equivalent every year. These annual emissions of CO2 equivalent from Woodfibre LNG is equal to adding over 18,000 cars to the highway, driving to Vancouver and back, every day. This is more than six times greater than current highway traffic. It is
irresponsible to approve this kind of polluting industry at a time when we need to transition away from fossil fuels to mitigate the risks associated with climate change, and to reduce the economic and health impacts of air pollution in general.

LNG tankers do not have enough clearance to get over the 9000 year old reef if they go off course. These 9000 year old glass sponge reefs have been called "Living Fossils" by National Geographic as until recently this species was thought to have gone extinct over 60 million years ago. MLA Jordan Sturdy recently made a statement in the House about the importance of this discovery in Halkett Bay near Gambier Island, and to support the proposal to expand the Provincial Park Protected Area to ensure these reefs are protected.

Sources:
http://jordansturdymla.ca/bcltv_videos/mla-sturdy-halkett-bays-glass-sponges/

5. ALSO The relationship of these two projects to fracking in northern BC and corresponding implications for environmental and human health and safety, is a major concern.

6. Every action has a reaction
Please think outside of the box
I have travelled many countries and canada is one of the few left with fresh air
We can drink from the tap and swim in our oceans. Majority of the world cannot do this. Don't let canada lose this precious resource.

7. "cleanest burning" is complete propaganda - true, but the issue is that from source to consumer, natural gas is much more polluting than coal.
"cleanest LNG facility in the world" is like saying the "nicest murderer in the world". Yes, I am dramatizing, but I am tired of hearing this. It ignores the fact that there are still very significant emissions at the plant, but the big picture is the impact of the fracking operations to supply the gas and the emissions for shipping the gas half way around the world!

8. The information that another Squamish resident has received from government is that some of the regulations around LNG tankers, plants regarding safety and other issues are only now being written. Are we just winging these regulations as government and industry has done in the past and present? It seems to me that because all the people involved are committed due to jobs they will not look at the impact of this project from an unbiased viewpoint. Is this not about a small percentage of Canadians with something to gain financially pushing through something that will rob future generations? If we are not part of the solution we are part of the problem. Industry does not tell the truth nor does government and there are many examples of this that I have observed in the last year. This project is enormous from start to finish and so is the complex web of consequences. Other countries are much further ahead with practising living without or minimizing fossil fuel dependancy. Only a climate change denier would approve of this project. We must support industries which will help us all get off of fossil fuels.

9. Human cause climate change is real and the district should demonstrate leadership by not supporting another facility which will escalate GHGs. It doesn't fit our OCP vision and commitments towards reducing impacts. WLNG will add to emissions here and globally, it does not take coal-powered plants off-line in China, no such agreements exist.

Fracking is a major concern and the district should consider up and down stream impacts of this project. This project will escalate fracking operations elsewhere in BC and will cause significant damage to environment and massive
increase in water use. We simply cannot afford this.

18 1. LNG poses some big challenges with greenhouse gas emissions

Natural gas is only a “clean” burning fuel in the sense that it is associated with fewer particulate emissions than the so called “dirtier” fuels it is replacing. But it is a wolf in sheep’s clothing.

According to a CBC News article from April 2014: “British Columbia Environment Ministry staff have warned their minister that the province’s dreamed-of liquefied natural gas industry poses some big challenges with greenhouse gas emissions. Internal briefing notes prepared for Environment Minister Mary Polak since she took office last year and obtained by The Canadian Press, single out methane emissions for concern. On top of emissions from combustion and flaring of natural gas, methane and carbon dioxide escape during hydraulic fracturing process, or fracking, the documents said. "Methane emissions are a particular concern since they have a global warming impact 21 times higher than carbon dioxide,” said one July briefing note.”

Although air pollution in China is a concern, it does have one good effect: it is driving China away from coal and towards renewable energy. This month, the International Energy Agency announced that energy-related CO2 emissions last year were unchanged from the year before. For the first time in 40 years, global emissions from the energy sector flatlined during a time of economic growth. Following an announcement earlier this week that China’s CO2 emissions fell 2 percent in 2014, the IEA is crediting 2014’s progress to China using more solar, wind and hydropower while burning less coal. Encouraging China to replace coal with LNG is an environmental disaster for the entire planet.

Those who profess a concern for the air quality in China are forgetting about the entire rest of the planet – including those impoverished nations who are already suffering the most from the effects of a 0.8 degree rise in global temperatures, despite having nothing to do with the cause of that rise.

Inability of government to monitor, enforce, and respond to issues

There are no regulations adopted to regulate this LNG industry from a technical standpoint. Any of the current standards are not applicable to the LNG industry. Do the regulators have the knowledge and the expertise and the capacity to oversee this industry or will they be relying on the proponent to monitor themselves and report to the regulator? Self-monitoring industries have created several examples of accidents with resulting environmental destruction in recent years, including the Lac Megantic rail disaster and the Mt Polley tailing pond spill. This is particularly worrisome given that the proponent of this project - Sukanto Tanoto - has a particularly poor record on environmental issues and shows a disregard for regulation (for example, one of his companies was last year fined $205 million for tax evasion).
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18 3. look at all the proposals for Howe Sound if they all get approved we will have worse conditions than ever. These projects need to be all taken into account at the same time and the cumulative effects need to be looked at. As stated before we need to, actually we MUST drastically reduce GHGs. LNG expansion will do the opposite. Fracking is ecocide, how could we support any industry that will cause fracking expansion?
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18 5. Saying Yes to W-LNG will, in effect, open the LNG-export industry door and create the demand upstream for the resource extraction (fracking). Associated concerns are as follows:

WATER

large volumes of water will be contaminated with toxic chemicals and used for hydraulic fracturing (fracking)

The BC Oil & Gas Commission (BCOGC) has been given increasing authority to approve water permits/licences:

2004 to 2012 – 1 year short-term permits

2012 – that was increased to 2-year short-term permits

Aug 2013 – BCOGC was given authority to grant long-term (5 to 20 year) water licences

The new Water Sustainability Act was brought to legislation last year but the regulations are still to be determined. It remains to be seen, with the Deputy Premier and Minister on Natural Gas, Rich Coleman, the degree to which the regulations will be industry-friendly. With the recent water-pricing announcement, many feel that the government
Important to consider is the implications of long-term contracts and obligations that would come with LNG agreements. With Canada now committed to more Internation Trade Agreements, consideration should be given to possible water-related investor state trade dispute challenges should environmental concerns necessitate industry water restrictions. “Canada sued the most over trade deals, environmental protections” ... http://commonsensecanadian.ca/canada-sued-trade-deals-environmental-protections/

In 2010, during a tour of Encana’s ‘World’s Largest Frack Job’ at Two Islands Lake, government and FN’s visitors of the water meter house revealed that there was a pipe bi-passing 2 water meters. It then becomes difficult to know the accuracy of the water used and reported by industry. http://www.bctwa.org/FrkBC-Apache-BiggestFrack.pdf

on contamination

Northeast BC is such a vast area, relatively unpopulated compared to areas of fracking in the eastern US where contamination of water from fracking is being reported, BC resources for monitoring are minimal and lacking. While the BC government and industry state that there have been no ‘reported’ cases of ground water contamination, reports are suggesting that there is a lack of information and knowledge at this time and caution moving slowly with the resource extraction – absence of evidence does NOT mean evidence of absence. This was high-lighted in the May 2014 Council of Canadian Academies. The report media release ...


Hydro-geologist, Dr. Gilles Wendling, explains about fracking and groundwater in the context of northeast BC in this video. Very informative ... https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=87LuGNoTp-Q&feature=youtu.be

BCOGC regulates and monitors the industry it oversees

from www.fracfocus.ca ... mandatory disclosure of chemicals is within 30 days AFTER their processes are completed and that exceptions can be granted for ingredients to be listed as ‘Undisclosed’ “if the supplier considers such information to be confidential business information”. The registry is a good first step, but conditional, after-the-fact disclosure is far short of a well regulated system.

There is no information on the chemicals used in 10’s of thousands of wells prior to the frac-focus registry in 2012

The BCOGC decreased the budget - from 4.83 million in 2013 to 1 million in 2014 – for reclamation of inactive wells. At a time when an LNG export industry would increase demand for ramping up the number of well sites, the BCOGC is abandoning orphaned wells ... http://commonsensecanadian.ca/bc-oil-and-gas-commission-abandons-orphan-wells/

Another indication that the BCOGC may not have sufficient capacity to monitor the industry ... “Toxic fracking waste illegally dumped in BC water treatment system” http://commonsensecanadian.ca/toxic-fracking-waste-illegally-dumped-bc-water-treatment-system/

“Talisman frackwater pit leaked for months, kept from public” http://commonsensecanadian.ca/talisman-frackwater-pit-leaked-months-kept-public/

In July 2014, the federal government made the decision to leave toxic fracking chemicals off a National Pollutant Release Inventory list of pollutants going into Canada’s air, land and water.

FIRST NATIONS

Treaty 8 First Nations are saying that the ramping up of resource extraction is not sustainable and is compromising living on their land.

Tribal Chief Liz Logan speaks:  https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VNdGc_U3qzE

Blueberry River Nation (area of Site C Dam) is also speaking out: http://commonsensecanadian.ca/VIDEO-detail/landmark-treaty-8-lawsuit-challenges-site-c-dam-lng/
HEALTH


In association, the growing evidence of these harms may strongly suggest why the British Columbia government has been withholding final report studies on fracking and health effects since at least May 2014, including a now two-year old, outdated literature review report on fracking.  http://www.vickihuntington.ca/content/bc-health-minister-mum-report-health-fracking-effects

In relation, this ‘withholding’ may be linked to why the BC government recently cut funding for an 8-year-old watchdog organization, the North East Oil and Gas Health Advisory Committee, “a driving force behind the government's health risk assessment” concerning unconventional gas and oil operations in northeast BC.” http://www.vickihuntington.ca/content/funding-cut-oil-and-gas-health-watchdoghuntington

18 6. Cleanest does not mean clean..baselines need to be established, acceptable to the people in the area not acceptable industry and bureaucrats that do not live here. Fracking is the shattering of the earths crust..how can that be any good..it causes a multitude of problems..pollution of ground water etc. All the above sections need to be addressed. This project is just wrong. A few jobs long term is a small benefit while rich people get richer at our expense.

18 7. Pipe should be installed best possible safety

18 8. Baseline studies are important to determine the change and potential pollution of water, air & land. Fracking can cause earthquakes and see page of toxic chemicals underground into wells, rivers, and trailing ponds

18 9. Allowing a heavily polluted are of the world (China) clean up it's air will benefit all of us

19 0. Climate change contributions, natural gas is not cleaner than other fuels when the lifecycle cradle-to-grave is considered

19 1. Cumulative impact of all development project planned for Howe Sound. Fracking the North East is a crime against future generations

19 2. Fortis people have told me that they will go ahead with their pipeline even if LNG Woodfibre does not go through. The will be other projects they said

19 3. Exporting LNG to Asia (or anywhere) is simply not the wisest use of this resource - the cost (monetarily) of cooling it and shipping it overseas is more expensive than shipping oil or coal. LNG is best used closest to its source.

Broad Env - Values |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>As per Water, Air and Land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We do not live in isolation anymore or in fact anywhere. The world is connected for better or worse more then it ever has been. The economy is truly global. Climate change is global. Therefore it makes sense that in order to reduce greenhouse gas and replace it with cleaner alternatives we all need to participate. We send cleaner fuel to places that depend now on less clean fuels. And we improve the economy as a result.

Nothing in life comes without risk. Separating fact from hearsay and hype from deliberate thought will be a challenge. Hype after all is part of the problem not part of the solution.
I am always mystified by those who would like to participate in the benefits of a global economy without taking part in any of the byproduct of said economy. Minimizing that risk is the key.

From an environmental and economic standpoint this project makes sense.

2. Balancing the economic, environmental and social aspects of every development is key.

3. We are supposed to be a world leader in environmental issues. We should be demonstrating this with using new technology and renewable energy. Instead we are working backwards and falling behind other countries and efforts

4. As far as finding an industrial business to fit an industrial site, I do not think a better partner could be found.

5. This is your chance to leave a legacy you are proud of. In the end, what is important to you? What is your reason for living?

6. Lack of trust in senior levels of government is directly linked to accountability

7. This has to be about money. Why else would we bring this into our beautiful back yard? In the end, how much money actually stays here? Certainly not enough to warrant this. I moved here for clean air and the healthy outdoor lifestyle. I want that for my children. Also, who are "we" doing business with? If trust is to be earned should we not have proof of a transparent track record?

8. Natural gas may be one of the cleanest burning fuels but more and more it is being obtained through fracking, a process so toxic and harmful that it has been banned by other countries. Why build infrastructure to support and encourage more of this practice? Secondly, do governmental organizations (whose own scientists are being silenced) have the capacity or the freedom to effectively monitor any issues that arise from this project? Baseline studies seem essential to hold the company accountable and to objectively know how our air, land and water systems are being impacted by this project over time.

9. Fracking is revealing itself to be opposite to clean as it comes...
   Not to mention proven correlations to earthquakes...
   Let's join the growing movement to support the ban of fracking, by choosing to not support this project and fund alternative energy options

10. God help us all .. just say NO!

11. I feel strongly LNG would have a negative impact on this area and our future.

12. I favour safe use of all petroleum products especially clean lng

13. This project exploits corporate greed and global unsustainable practices, it is not worthwhile for the community of Squamish.

14. I value exploring and investing in energy initiatives that have less impact on the environment.

15. We chose to move here because we felt Squamish had more to offer us than North Vancouver by being so green and beautiful with Howe Sound at our feet, vast trails, mountains, lakes and valleys all around. Adding both of these projects will take away from what makes Squamish so pristine. I don't believe the trade off will pay off as I believe families like myself who are considering moving here will not because instead of seeing growth built around the natural beauty of Squamish they will see the eye sores, the potential risk and dangers and Squamish will no longer seem like a better choice. I guess we have to ask what is more important - adding money to the economy at the risk of losing natural beauty and creating a potential wildlife and environmental disaster or saying no and watching our town and economy grow (albeit maybe at a slower rate) but in a different more organic direction.
16. We need to think out of the box as a municipality, as a province and as a country to come up with sustainable ways for the future that do not affect our environment, our air, our water, our forests the same as an LNG plant will do. If there are problems, spills, fires, leaks we cannot go back and undo what has been done, a project like this can have massive consequences that will affect our lives and the lives of others for years to come.

17. Council should get on a plane and go see for themselves the fracked land, the flares, the collateral damage. Get off your butts and quit acting like you know it alls.

18. Global energy demand is not going to drop as a result of this facility not being built. This energy will have to be produced and it makes sense to use the cleanest burning fuels that we have. CO2 is only one pollutant that must be considered. There is also the issue of particulates and the effect on health. London is an excellent example, in the early 20th century the air on london was unbreatheable due to the use of coal. People were dying in the thousands due to lung diseases. It was only with the introduction of gas that the air was cleaned up. Its not that LNG will necessarily displace the coal that is already being used, but the global energy demand will continue to increase, and will have to be met. It makes more sense to meet this demand with a cleaner burning fuel than coal.

19. My feelings are that the overall impacts, from air quality, to noise, to tanker traffic and wakes, to other aforementioned ethical feelings, I am against the WLNG proposal.

20. We can be a supplier to China, Russia is too unstable and more likely to “pull the plug” on a buyer for political reasons. This company is a Canadian company subject to Canadian laws and regulations despite its parent companies.

21. That those who say this contributes to an increase in hydraulic fracturing (“fracking”) are misinformed. The amount of gas this plant will liquefy is a very small percentage of the total gas extracted in this Province and at least 50% of our gas we use in our homes is from fracking. This plant will not increase the amount of gas extracted on an annual basis in this Province. Also, the fracking process is changing and improving. Finding ways to limit fugitive emissions has become an industry itself. If you want to stop fracking, you need to go Victoria not the District of Squamish.

22. Did Woodfibre write this survey? Why are so many answers written super pro-LNG and as though the project is happening?!

23. I feel that we have an opportunity to emerge as a leader towards a truly sustainable and resilient community of a future. We can no longer treat environment separate from our economy and a significant part of our livelihoods now and in the future will hinge upon a healthy environment we protect. Squamish’s past is about renewable resource based industry, not about fossil fuel industry, I couldn’t imagine a more inappropriate place for an LNG facility. We should be investing in renewable and alternative energy, not in LNG. Our environment and Howe Sound is all we have to create success in the future, why would we take such a massive risk with an industrial facility that has very little benefit to us?

24. It’s completely against my values to support this project. Squamish is breaking out as a global leader in outdoor recreation and entrepreneurship. We are a hub for innovative ways to shift traditional economic sources of revenue that are known to be harmful to the earth. Climate change is real. I do not want Squamish to go back in time when it’s on the path of being known and seen for its change makers and innovative ideas.

25. As a Gen X I am hugely concerned by the bigger picture and the world I/we are leaving behind for our children. We are not giving the next generation the best chance of being sustainable. Fracking has not been proven to be safe to environments or to health. The majority of the people I talk to in the community who are pro-LNG are older or have no children and I believe are less concerned with the environment.

26. The LNG facility is extremely short sighted. Human reliance on fossil fuels must be deterred. Squamish contains a large population of commuters, who currently inevitably rely on fossil fuels to get to their place of work. Council needs to spend more time on developing alternative work options for commuters (such as shared work spaces within the municipality) as well as green alternatives to the Woodfibre site. This council was voted in on its opposition to Woodfibre LNG: it’s time to put your money where your mouth is and do all you can to make sure this does not happen.
27. I feel more research is needed on the impacts of fracking process in BC. I do not feel that our community should be benefiting from an extraction process that has potential to do so much harm in another part of our province.

I am also not confident that the government agencies that are to monitor, enforce and respond to issues have the resources, manpower or skill sets to do the job. I also do not trust that once the plant is build and making money for its owners that they will be willing to shut it down and have loss time in order to followup on environmental concerns.

28. If the project is going to be an absolute environmental disaster then it shouldn't be considered. But if it is something that has a minimal impact then it should be considered. We already have many big ships coming into the sound to be unloaded at the terminals, which I'm pretty sure most people don't even realize, so the proposed 3 -4 more a month is not the end of the world.


30. I think the risks from global warming are very acute for us here on the coast, because with only a couple degrees in temperature change, we go from snow to rain, and once it rains on our snow, it's done for. Since so much of our economy in the Sea to Sky is based on snow sports, I think we need to do what we can to slow global warming.

31. NG as clean fuel is irrelevant to the broader issue: we need to start the transition off of fossil fuels. Continuing to promote and develop fossil fuel energy projects comes at the opportunity cost of kick starting the switch to alternative energy sources. Climate change manifested as extreme weather events and rising ocean levels will have an economic impact on the DoS. Have studies been done to understand potential costs?

What function does natural gas (and oil) serve in the planet? What is impacted when it is removed? Does it act as a thermal buffer? A lubricant? A filter (we use carbon as a filter in many applications)? Intuitively, it would be naive to think it serves no purpose. Leave gas (and oil) in the ground.

It's very difficult to process the complexity of the proposed project, with the many interactive environmental and social effects, let alone in consideration of other projects proposed for Howe Sound. The document based approach is a mediocre method of communicating and assessing the multitude of impacts. I picture a comprehensive systems-based diagram, overlaid on a map of Howe Sound region and with timeline going back to pre-industrialization of the Sound, to document and reveal the health of Howe Sound at various points in history, linking to human activities. Is there time to create a system map as a visual aid to help digest the complexity of interactive impacts, including other projects in region?

32. The environmental assessment and future monitoring is important, but we have to look at the big picture of providing a clean burning fuel for us and other countries around the world to use instead of the dirtier alternatives.

Until another viable option comes along, this is it!

33. I am absolutely opposed to this "project"!

34. you all are idiots.

35. I believe it is unethical/immoral for us as individuals and, I would argue, as a community, to ignore the upstream and downstream impacts of the choices we make. We want to have a clean community, but we are willing to support an industry that destroys the environment in other communities. This is not just a NIMBY issue - it is a Not In Anybody's Backyard issue.

36. Howe Sound is a tremendous asset providing key ecological services and cumulative impacts of all projects and development needs to be factored into the project review.

37. This project is an environmental disaster that isn't going to employ many people and will risk the health of our community, watershed, how sound, marine life.. and for what, subsidized taxes? It doesn't make sense.
38. I live here! This is MY earth as well as it is yours. You have the opportunity to say no to fossil fuels and yes to cleaner alternative energy. Even better than that, you have a community that supports you in leading the way towards a more sustainable future.

39. We have a responsibility to look after our environment. It has to be the forefront of our decision-making process.

40. Council should think globally and act locally. Creating an opportunity to provide access to natural gas to displace dirtier energy fuels in other parts of the world is a local action that can help address a global problem.

41. We are 'killing' Mother Earth...

42. I do not trust the petrochemical industry to do the right thing. I trust them to do the cheapest thing possible, while dancing close to (and often over) the lines set by regulation. I have no faith that these cancer-causing chemicals, being captured and stored in large amounts -- will not be mishandled.

43. This project is a win for the Community, we need some economic diversity for jobs, taxes and financial impacts in the community. Look at all the closed storefronts, they need viable industry to provide a customer base, all the talkers about tourism filling the gap have never shown a true impact, and the taxes keep rising making it even more difficult to survive.

44. Beautiful British Columbia's entire identity is based on the idea that we appreciate, revere and care about the land in which we reside. The land which we are the caretakers of. Howe Sound can, and should, stand as an example of hope to other communities. An example of a place that has seen abuse, and is seeing remarkable turnaround and enlightened decision making. Council has the exciting opportunity to make an educated, forward-thinking AND environmentally sound decision that could positively impact the sound and its people for years to come.

45. Please insist that Sandia Labs does 3rd party consultation with Transport Canada and the Coast Guard. WFLNG should not be even considered without proper evaluation by the experts.

46. Again we need to consider the consequences of facilitating the transport of natural gas through the extremely vulnerable Howe Sound. By doing so we are also sanctioning the extraction, combustion and inevitable emissions (methane) in BC and elsewhere in the world.

47. Many people are coming forward with compelling information on why this proposal is simply the wrong industry, at the wrong time, with the wrong proponent, at the wrong place and the wrong economic strategy. Listen not only all these voices but also to those much quieter that come as whispers when the herring school and the natural food chain is reestablished and we are so graced to witness having reconciled the grave harm we had come to bring upon this forgiving gift that sustains us in our ignorance. What do we plead when we are warned by all the collective voices and go ahead anyway? What do we tell our questioning grandchildren when they ask WHY?

48. Export of LNG to "reduce harmful emissions in other countries" without investing the tax dollars into green projects in our own Province / Country is not in the best interest of British Columbians or residents of the District of Squamish.

49. We, both collectively and individually, must strive to prevent further incremental damage to vital systems such as estuaries and oceans. If we maintain the status quo, this planet will be a "big, smoking ball of sh*t in fifty years" (George Carlin).

50. If there was a industrial disaster of the facility or any of the tankers the implications would take years to clean up.

51. Burning natural gas is the best of a bad bunch and is not the best we can do. Why isn't Increasing the risk of earthquakes enough to shut this whole project down? We've had a few noticeable ones here recently. What good is an LNG plant on the local and global economy if all we perish in a quake caused by the needless fracking at the root of this evil. I'm not a particularly opinionated or emotional person but this topic stirs tremendous emotions because it just simply does not make any sense!? I have yet to meet anybody who believes in the economics so why take on all these risks?

52. I came to Squamish because I love the nature here, the ocean, the mountains, the forests. So do the many tourists who are coming to Squamish to enjoy the views, bike, climb, hike etc.. An LNG plant does not fit in the picture of new Squamish, it means going back to the past, where Squamish once was a heavy industry town. But the population of
Squamish has changes, this is not what the majority wants anymore. And that is how democracy fundamentally should work, the majority rules in a fair vote.

53. The amount of propaganda I've seen from LNG in local papers tells me that this issue is not a clean company to be in business with. I don't trust local or provincial govt to monitor this plant for environmental infractions

54. I am NOT against development; just the development of old industries when better options are present. Again I encourage you to explore our geothermal potential.

55. Unfortunately, we have some people in society that talk about issues but often no solution. I do not necessarily have an issue with the government and the whole process... because what would I offer as a solution? Right now the proponent is doing their own studies with a hired consultant who are bound by their professional duties to be objective and true to their findings and recommendations. We have governments (local, provincial and federal) which may not be the most experienced with LNG ... so I may offer them to seek LNG professionals globally to assist in their LNG intents. But that is the system that we are living with today, and it works as well as it can - Canada is a highly regulated country and we pay hard earn money in the form of taxes to fund this system. If there is a real issue, there needs to be hard evidence-proof to go off on instead of vague speculation because the party in power is not to one's liking. And the lack of understanding as to how a political party can influence the market is astonishing... one comment on FSS said that Harper was selling LNG at the G20 ... seriously, it is discouraging. The local council has more of duty of educating the public on the roles of government and when they are over stepping their boundaries (which happens far too often) than campaigning popular rhetoric of stopping an industry set up shop.

56. We have a fiduciary responsibility to our children to leave the environment less polluted than when we inherited it. There are many good options for energy and power that have less of an impact than LNG.

57. As above

58. Never don't want it lets work towards newer energy resources. Please

59. I value our community, our environment and our natural assets. We have it all. We have new, talented young people who love our town. I hope we can stop this project so that the young children in our community have a beautiful place to live in like we do.

60. support this project the town needs it.

61. The SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS of WFLNG could be devastating. So much so that very little is written about it in the WFLNG EA Application. According to a report released by the David Suzuki Foundation, Howe Sound's watersheds at risk provide up to $4.7 billion in natural services to the region each year (http://www.davidsuzuki.org/media/news/2015/02/study-shows-abundance-of-natural-wealth-in-howe-sound/). We need to have a much larger conversation around how this LNG export terminal will affect our current economy, lifestyle, and how we want the world to see us.

62. I will NEVER support something that comes from corruption, something that harms nature, or something that puts out a questionnaire like this that is worded in a biased way to make it sound like it's so wonderful. I smell crooks.

63. In university, you write a thesis, present it to the class. Then defend it to the best of your ability against the classes arguments. Here this company has presented its project and swooned us with all the positives of the project. Now we have to find people who can argue against it. Then if the company can provide valid reasons, answers and concerns for the community and environment would it be acceptable. But a lay man can't argue with a professional we need some professionals of our own.

Try contacting these two people (New Brunswick scientist Dr. James Venart and SPB Researcher Robert Godfrey) They are working with issues at a proposed LNG facility in N.B.
64. No fracking, no export.

65. I care about the environment as much as anyone but it appears that some members of this council are obsessive about some issues (LNG) but tend to ignore others. (Overworked sewage treatment plant)

66. Modest 20 year gain from the facility is wiped out by the risks to the local and wider population and environment.

67. Squamish is beautiful, green and clean. Fracking, LNG production and the relating tank traffic are not. We have an opportunity here to keep moving towards a greener future. LNG is not the answer.

68. Squamish is currently a great place to live and a lot of young families are moving here. If the environment is negatively affected by LNG, many people won't want to live here. This community will become like other dead, extraction industry towns.

69. I think it is important to think both globally and locally. The more natural gas we sell, the more fracking happens. That leads to more greenhouse gasses, and more ground water pollution.

And if you have read the David Hughes report (D Hughes is a highly respected Canadian geoscientist), if we follow Christy Clark's lead, we will sell all our natural gas in a few years and will soon be importing it from....US? China?

70. LNG is a valuable addition. However, if it was the thin edge of the wedge for further industrial activity on our waterfront, that would be much more concerning. If this goes ahead, can we put limitations on other activity on the howe sound.

71. I have lived in Brackendale for over 30 years now and raised 4 sons here. When they were younger we would often go to Porteau Cove and play. We would read the stories of how the whales used to come up the sound over 50 years ago. Never did I expect them to return as the world rarely heals itself in the way OUR Howe Sound has. Please lets say no if we can.. The whales are back.

72. In any case, how is shipping our gas across the ocean supposed to be considered an environmental good? The potential for accidents is too high to make this a "good" alternative.

73. The only reason i still live here is because wood fibre mill shut down- more heavy industry on that site will spoil Squamish's (new) favourable image as 'recreation/ tourism/ nature loving destination or place to live.

74. I wholeheartedly oppose LNG Woodfibre...there is too much to lose and what to gain??

75. Strongly against FRACKING and Sukanto Tanoto's poor environmental and humanitarian record.

76. I don't want 'less bad' for our community, I want actual good options- not options marketed as good.

77. We need to recognize that the willingness and the ability of governments -- both provincial and federal -- to exercise oversight over large, wealthy corporations is minimal. The federal government has made it plain that it wants to invest in hydrocarbons -- and also made it plain that it is unwilling to allow opposition to its plans. In this climate, it is difficult to imagine that the risks of new LNG development in the Howe Sound will be overseen and monitored effectively; it is impossible to believe that FortisBC or other partners would be held fully to account in case of a major catastrophe. The federal government has muzzled the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and insisted that it has the right to block the publication of scientific material that undermines the government’s claims about other matters; what gives us any confidence that the government will suddenly decide to behave responsibly?

78. NO!!

79. Natural gas may be considered a cleaner solution than coal, but can we do better with less of s short-term vision? The impacts of the industry in northern BC are concerning. Are there really effective regulatory measures for extraction, transport, storage.

80. What is the basis for the claims this will be one of the cleanest LNG facilities in the world, and that LNG is the cleanest burning fossil fuel? I think some (many?) would dispute those claims. As written, they are presented as fact (and a sales
81. Woodfibre is only short term gain with far more negative long lasting effects. 

82. We attract more and more tourists every year to escape from the cities and man made machineries, industry, etc. to enjoy nature at its finest and wildest. This sort of industry does not belong in one of the most beautiful places in the world. Our rivers provide huge spawning grounds for salmon and attract millions of migratory birds and wildlife. Industry has been so busy destroying this over the last century, it is time to preserve and petition to save our land as a natural wild life conservation area before it is too late. 

83. Health concerns: we have enough cancer, heart problems, allergies, asthma, etc. We do not need to add anything to the list. We should be thinking of ways of reducing the pollution and environmental impact; not of increasing it. No matter how many promises they (LNG industry) make. Look at the Kitimat and pollution there! They also promised a very clean and environmentally sensitive operation and look what they did! 

84. so many different types of actual clean energy. Why go backwards? This is potentially a big mistake

85. Putting money into this project is stealing from research and development into scientifically proven cleaner and eventually cheaper sources of energy

86. I do NOT want this to go through for many reasons!

87. The cumulative impact of all the factors listed above in unacceptable!

88. Against the combination of Steven Harper and Christy Clark and Woodfibre LNG, owned and controlled by Sukanto Tanoto’s "empire", one might think that the municipal government of the small town of Squamish, with its own range of viewpoints, has a very tough challenge to protect our much valued environment. 

David and Goliath had comparable odds.

89. No environment, which includes air, land and water... none of the other pillars matter. We must switch to renewable energy solutions like solar, wind, tidal and geothermal.

90. I understand the need for alternative fuel and energy sources in manufacturing overseas. I also believe that the need to step back and realize what the future holds is important. The decisions we make now have huge impacts on our children's children. Long after leaders of government and industry have passed on and their childrens children reap the financial benefits of decisions made in the present, residents of the Howe sound community will be left with a disaster. There will be no yearly dividend or stock options for us. There will be no benefits at all except for those in the know (government officials and industry insiders). If this seems like a great idea then maybe some of the proponents would like to buy property in Squamish and live here on permanent basis and raise their families in the shadow of a negative proposal.

91. My British Columbia is not a place for fraking, fracked gas pipelines, liquefied natural gas export terminals or transport tankers. From a provincial perspective, the implications and impact of harvesting this non-renewable resource is not an economical or environmentally sustainable effort. What of the greenhouse gas emissions from the fraking process, the fraked gas pipeline construction, the gas liquefaction, and export? The resulting increase in BC's carbon footprint is too great. What of the impact on watersheds, ecosystems and public health from the use of fraking chemicals, resulting air pollution and obsolete equipment and wells once the shale runs dry? To me, there is no compromise for clean air, clean water, a healthy environment and healthy people.

From a local perspective, the risk of explosions and spills is completely unacceptable. Zero tolerance. This means that even the most comprehensive safety and mitigation plans are not protective enough. Accidents will happen and to me, this is an unacceptable risk to be undertaken when it is our health, our home and our environment at play.

92. I value clean, air, water, and land. Please consider that it is the land we live on, the air we breathe and the water we consume that sustains us.... its that simple.

93. I am not in support of LNG.
94. I am older and feel guilty about being part of a generation that dramatically ramped up our use of fossil fuels. I cannot support policies that are surely going to screw the environment for our offspring. As much as possible, we need to leave fossil fuels in the ground.

95. We have the choice of making decisions to respect the environment. Let's make those choices.

96. We need to move away from dirty fossil fuel process and investigate in clean healthier renewable earth friendly energy sources

97. Global solutions are part of the local decision making.

98. We are all on board the same ship—planet earth. If our gas can displace coal-burning facilities elsewhere in the world, we have a moral obligation to make it available (for purchase, obviously, but available nonetheless).

99. Why spent all this money on a project that is going to lose money we are suppose to be cutting back on green house gas so why go ahead with a project that is clearly not a money maker and big business is pulling out of it in other countries?

100. Keep the focus on local issues and concerns. Focusing on global warming and fracking and fossil fuel extraction distracts from the concerns we should be addressing and can have real influence to change. I remember the outrage against Walmart coming to Squamish and how it sells goods made cheaply in sweat shops overseas. But there is a global, regional, and local demand from these types of goods and not allowing a Walmart store will not make an impact on the demand. Ironically for those against Walmart in Squamish, it is now the largest employer in Squamish and its employees can get to and from work by transit or bicycle.

Hello, My name is Jamie Martin. I live on 1109 Plateau Crescent, Squamish, B.C. I have lived in Squamish since the mid 1960’s. I have witnessed personally heavy industry here and seen the devastation both on land and in the air. I went to the elementary school down town and saw 2 of my classmates develop asthma and had to go to school in Brackendale due to the air pollution. There were warning siren towers placed around town and would go off periodically. The smog down town in June during a high pressure weather pattern with no clouds around was astounding. I have been windsurfing here in Howe sound for 30 years. We have held world cup windsurfing races and the Canadian Windsurfing national championships here. We have unique inflow wind thermals that also blow straight thru town from wood fiber. Our wind sport society operates off of the end of the spit just down wind and not far from the woodfiber site. We will be up to 800 members this year. When woodfiber was in operation our members were the first to get the smell of the air pollution. I am a director and past president of the society for 15 years. I also have been sitting on the Squamish Estuary Committee for the past 15 years where I have learned a lot about the Howe sound and the recovery it has been going through. I have witness wales, dolphins and orcas all returning right up to the river mouth. Never in the past have we seen this until the last 3 to 4 years. I had a Whale spray in my face when he or she was feeding off of the river mouth and I was down wind on my kiteboard. The Howe sound fiord is unique and due to the lack of activity at the old woodfiber site has allowed the large water mammals to return. If you look at the geography of the site of woodfiber it is like doorway as the mammals round the corner to come into the harbour and to the river. Those ships that LNG are proposing are huge. They will be assisted by 3 to 4 Tugs all the way up the sound. These tugs noise decibels will not be good for the retuning mammals. I am getting sick and tired of the LNG propaganda as they compare themselves to other places around the world and try to spin off the impact of the pollution and activity under water that this plant will create. We are not other places, we are a unique Howe Sound Fiord. It has been said that Howe Sound is the worst place to set up industry.

The other frustrating point about this plant going in is it is the only plant that Christy Clark and the Liberals can get up and running first to make good on their mandate to start delivering LNG before the other plants come on line that are not near populated areas. We are being used as a political pawn here on this plant.

These pipes are 24” diameter and will be able to double the shipping in the Howe Sound in the near future, of course they will deny this. I know you are supposed to make recommendations but that is what they want regardless of the risks because they are recommendations only.
I could mention the safety, the economy, and more on pollution but I will let the others write in on this. I thank for your attention and hope you will do the right thing.

Best Regards
XXXXXXXX

1. Who will pay to evaluate and monitor the health of our air and ocean? Will it happen at all?

2. I am not convinced that the necessary baseline studies are adequate (or even exist) with regards to: fish, birds, marine mammals, air quality, shipping, water quality, marine sound, and atmospheric sound, marine life near the Woodfibre site, and the cumulative impact assessment. Proper studies need to be completed before any decisions can be made regarding this project.

3. My biggest concern is that our gov't will drop the ball on continued oversight of this and other environmentally sensitive projects. I believe this is where local gov't and local environmentalist can be of great value, in holding the industries to account.

4. Focus on the positive and make sure industry comes to this community in a way that is environmentally sound; rather than railing against growth, ensure growth is sustainable and lead the way!

5. Think of the bigger picture. Reduce emissions & let's be pro active about the future of our planet.

6. NO LNG

7. Wouldn't it be really neat if we could live in the present and the future, and not go backwards to backwoods living.

8. We have regulations and processes. Rely on these and keep them relevant and broader environmental concerns will be in positive balance

9. It's time to be a leader in environmental protection to preserve outdoor recreation, quality of lifestyle and to build forward on those values.

10. The fact is that when corporations are involved with large scale environmental projects, our planet is not cared for as it should be. The corporations first interest is $$ and it always will be. Profit is the bottom line for Big Industry, and "environmental management" is a peacock display to hide the fact that they are always trying to minimize cost and maximize revenue. Our ecosystems should not be taken advantage of like that.

   We need to make a major shift globally, and Canada (Squamish) can be the pioneer here. As a species we are responsible for the health of our planet. Money is a concept designed to support trade of goods and service, the environment is a living thing, and we are a part of that living thing. Without our environment, trade and industry have no marketplace.

11. If council is not up for this task then let's get people who are

12. I don't believe or trust that the government or the owner of the LNG project have Squamish best interests at heart. If we say yes to this project what recourse do we have if they don't follow through with environmental concerns or economic impacts. They have enough money to do what ever they want if we give them an inch, they will take a mile.

13. The pollution from fracking is well documented - even in BC, earthquakes are occurring at the fracking "mines". Water is poisoned and methane, the worst greenhouse gas is released by fracking.

   Do not support any stage of this process.
Be a part of the movement that is happening around the world - countries that are taking bold steps towards supporting renewable resources. Reject LNG, don't behave like a 3rd world country, do not support this destructive project.

The cracking industry has a poor track record thus far, the tech hasn't improved enough, and this will impact the brand that Squamish has been working so hard to build over the last two years and more. Not a good investment.

LNG has proven, world wide, that they are a good environmental partner and why is council no taking into consideration all of the positives re LNG and only concentrating on the negatives. Council represents all of us and not just their own opinion, they are not neutral they are focused on what they want and have not been elected to behave that way. (Fortis is an example that will cost us all money in additional taxes to cover the legal challenge.)

Squamish looks set to continue to become a solid commuter/recreational area with much potential, does it really need the complications and potential risk of industry like this? Even with the best intentions, a project of this size is surely bound to cause much damage in the estuary during construction and the risk of tankers in the proposed waterways seems to be tempting fate regarding a major environmental catastrophe during operations.

The environment is the most important thing. It is much more important than 25 jobs, and some tax money. The federal and provincial government are not focused on protecting the environment, so we need to be at a municipal level.

Global warming is here

The Woodfibre Property is already zoned for Heavy Industrial use.

abuse of the environment

We are deeply concerned about the project, and hope Council will work for the interests of the people, including preservation of the environment, wildlife and sealife.

One of the best things we can do for the world is to assist China reduce its reliance on coal - we all share the same air. And water on this earth

I think it would be good for Squamish.

There is a flimsy argument being touted by some that this plant is good for global GHG as it would replace dirtier fuels such as coal. There is no proof that increasing supply of one fossil fuel will decrease another. Australia is a good example of this. Australia is one of the worlds largest suppliers of LNG yet coal is still used for around 74% of electricity generation. It is proof that even if you have LNG in your backyard, it’s no guarantee it will reduce coal consumption. Fracking should also be taken into account when assessing the environmental impacts of LNG and this plant.

Howe Sound has only just started recovering from the dark industrial past. Let’s not risk going backwards by inviting industry into the Sound again. The Sound should be a protected park in my opinion and defended from any more industrial impact.

This project has no fiscal benefit to Squamish. It has no job benefit to Squamish and its certainly no benefit to the environment. Tax payers will not only dealing with the tax subsidies that this industry already has in place it will now be paying the electrical bill. So I fail to see why it should be going in at all.

Recently I was in the building 627 in front of the hazardise gas emissions that were coming for re the port. It was 4pm by the time someone in the building decided to tell us that we should leave. The police were suppose to have all of us safe in
9. an area that was 12 city blocks. They couldn’t even keep the people that were directly in front of the fire safe? I have zero thoughts that anyone is going to come and help with anything that goes wrong at this plant.

10. we as individuals and citizens together have to say put the legislation in place to protect the earth for future generations and then learn to live with a little less to save our home. It’s time to stop being so dependant upon carbon fuels and find a new way and we need our leaders to help put this in place.

11. I want the District of Squamish to honour and uphold the bylaws and development process that they were elected to uphold.

12. I live here, and choose to only because it truly is the best place on Earth. I have travelled all over the world, and this is the place I call home. Who are we to risk fragile ecosystems in a critical time of global climate change....

13. by opposing the LNG project, Squamish has an opportunity to further enrich the health of the environment.

14. The gain in my opinion from wlng does not out weight the potential environmental risks

15. there is always still risk of error. I don’t feel we should be taking any risks with the environment in this area. It is just too fragile.

16. To be honest, I am frightened that we will accelerate global warming, earthquakes will do irreversible damage to our province and we will give away a resource that we need at this time.

17. While I have no illusions about the likelyhood of the original abundance ever being restored, it is important that at least representative populations should be maintained in large enough numbers that there is hope that species will not be extirpated. The LNG project may very well do so much damage to the Howe Sound aquatic ecosystem that numerous species will be endangered or extirpated.

18. I cannot support an industry that increases greenhouse gasses through fracking and pollutes fresh water reserves;

19. I cannot support an industry on Howe Sound until a thorough study on Cumulative Impacts is undertaken

20. I have no confidence in our senior levels of governments ability to regulate and enforce even the most basic levels of safety on Howe Sound given their terrible track record.

21. Transport Canada, the CCG and DOF have never really synched and are completely engulfed in federal red tape all the time. The budgets have been cut, the level of communication between these agencies and the communities that would eventually depend on their help in the case of an emergency are almost non-existent. The CCG can barely run an efficient program under their current budget and LNG would increase traffic so much CCG would be completely out of their league as far as managing the new shipping challenges. As far as the cumulative effect on new development: LNG "may" produce 35 full time jobs. I figure that about 28 households. How many units are currently slated for or under construction right now? Hundreds? LNG won’t sustain the growth in this town, it will deter it, and the current developments will fail or stall if LNG ends up here.

22. Government funding to manage to a sustainable and renewable forestry industry are continuing to be cut. This has left little funding to ensure compliance to its own regulations. I believe this reflects the current governments attitude toward it’s commitment to environmental sustainability and protection of resources.

23. I do not support the LNG project on any level.

24. Water is more important than Natural Gas. We can live without Natural gas, but not without clean water. Fracking is wrong.

25. i am totally totally 100% against this.

26. my submission to EAO on WLNG
4. I will first draw on the expertise of others:

1. SAFETY: Siting an LNG facility in Howe Sound violates international safety standards and practices, putting Howe Sound residents at risk

As LNG tankers transit Howe Sound, there is a high-danger zone for 1,600 metres (1-mile) on either side of the LNG tanker. If an accident happens, people within this zone risk death by asphyxiation, or death/injury by fire or explosion. Every time a tanker travels through Howe Sound (approximately 6-8 transits a month according to Woodfibre LNG) several Howe Sound communities will be in that high-danger zone, including: Bowen Island, Bowyer Island, Anvil Island, Passage Island, Porteau Cove, West Vancouver, and parts of the Sea to Sky highway. The Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) LNG Terminal Siting Standards states that LNG terminals should not be located in narrow, inland waterways with dense local populations and significant commercial, recreational, and ferry traffic. Why would that guideline not apply to Howe Sound? The proposed siting of the Woodfibre LNG terminal and associated transit of LNG tankers through Howe Sound poses an unacceptable risk to safety of people in communities along the shores of Howe Sound.

Sources: Sandia Report, 2004 and SIGTTO LNG Terminal Siting Standards

2. ENVIRONMENT: The once-through seawater cooling system proposed by Woodfibre LNG is outdated

Woodfibre LNG is proposing an outdated and damaging cooling method to help cool the LNG facility. They propose to extract 17,000 tonnes (= 3.7 million gallons, or 7 Olympic-sized 50-meter swimming pools) of seawater from Howe Sound, chlorinate it, heat it, and then spit it back out into the sound every hour of every day for the next 25 years. This method has been banned in California and several other places as it is very damaging to marine life such as juvenile salmon, herring, and plankton which are the building blocks for all other life in Howe Sound. If the herring are impacted, the dolphins, orcas, and humpbacks are also impacted as they no longer have a food supply. The impacts of increased water temperatures and the addition of chlorinated seawater will likely reverse the recent revival of marine life in Howe Sound, which is just now recovering from the toxic legacies of previous industries. This is unacceptable.

3. HEALTH: Social costs and health impacts of air pollution

Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Emissions of NOx and SO2 interact with other compounds to form fine particles, which can affect both the lungs and the heart. Exposure to these particles is linked to increased risk of respiratory symptoms, such as irritation of the airways, coughing, or difficulty breathing; decreased lung function; aggravated asthma; onset of chronic bronchitis; irregular heartbeat; nonfatal heart attacks; and premature death in people with heart or lung disease. A new study published in the scientific journal, Climatic Change, estimates the true social costs of air pollution that aren’t accounted for in the cost of fossil fuels and other pollutants. Social costs include the health impacts of air pollution as well as impacts from climate change. The study found that sulfur dioxide costs $42,000 per tonne, and nitrous oxides cost $67,000 per tonne. Sources:


4. SITE SUITABILITY: The Woodfibre site is not a safe location for a hazardous LNG facility
On February 15th, 2015, a 3.4 magnitude earthquake hit Vancouver’s coast that was felt throughout Howe Sound. The Woodfibre LNG proposal is located within this zone of moderate to high earthquake risk, on two known thrust faults. The Woodfibre site also has a history of slope failure. In 1955 a wharf and three warehouses collapsed into Howe Sound at the Woodfibre site, causing $500,000 – $750,000 in damages (Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4). A recent, but unreleased, geotechnical study by Knight Piesold identifies that approximately 46% of the study area was mapped as having rapid mass movement. This means landslides and slope slumping...including existing natural landslide hazards as well as terrain where construction activity may increase landslide initiation. Why hasn't the geotechnical study by Knight Piesold been released?

Sources:


Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4

B.C. Ministry of Energy and Mines

5. ECONOMY: The requested socio-economic study has not been provided

During construction, only 4.3% of jobs (=38.5 out of 895) will be for locals living in the Squamish/Whistler corridor (See Table 6.2-8 of the Labour Market section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Why are there so few jobs predicted to be filled by workers in the Squamish/SLRD area? The EA application is also very unclear about how many of the 100 full-time jobs will be filled by residents of Howe Sound once the LNG terminal is operational. What are the benefits to Squamish? What are the costs? There is still no clarity around how much in municipal taxes will be paid to the District of Squamish. How will this project impact existing small businesses and existing industries in Howe Sound?

6. CLIMATE CHANGE: 142 thousand tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions is unacceptable

Woodfibre LNG is now estimating greenhouse gas emissions to be 142 thousand tonnes of CO2 equivalent every year. These annual emissions of CO2 equivalent from Woodfibre LNG is equal to adding over 18,000 cars to the highway, driving to Vancouver and back, every day. This is more than six times greater than current highway traffic. It is irresponsible to approve this kind of polluting industry at a time when we need to transition away from fossil fuels to mitigate the risks associated with climate change, and to reduce the economic and health impacts of air pollution in general.

7. GOVERNMENT REGULATION: Inability of government to monitor, enforce, and respond to issues

There are no regulations adopted to regulate this LNG industry from a technical standpoint. Any of the current standards are not applicable to the LNG industry. Do the regulators have the knowledge and the expertise and the capacity to oversee this industry or will they be relying on the proponent to monitor themselves and report to the regulator? Self-monitoring industries have created several examples of accidents with resulting environmental destruction in recent years, including the Lac Megantic rail disaster and the Mt Polley tailing pond spill.

8. ENVIRONMENT: Removal of water from Mill Creek unsustainable for fish life

Woodfibre LNG has secured the water license to extract water from Mill Creek, which flows through the Woodfibre site. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans has objected to this because the amount of water that WLNG is proposing to
remove will reduce water levels in Mill Creek to levels that will no longer support fish life, especially in the summer months. Woodfibre LNG needs to source water for this project from somewhere else to protect this important stream habitat which is home to several native fish species.

9. ENVIRONMENT: Missing baseline studies

The following baseline studies are either missing or are inadequate as they do not conform to any recognized scientific standards: fish, birds, marine mammals, air quality, shipping, water quality, marine sound, and atmospheric sound, marine life near the Woodfibre site, and the cumulative impact assessment. Proper studies need to be completed before any decisions can be made regarding this project.

10. VIEWSCAPES: BC Hydro clearcut of two 64 metre swaths of forest at the Woodfibre site will impact viewscapes from the Sea to Sky highway and the gondola

BC Hydro is proposing to clearcut two 64 metre swaths of forest at the Woodfibre site which will create visible scars in the Howe Sound viewscape which will be very visible from the highway and the gondola. This information was only made available during the recent BC Hydro open house held on 19th March, near the end of the public comment period. This information is not included in the cumulative impact assessment of the Woodfibre application and it should be. This late release of information pertinent to this project and the timing of the BC Hydro open houses is unsatisfactory.

11. ENVIRONMENT: 9000 year old glass sponge reefs endangered by tanker traffic

LNG tankers do not have enough clearance to get over the 9000 year old reef if they go off course. These 9000 year old glass sponge reefs have been called "Living Fossils" by National Geographic as until recently this species was thought to have gone extinct over 60 million years ago. MLA Jordan Sturdy recently made a statement in the House about the importance of this discovery in Halkett Bay near Gambier Island, and to support the proposal to expand the Provincial Park Protected Area to ensure these reefs are protected.

Sources:
http://jordansturdymla.ca/bcltv_videos/mla‐sturdy‐halkett‐bays‐glass‐sponges/

12. ENVIRONMENT: Will there be smog? Will there be a smell?

Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2‐14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application).

Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2) is a reddish-brown gas with a pungent, irritating odour. It absorbs light and leads to the yellow-brown "smog" pollution haze seen hanging over cities. It is known to irritate the lungs and increase susceptibility to respiratory infections. In combination with either ozone (O3) or sulphur dioxide (SO2), nitrogen dioxide may cause injury at even lower concentration levels.

Sulphur Dioxide (SO2) is a toxic gas with a pungent, irritating, and rotten smell. Current scientific evidence links short-term exposures to SO2, ranging from 5 minutes to 24 hours, with an array of adverse respiratory effects including bronchoconstriction and increased asthma symptoms. These effects are particularly important for asthmatics at
elevated ventilation rates (e.g., while exercising or playing). Studies also show a connection between short-term exposure and increased visits to emergency departments and hospital admissions for respiratory illnesses, particularly in at-risk populations including children, the elderly, and asthmatics. The addition of these air pollutants in Howe Sound is of particular concern as recent research by MSc student Annie Seagram (studying under Professor Douw Steyn, Department of Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Sciences at the University of British Columbia) has shown that the Howe Sound airshed and Lower Fraser Valley airshed are connected. Emissions from Woodfibre LNG will add to the pollution in Howe Sound, exacerbating the existing air quality conditions, particularly in the Squamish-Brackendale corridor.

Note that Metro Vancouver annually issues several Air Quality Advisories due to high concentrations of ground-level ozone. This pollution also impacts the Howe Sound and Squamish, and exposure to these pollutants are of particular concern for infants, the elderly, and is directly linked to health issues such as lung or heart disease and asthma.

In addition: the BC government needs to ensure the protection of the 9000 year old glass sponge reef at Halkett Bay off Gambier Island.

About Glass Sponge Reefs: http://www.eao.gov.bc.ca/pcp/forms/Woodfibre_LNG_form.html

Glass Sponge Reefs in Halkett Bay off of Gambier Island

MLA Jordan Sturdy spoke in Legislature about the glass sponge reef at Halkett Bay off Gambier Island.
http://jordansturdymla.ca/bcltv_videos/mla-sturdy-halkett-bays-glass-sponges/

Tankers do not have enough clearance to get over the 9000 year old reef if any off course action happens.

Transport Canada Dangerous Goods Dept. is not at all ready for LNG. In fact they now have a task force for rail and road.

I have been a member of 2 Stakeholder Teams focused on the protection and restoration of salmon habitat. I include information and links for your convenience and ask that a similar project be implemented for the WLNG and Fortis BC applications.

2005 SALMON RECOVERY PLAN
Entire Salmon Life Cycle
$250,000 Pacific Salmon Foundation

$2 million
5 year plan
Cheakamus Salmon Recovery
Squamish Nation and Stakeholders

CERT C
The Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Technical Committee (CERTC) website, provides information on Cheakamus ecosystem restoration activities.

CERTC was formed in August 2005 in response to a train derailment and subsequent spill of sodium hydroxide into the Cheakamus River. CERTC's mandate is to understand ecosystem-level impacts and develop restoration and monitoring strategies for affected species to accelerate the return of the Cheakamus ecosystem to a pre-spill state as quickly as reasonably possible. CERTC Terms of Reference (pdf).

CERTC recommends programs for implementation to the Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Steering Committee based on input from experienced professionals, external specialists, interested parties and the public.

Both committees include representatives of:

- CN
- District of Squamish
- Fisheries and Oceans Canada
- BC Ministry of Environment
- Squamish Nation

Thank you for your interest in Cheakamus ecosystem restoration.

Comments can be made to CERTC at comments@certc.ca

Fish Assessment

Following the spill, B.C. Ministry of Environment (MoE) fisheries biologists, technicians and contracted staff documented fish survival and compared fish density information to available previous data.

Fish mortalities were collected from the Cheakamus River downstream of the spill, with activities including:

- Recording mortalities by species and location;
- Collecting length data to determine age classes of impacted fish;
- Collecting scale samples to further supplement brood year identification; and,
- freezing and storing of samples for further examination, if required.

Fish Impact Assessment (MoE and DFO) (pdf)
MoE Estimated Impacts on Salmon and Trout Populations:

Chinook
- 25% of juveniles from 2004 spawning population
- 50% of 2005 spawning population

Chum
- juveniles not affected
- 2005 spawning population not affected

Coho
- 50% of juveniles from 2004 spawners
- 2005 spawning population not affected

Pink
- juveniles not affected
- between 3 - 10% of 2005 spawning population

Steelhead
- 90% of mainstem juveniles from 2003 to 2005 spawners
- 2006 and 2007 steelhead spawning populations not affected

Estimated Impacts on Other Fish
Ninety percent of resident fish in the mainstem Cheakamus River may have been affected by the spill including:

Dolly Varden/Bull Trout
Rainbow Trout
Lamprey (2 species)
Sculpins (bullheads - 2 species)
Sticklebacks

Juveniles rearing in tributary streams at the time of the spill were not affected.

Benthos Recovery Presentation - Triton Environmental, 2008 (pdf). New!
Appendices (pdf) New!

Ecological Assessment

A screening level qualitative assessment of ecological effects has been conducted for CN to understand the potential effect the spill could have had on receptors other than fish in order to identify and target the need for ecosystem restoration activities.

Given the broad scope of the project and the limited amount of available data (i.e., exposure data, such as concentration of NaOH in environmental media, NaOH ecotoxicity toward specific species) it is not possible to conduct a comprehensive ecological risk assessment for each species present in the ecosystem. The screening level assessment focused on the functions of populations and communities within the ecosystem. This recognizes populations are less sensitive than their most sensitive individual member and some effects may be observed at the population level without impairing the functions of the ecosystem as a whole.

Qualitative methods using subjective ecological effects ranking categories, such as high, medium and low, were used to describe the likelihood of adverse effects rather than providing a numerical estimate of effects. To minimize subjective influence, the interpretation of ecological effects contain a clear explanation of the lines of evidence leading to the conclusions, including a description of the uncertainties and assumptions used. Additionally, matrices were used to provide a structured framework for the characterization of ecological effects. The assessment used existing information from baseline and monitoring reports and from previous scientific literature.

This screening level assessment of ecological effects consists of three main steps: problem formulation, analysis and characterization of the likelihood of adverse ecological effects. Results from the ecological effects assessment will be used to determine the direction of future recovery efforts for other components of the Cheakamus River ecosystem.

For more details, view the
Ecological Final Report (pdf) New!
Amphibian Assessment – October 2007 (pdf) New!
Water Quality

River Sampling

Water quality professionals tested and monitored the following:
Water quality in the Cheakamus and Squamish Rivers, August 5 - 8, 2005
Water quality in the Cheakamus during site remediation activities, August 10 - 26, 2005
Water quality in the Cheakamus after rainfall events, August 17 - October 28, 2005
Monitoring was conducted over a variety of meteorological conditions and river levels. The parameters monitored included: pH and conductivity, sodium, total dissolved and total suspended solids, total and dissolved organic carbon.

Results

The Cheakamus River was cleared for recreation after 24 hours by Vancouver Coastal Health on August 6, 2005. Water quality downstream of the derailment site was determined to be similar to that upstream.

Well Sampling

Forty-eight wells within 100 metres of the Cheakamus River were sampled on August 6 and 7, 2005. The parameters monitored included pH and conductivity, sodium, total dissolved and total suspended solids.
The sampling was coordinated by Environment Canada, Vancouver Coastal Health Authority, Triton Environmental Consultants Ltd., and Quantum Environmental Services.
Drinking water from wells was cleared for drinking by the Vancouver Coastal Health Authority after 48 hours on August 8, 2005.
No additional detailed water quality sampling is required.

CERT C Stakeholder Team
The Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Stakeholder Team (Stakeholder Team), established by CERTC, is a public advisory group comprised of representatives from interested organizations and individuals with local knowledge of and experience with the Cheakamus River.

Meeting Notes

September 30, 2010 (pdf) New!
June 24, 2010 (pdf)
March 25, 2010 (pdf)
October 29, 2009 (pdf)
June 17, 2009 (pdf)
March 5, 2009 (pdf)
November 27, 2008 (pdf)
September 25, 2008 (pdf)
May 27, 2008 (pdf)
March 27, 2008 (pdf)
January 24, 2008 (pdf)
December 6th, 2007 (pdf)
September 27, 2007 (pdf)
June 21st, 2007 (pdf)
April 25th, 2007 (pdf)
February 28th, 2007 (pdf)
December 6th, 2006 (pdf)
July 6th, 2006 (pdf)
May 25th, 2006 (pdf)
April 27, 2006 (pdf)
March 25, 2006 (pdf)

Presentations

Overview of the Cheakamus River Large Woody Debris Stream bank Protection and fish habitat development project, June 2011 (pdf) New!
Update on Cheakamus River recovery strategies and monitoring programs, March 2009 (pdf) New!
Update on Cheakamus River recovery strategies and monitoring programs, January 2012 (pdf) New!
Cheakamus River Sculpin Recovery Presentation to CERST - Fall 2010 (pdf)
Adult Wild-and Hatchery-Origin Steelhead Returns to the Cheakamus River in 2009(pdf)
Cheakamus River Bull Trout Radiotelemetry and Enumeration Program, 2007-2009(pdf)
Cheakamus River Side Channel Re-watering Projects, March 2010 (pdf)

Role

The Stakeholder Team provides input into the development and implementation of monitoring and restoration programs for the Cheakamus ecosystem.

The Team helps coordinate and communicate comments and recommendations from interested parties to CERTC, and also receives updates on CERTC activities, as the information becomes available. All input from the Stakeholder Team is considered advisory in nature and final decisions regarding monitoring and restoration programs rests with CERTC and the Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Steering Committee.

Stakeholder Team Terms of Reference

CERTC Communication to the Stakeholder Team

CERTC Responses to Dec 6 2006 Stakeholder Team Questions (pdf)
http://certc.ca/public_events.shtml Events and Brochures.
http://certc.ca/monitoring_programs.shtml
http://certc.ca/recovery_plan.shtml to 2012

SQUAMISH ESTUARY MANAGEMENT PLAN

[PDF]Skwelwil'em Squamish Estuary Wildlife Management Plan


PDF]View the 1999 Squamish Estuary Management Plan


REPORT OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE ON THE PROPOSED
SQUAMISH ESTUARY MANAGEMENT PLAN

Volume One and TWO THE PLAN  September 1982

Volume TWO Pages 211 to 233 re: PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT WORK GROUP
REVIEWS OF SEMP DRAFT 1982

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT WORK GROUP MEMBERS
Squamish Estuary Nature Centre ad hoc Committee
Squamish Council
1999
SEMP

https://squamish.civicweb.net/document/10318/Feb%201,201999

Page 19 Signatures to 1999 SEMP


1982 TO 1992
SEMP!


Howe Sound has also been improved because the Fraser Basin Council has successfully restored the waters at Britannia Beach on Howe Sound BC.
http://www.fraserbasin.bc.ca/about_britannia.html

Clean up after industry pollutes is never complete and restoration actually takes centuries.

The economy here in Howe Sound no longer depends on big polluting industry. What is evolving is self-employment in businesses that depend on "the scenery". Like the film industry. Also tourist activities because HOWE SOUND NOW HAS WHALES! DOLPHINS! HERRING!

Eagles and salmon have always drawn the public to the wilds of Howe Sound. People stay to live in a healthy environment and to co-exist with nature. There are economic benefits to all aspects from the sea, keeping the wild fishing industry to the sky where Whistler/Blackcomb are world class ski resorts with a growing population in what was once a village. Our proximity to Vancouver BC, also a source of employment, allows those who live in the Howe Sound area to park the car and enjoy recreating without it when not commuting to work elsewhere.

The LNG Project needs to be assessed as a having a negative impact on a recovering Howe Sound.
Many have written who have been able to study and report on the negative impact of the WLNG project, the Fortis BC
pipeline and the gigantic tankers.

For me this is a forced endeavor. I feel quite intimidated by the fact that the WLNG company can afford $250 million dollar fines for environmental atrocities elsewhere.

It brings to mind that Woodfibre had 600 pollution violations that could have been charged against the owners and the government would not allow that to happen in 1983.

When in 2005 Woodfibre was closed, there was a statement from the government that the Woodfibre site would never again be used for industry. The re-zoning never took place and now this is a legal application with deadly consequences. Global warming could have been avoided had alternative energies been used these last 40 plus years.

I have lived here since 1977 and I have enjoyed the transition to a Howe Sound that is recovering. Those moving to Squamish now, afford to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars to buy a small accommodation here. This isn't so as to return to dirty industry and the putrid polluted smell of money when industry has an "accident".

Sincerely

XXXXXXX

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Council needs to lobby that this project is developed as a best-in-class facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>We value clean air. We value biodiversity in the Howe Sound. We need nature to be healthy for its animals...including humans...and the plants to survive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I strongly feel that we should be focusing on new green technology and not using fossil fuels, fracking for example which we know hardly anything about. The time has come to put a stop to money coming before the earth and our lifestyle. Look at what just happened in France this week: all new buildings need to have either solar panels or green roofs. These are the types of steps that need to be taken regularly, instead of allowing massive non-Canadian companies to profit from our resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I also feel this is contrary to the recent direction Squamish has taken. How does this impact the gondola or the oceanfront?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yes China, India and other countries, including ours, are using coal. Yes, gas burning is cleaner than coal. Yes, the whole world is wanting to adopt even cleaner energies. YES!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>This is the number one issue for humans for the next century. We need to actively do something to discourage climate change and increasing our emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>None of these points reflect my concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The proposed benefits of this project do not outweigh the priceless value of doing everything we can to protect and preserve our wildlife and environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I am totally against fracking and I don't want Squamish to play a role in supporting fracking by hosting an LNG plant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>We need to think about Howe Sound as a whole system. We know so little about it. We need to learn more, but not in the way of &quot;we're monitoring the LNG project and oh look its having a negative impact compared to &quot;baseline&quot;. How is that helpful?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>That no matter how anyone tells us it's safe it's not. That we must stand up and find the right fit for that industrial site that doesn't include such unknowns and from what we do know from science, place risks on the environment we call</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I strongly oppose expanded fracking and gas extraction activities. We would do better to moderate our use of natural gas, using it domestically as a transition fuel, while developing renewable energy sources (instead of extracting it as fast as we can, using huge amounts of energy to compress it and ship it overseas). Environmental impacts of all proposed Howe Sound developments definitely need to be considered.

Stand up, as municipal council members you are the elected voice of the people of Squamish!! Be the little town that "CAN AND DID", take the leap and lead us. The systemic flaws in our current society need to be changed by those in power, give us a voice!!

I am also extremely concerned about
- the need for baseline studies of our water, air, and land so that we know what, if anything, is changing over the lifetime of the operation.
- the cumulative impact of all development projects planned for Howe Sound.

The following baseline studies are either missing or are inadequate as they do not conform to any recognized scientific standards: fish, birds, marine mammals, air quality, shipping, water quality, marine sound, and atmospheric sound, marine life near the Woodfibre site, and the cumulative impact assessment. Proper studies need to be completed before any decisions can be made regarding this project.

The inclusion of the following misleading, false statements in the above question angers and frustrates me:
- The proposed LNG project would be one of the cleanest LNG facilities in the world.
- Natural gas is the cleanest burning fossil fuel and is used in many places to reduce emissions by replacing dirtier fuels.
- The proposed natural gas pipeline cannot be re-purposed for oil.

We need to lower our green house gas emissions!

Clean air clean water and abundant sea life is what I value.
Not financial gain for the short term
Always go back to when you were a child and recall what you valued
I want my kids to have healthy lives with a few animals left and fresh water
Why destroy the 9000 year old glass sponges that have returned to our waters.

LNG will destroy and hope of regenerating fragile ecosystems. Once the vulnerable ecosystem is destroyed it will be hard to get it back. So let's protect what we have please

The proposed tanker route violates international safety standards for distances from inhabited areas – how can this project even be considered in such a narrow inlet where it is impossible to maintain the 1 mile safety zone on each side of the ships? As we know, tankers collide with reefs and rocks – it’s only a matter of time before it would happen here.

Yes, we must consider the other projects - the incineration plant being of major concern - combine the air quality impacts of both projects - what will that mean for the health of Squamish, which is directly downwind of these?

I don't believe that the pipeline cannot be repurposed - it happens regularly - there is nothing stopping them doing it here. The pipeline is much larger than needed for the estimated 3-4 tankers per month - what plans do they have to scale
1. The idea of creating thousands of fracking wells in Northern British Columbia is bad business as well as bad environmental practices. We have no guarantee that China will stop using coal. We have no definitive information that coal is worse than all of the effects of fracking. We must think globally and we must think about global warming. If this project goes ahead it will most definitely cause numerous devastating consequences with the possibility of catastrophic events. We have no guarantee that China will produce less GHGs. We also have no assurance that the LNG will sell. What if China decides to pull back with Canada and rely entirely on other suppliers? What if the future price of LNG is unprofitable? In North Bay Ontario TransCanada is now applying to push through bitumen in a NG pipeline. We have no absolute assurances that this will not happen here and then we will have oil spill concerns.

2. We owe it to future generations. We need to bite the bullet role up our sleeves and stand up for our environment. What could be more important than clean air, clean water and a healthy environment? Please help us protect our children, please honour why so many people have moved to Howe Sound. After the mill closed I doubt anyone moved to the region to find a job in heavy industry. People moved here because they believed Squamish is a great and healthy place to raise children, the best place to recreate and one of the most beautiful places in the world. Why would we risk this. I know so many families who will move away if WLNG will happen.

3. I do not trust the owner from his past history

4. many people have moved to Howe Sound. After the mill closed I doubt anyone moved to the region to find a job in heavy industry. People moved here because they believed Squamish is a great and healthy place to raise children, the best place to recreate and one of the most beautiful places in the world. Why would we risk this. I know so many families who will move away if WLNG will happen.

5. Project just wrong..should not go ahead

6. Woodfibre is overdue for revitalization and LNG should do that safely

7. I do not want to breathe polluted air or be on polluted water. I want to gaze over the beauty of Howe Sound from the gondola. The beauty of the area has attracted many residents and tourists.

8. Fracking should have no bearing on this discussion. WLNG discussion is about where the gas is shipped from, not where it is produced.

9. Unacceptable risks

10. I am not in favour of this project as it industrialized what is reverting slowly to a place that’s beautiful and liveable

11. Human impact on the environment is incremental. To some, this LNG project looks like a great opportunity for Squamish. In future years it could easily lead to projects of even greater impact.

12. We need to back off the extremely environmentally harmful practice of fracking.

---

** econ- Facts |**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>There is no financial upside to Squamish. However, we take on a huge responsibility for accidents and the inevitable cleanup when they go away. Woodfibre and Nexen have demonstrated that companies simply...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
abandon the area and leave the next person to come along and inherit the problem. There is nothing in
the plan to guarantee that the site will be restored to its current state (including the water life).

2. Investing in this projects just submits Squamish to more of the boom and bust cycling that come with
relying on repurchase extraction.

The Province keeps lowering what taxes they will have to pay.

What guarantee do we have that they pay 100% of spill clean up without lawsuits? Just take a look at the
cleanup efforts on the gulf.

What guarantee do we have that they hire true locals?

Has any analysis been done about the economic benefits and job numbers compared to investing in true
clean renewable energy? The studies show wind and solar and wave power are leading the way in job
numbers compared to fossil fuels. This project seems really short sighted.

3. Life is a balance. Cannot partake in a global economy cherry picking when what we want and what we
don't.

Risk vs reward.

4. As Council is in the middle of the budget process the lack of an industrial tax base should be becoming
obvious. If we do not make this development happen we are turning down several million dollars a year
in taxation revenue, and will remain a bedroom community with high house prices, high residential
taxation and little job opportunities for our kids.

5. We need industry not just tourism. I don't believe LNG is the right project for this area but relying solely
on tourism seems to be a flawed basis for an economy because it provides low wages and is subject to
dramatic highs and lows.

6. Comments regarding where people will live who work at a proposed site is akin to asking the school
district why all local teachers don't live in squamish. Squamish's job is to provide the opportunity for
single people, families, and retirees to live and play. Just as Squamish council is already doing, we need to
plan for growth. We already have a great place to live. I know of several people who live in Squamish and
work in Alberta. Wouldn't it be great to provide more jobs locally so they didn't have to commute and the
dollars stayed in Squamish?

7. I would like to know what direct impact the Squamish council has on this project coming to squamish if
any and I think they should disclose what this is. I don't think they factor in what all community members
want.

8. The small number of jobs and tax are not worth the many negative effects.

9. Are these jobs the type of jobs we want in this town going forward?

Do we really want to sacrifice the environment we live in for the sake of a few local jobs?

10. Who in the blazes wants to go whale watching or boating in the sound with fracking LNG tankers?

We are getting a tripiple 'A' brand image lets not f.. it up with fossil fuel imagery which will be passe soon.

11. Economically and from the standpoint of the major focus in Squamish on eco-tourism and clean industry
together with minimal benefit to Squamish residents regarding WLNG jobs, this project is not a good fit in
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Dies council real have this beast tamed and controlled? You better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The projects 'do not really fit' - thats bull ****. I've read all 98+ pages of the new brand document. No where in that document does it say we, as a community want to pollute our waters, put our city and people in harms way and provide only 100 jobs, that may not even go to residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Eco and regular Tourism will bring so much more money and benefits to our town than a dirty plant. Who wants to kite surf with tankers? Who wants to spend good money of the gondola to view tankers? Chances are, we are much better off economically advertising new, amazing cutting edge renewable energy and future self-sustainability, than to be associated with fracking and other environmental injustices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>We cant have both! .. Hardwired for Adventure ? or Hardwired for LNG ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I moved to Squamish in 2004 because I was told this town was moving away from heavy industry and towards recreation and tourism. I bought a home here. I am invested here. LNG takes Squamish backwards not forwards. I want to sell my house and move if lng goes through. How many other families feel the same?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>LNG will not benefit our tourism/natural environment focus...it's not the right fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>all jobs should be offered to locals first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>The project will no doubt have some economic benefit for the community, but no doubt it will have some negative effect (in terms of diminishing aesthetic and related tourism activity and livability for residents) but it's hard to say what the balance will be. I'd encourage Council to be very suspicious of any economic benefit information that the proponents provide as these figures tend to misrepresent net benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Tourism jobs are typically service jobs which require few qualifications and are not high paying positions. These jobs have limited career/growth potential. Competition among tourism destinations is high, particularly with our proximity to Whistler, Vancouver and Victoria. Woodfibre LNG will provide stable jobs with career potential that will pay qualified people reasonable living wages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>With clean, renewable energy available and marketable to many countries including ours, as well as many other platforms to boost the local economy (example : music festivals that bring in close to $40 million in 4 days) .. pillaging the only land we have for limited resources in this lifetime seems like a counter-productive way of survival.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Does this project really create long term jobs? If so how many? Compare that to luring more rec-tec companies and their employees that come here for the environment, trails, forests, climbing oceans and awesome living conditions. We need long term jobs, not temporary jobs. Companies want to move here, we need to make it easier for them to do so. Most of their employees already live here- so if they live here, play here and end up working here- then the community as a whole benefits because it means they spend their money here too. That's where the solution is for long term. As far as the oil prices and recent fluctuations go, I stand by my point of finding more sustainable ways for the future. Oil is not our future but it can be our demise. Also, even before Squamish’s new branding many were all seeing the place for what everyone see’s it as now- a recreation playgournd. I moved here for the mountains, trees, fresh air, bike trails, hiking trails,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lakes, rivers and estuary. I moved here because I love the clean, healthy environment and being outdoors—
and I know I am not the only one. This project puts all of that in jeopardy.

23. FACTS? There are none!!!! The only fact is that it's all a moving target.
For more information from outside the hyperbole heard around here go to:
http://www.ogi.com/webcasts/2015/03/global-lng.html

24. the tax base alone is desperately needed in Squamish.

25. My chief concern is that the District will realize far less direct property tax revenue than makes it worth
the effort to bring the plant here. It remains unclear to me exactly how many jobs will be created and
whether the majority of the employees will live in Squamish. The lower the taxes, the few the jobs and the
less of the employees who live in town diminish the reasoning for proceeding.

26. More people living in Squamish with good paying jobs spending more money within the community.
People who work in the city are more likely to shop there.

27. The concerns about industry and tourism not being compatible are in my mind overstated. Forestry and
tourism have coexisted for years. As a matter of fact many of the tourism opportunities we currently have
only exist because of forestry opening up the back country. Why can't this project and tourism activities
coexist.

Consider what cash strapped Squamish can do to advance our own environmental issues with the
enhanced tax revenue from this facility. We all want bike lanes, and more parks, and an ocean front park.
We need to upgrade our Waste Water Treatment plant which has a huge impact on our local
environment. We need more energy efficient municipal structures and an upgraded recreation centre.
None of these are things we can afford. Far more can be done for local environmental issues than we can
ever afford to do.

Many people only think of the direct jobs with the operation of this facility, but they completely forget
about all the indirect support and supply jobs that go along with it. When any plant is built they need local
electricians, welders, millwrights, plumbers, supply stores, fabricators to keep these facilities running.
These are all local people that are already working and living in our community and many of them are
now having to drive down to Vancouver or up to Whistler.

I see a huge opportunity for Squamish to become an incubator for complementary industries. Waste Heat
and CO2 are valuable commodities and can be put to a variety of uses. One example is the production of
biofuel produced using algae. This process requires heat and CO2 to produce algae that can be harvested
and processed to produce a biofuel similar to bio diesel.

Many other industries can make use of the heat and CO2 as well. Greenhouse agriculture, aeroponic grow
systems, aquaculture are just a few other industries that could be set up on the land not used by the plant
and put the waste products to good use and stimulate the local economy. Research into these production
systems in conjunction with our world class universities just down the road could put squamish on the
world map for innovation.

28. I think the employment created for local residents is not worth the losses that will occur in air, noise,
and water pollution, let alone the bigger ethical implications of doing business with a person such as the
WLNG proponent. Not to mention, the growing backlash to fracking everywhere as scientists are
sounding alarm bells.

29. How many homes would it take to generate the tax money that Woodfibre would generate? Jobs mean
people earn money and buy locally as well which mean taxes and employment. They may buy a home here and pay more tax to the District. A total win/win situation!

30. Good jobs most of which will be filled by Canadians. Temporary workers who might be used at the start of this plant will either become Canadians or will train Canadians. If Temporary Foreign Workers are used, it will be as the TFW program was meant to be used! Not like the use of the program by the Royal Bank or McDonalds, etc. This plant will provide direct and direct jobs and infuse money into the local economy with its procurement practices.

31. We need more local jobs that can support a family. This plant will provide direct and indirect jobs and much needed tax revenue.

32. We need the tax dollars and we'll paying jobs.

33. I don't feel the number of jobs this brings into our community long term is worth the risks we face with the LNG industry.

34. Squamish is a bedroom community, already housing is unaffordable for most new home owners.

35. Interesting that you should ask the respondents to separate between facts and feelings/values when your questions are so filled with assumptions and blind acceptance of government press releases. The reference to a $100 billion Prosperity Fund is very misleading as even the provincial government has acknowledged the uncertainty of it, in light of FIDs being delayed by the industry and the likelihood of the anticipated volume of LNG projects. Please see provincial budget announcement and the comments by the Finance Minister from last month for doubt on the facts in this election campaign press release. The reality is that the provincial government has PROJECTED numbers they have been unable to substantiate in any which way and have clearly adjusted their expectations in their budget projections. And that is fact!

The questions are also curiously focused on a juxtaposition of between LNG facility and tourism. Not one of the questions deals with the option of a diverse economy including appropriate industry but not LNG. The assumption in the question is that Squamish has a tourism focus, which would be news for many. Based on a number of research studies, entrepreneurs provide the biggest impact on local economies (OECD). Squamish's natural amenities, environment and location attract exceptional human capital looking for the lifestyle offering we have. This information is based on data. Our entrepreneurial culture, renewable resource industry such as forestry, knowledge-based industries such as education, technology and rec tech along with health all create the foundation to our economy currently. Those are also the sectors anticipated to grow in size (https://slrd.civicweb.net/document/37261/Employment%20Projections%20for%20the%20Squamish-Lillooet%20Regional%20District%20-%20Final.pdf?handle=5BEF3341FD7F47F38CF0E5D2003D65D7) and offer more employment and business opportunities in the future. The reality is that we simply don't have non-renewable resource industry in this town, why would we start that now at this juncture when all economic indicators point to reverse of that trend in the future?

Factually, the proposal submitted by WLNG to the EA process does not contain a proper socio-economic assessment, which was identified by both the Valued Component process and the District LNG committee as being critical. We do not know how this project will impact our existing economy and these impacts could fundamentally alter the community in all facets.

Squamish has a limited quantity of industrial land, in particular in locations where there are limited impacts to other commercial operations and/or residential areas. The employment density on WLNG site is very low with limited return value to the community. This reflects the capital intensive nature of resource-based industries and is not an appropriate use of this valuable industrial site. I understand the
District does not control the ownership but you do control the land use.

The economic future for LNG projects is dubious given the current spot price in Asian markets. The proponent is a privately held multinational with headquarters in Singapore. If the project proves a money loser in 5 or 10 years and is closed, what enforcement power would the District have in terms of site rehabilitation? What about loss opportunity costs? Many industry and financial analysts do not anticipate BC LNG industry to materialize given the high cost of product delivery from wellhead to end user. A glut of oversupply is expected even by the most optimistic of analysts. Although the proponent does not rely on spot price but rather long-term contracts, it looks more and more unlikely that the BC LNG facilities will be able to compete with Australia and US. I want to know the projected returns to the community over time versus costs, all impossible without a thorough socio-economic impact study. The District must insist that proper bonding is in place, the amounts are entirely too inadequate in case of major accidents or bankruptcy for instance.

36. I believe the jobs proposed by Woodfibre are very small compared to the opportunities in other industries including tourism and film. From my understanding there are potentially 100 jobs for locals. This is an extremely low number (can you imagine if only 100 people voted? Peter couldn't even light his toe nail on fire). The real issue for me however is that I don't feel these projects align with the brand and vision for Squamish. The New York Times didn't write about the forestry industry when they wrote about Squamish. The wrote about the environment, the opportunities for outdoor exploration. Not a pipeline or a tanker. As a small business owner and entrepreneur I see Squamish has a hub for start ups and IT. There are so many creative, talented and visionary people in town who are interested in bringing creative studios, software companies and rec tech to town.

37. In a town of around 17,000 people, the number of jobs touted by the proponents of LNG (if indeed that is what is created) does not balance fairly with the labour needs of the rest of the population.

38. This is critical: The proposed projects do not really fit with Squamish's new brand and tourism focus. The future economic success of Squamish must be based on tourism and this project will directly detract from that.

39. Most of the people potentially being employed at the facility may not be from Squamish, that being said though the people that will come to work at the plant most likely will be moving to Squamish, paying property taxes in Squamish and spending their paycheques in Squamish. When I look around our town there always seems to be another small business shutting its doors. One will also see many commercial buildings remain empty for quite some time. As a community we need to consider all options for tax revenue. If the LNG plant is going to be an absolute environmental disaster then no we shouldn't go for it. But if the environmental impact is low then we should consider looking into it.

40. Since the proponents of this project mention the economic benefit we could get, I want to point to that the property tax for Woodfibre is CAPPED at $2M. So we have to deal with the environmental impact without even getting much of the benefits. I mean why cap it, if the point of this is to make money for the district and British Columbians!

41. If the project goes bust due to poor economic conditions, does this put the DoS at financial risk? Taxes appear to be the only economic benefit we'll see (seems job counts were over estimated). If economics become unfavourable after a few years of operation, does DoS stop getting taxes? Will it have been worth the environmental trade offs?

42. We need a large tax-paying industrial partner in this town. How else are we really going to bring our property taxation rate down and upgrade our failing infrastructure? I am convinced that a number of elected officials are blindly ignoring this simple fact in order to appease a small radical element that live in some kind of utopian dream world where nothing matters but being able to hand feed deer on Cleveland Avenue. This isn't Portlandia. Please wake up and act as true leaders for this town by ensuring our future is financially sound.
43. As a former Senior Property Tax Analyst for Bell Canada I can assure you that the $2 million that WLNG has offered Squamish in property taxes may never actually be seen. As a property tax analyst representing industry it was my job to lobby municipal and provincial governments to reduce our property tax owing by decreasing mill rates for our industry. While we appealed all of our property taxes on an annual basis to the highest levels we could (meaning that both sides had to use legal counsel), we did not pay our property taxes. Yes, we would be accruing penalties and interest, but frankly we had deeper pockets and more lawyers than the municipalities and would win the majority of our appeals meaning that we ended up paying very little in taxes, none of the penalties and interest while municipal governments would be on the hook for legal fees and the hit to their books from significant unpaid taxes over a 2 to 3 year span. We especially lobbied for lower tax rates as values of our assets decreased which we are currently seeing with the price of Natural Gas. With so many countries having jumped on the LNG band wagon and more supply than demand, this will be a trend that continues and WLNG will cry poverty and unfairness to BC Assessment regarding their annual assessments and demand that their mill rate and utility rates by decreased. I can pretty much guarantee this happening to Squamish. And frankly, $2 million in annual tax revenue is an absolute joke if you consider all of the tourism opportunities that will be missed if WLNG is built and from all of the people that may have moved here if we did not have the WLNG plant. I am also very concerned that the actual number of local jobs that will be available through WLNG will be less than 30 which again, is not enough of an impact for us to "sell the farm" for.

44. everyone begging for money from the "district" that the tax payers have to put out. **** you, I pay enough taxes, and I don't benefit from them. industry= tax $= less I have to pay for handouts.

45. Both the tax benefits to support all of the communities wants and the wages/income taxes that will derive from this project.

46. I am interested in knowing how many jobs will actually be filled by Squamish residents long term. A short term boom is great if even those short term workers are staying and living here but if they are returning home to the lower mainland we will need see the benefits we have seen in the past. If this is the case it is not worth the possible negative impacts to our environment and current economic drivers such as tourism, water sports etc.

47. Tourism and recreation are the highest ecosystem service for Howe Sounds on per hectare basis (David Suzuki Foundation, 'Sound Investment' report Feb 2015)

48. Jobs, what jobs?? Most of the facility will be brought over by boat, people with an expertise in field will be hired (what no LNG experts Squamish??), and revised temporary worker agreement to bring in people from other countries.

49. Property taxes on Woodfibre site has been capped at $2 million per year. That means that this is all the money that Squamish municipality makes on the deal. Why should Squamish, with so much to gain in terms of population and healthy economic growth based on an environmentally focused population make this silly risk of allowing a harmful industry to inhabit Howe Sound shores?

50. My understanding is that both the LNG project and the Fortis pipeline expansion will bring significant new tax revenue to Squamish. In addition to the direct jobs and training opportunities associated with the LNG plant there will also be indirect job or work opportunities associated with service industry and marine businesses that would support any new major development located in the region.

51. BC needs Lng to reduce taxes. BC has huge taxes and revenue royalties from lng will help us all

52. Wish I could have chosen more than three items in this list. Basically Squamish has revitalized itself from the old days of the mill and the mine. This used to be the stinky town that you had to pass through on your way up the highway to somewhere nice. Now this place IS somewhere nice. Are we really going to piss that all away for a few (a VERY few!) temporary jobs? What about the jobs at the Sea-to-Sky gondola? At the spit? At the numerous shops that do a great business supplying outdoor gear to the tourists who come from all over the world to bike and ride and soar and hike and slackline and climb....?
53. This project would truly have both short and long term benefits. There is no true negative impact to any other sector in the economy, only upside.

54. Squamish tourism and LNG can work together. We don’t need to say no to one and yes to the other. It is important to recognize that Squamish needs high paying jobs and industry that provides tax base to help the infrastructure of the community. Industry can also provide the revenues needed to enhance the environment that provides jobs for tourism.

55. Economic - Canada already has one of the highest standards of living and quality of life compared to the vast majority of people in the world. When is it that we will have enough? When does having 'more', at the expense of the vulnerable, (people and the environment) become immoral? When is it unjust or greed?

I have read that, the profits from selling LNG will go to the company owned in Singapore. There will be no federal taxes and low provincial taxes (proposed) on net profits from LNG. They will not pay carbon tax because that only applies when the gas is burned in BC. The Municipal tax is only $2 million/year which is peanuts compared to the profit the owners are going to make. BC Hydro will actually loose money. Only “up to” 100 long-term jobs will be created. Fortis hasn't planned to hire anyone new for maintaining and operating the gas pipeline. BC Hydro will probably use only current staff for this work.

In the end a billionaire in Singapore will get richer at great expense to our quality of life and our future.

56. Only 3%? The $100 billion Prosperity Fund has evaporated and demonstrated itself to be the hopeful wet dream of a politician desperate to consolidate the old guard of resource extraction and export barons. We are at the cusp of becoming one of the most significant tourist destination in the world and that is truly sustainable since they come for the natural beauty and we are even considering putting a refinery right smack dab in the middle of this jewel???? Are we out of our minds?

57. Good paying jobs are needed in Squamish and at the end of the day LNG is better than piping bitumen in from Alberta...

58. The cost to clean up any of the leftover material left on the site would never recoup the cost of what was made from the LNG project in the first place. We’re still cleaning up the Britannia mind contamination site for the next hundred years or more according to the facilities manager at the Britannia Minesite which will cost the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars over the next hundred years

59. Squamish is no longer a resource exploitation community. Get with the program! If we preserve what we have, we can bring tourism here for the long term. LNG is a dead end in more ways than one.

60. The cost to to rehabilitate the area would take a enormous costs that may not be balance from any profit to be made from the project. Britannia mine will be cleaned up for the next hundred years or more according to the facilities manager. Any money that was made during the operation of the Britannia mine is now being outweighed by the cleanup costs that direct taxpayer is footing the bill.

61. Are the economics really there? Do the facts based on current and reasonable predictions on oil and gas prices, plus the options/likelihood for China to use nuclear power instead really make this project an economic sanity?

62. Squamish has been attracting a lot of young entrepreneurial people who value recreation to town. As these people move here we will see more business start up by these people and to service these people.

63. LNG does not fit in with the Green Rec-Tec Industry Squamish (and its residents) are longing for. LNG means going back to being a heavy industry town. But the town and its population has changed. People
here are about health, happiness, family and playing in nature, not heavy industry destroying Howe Sound.

64. Squamish is in desperate need of high paying jobs. The construction jobs may not 100% come from locals but they will be from people who will need to live and spend their money in Squamish while they work here. The permanent jobs will bring more people into Squamish that can actually afford to live here providing more money into our tax base. Having industry like this will allow our children to not only grow up in Squamish but be able to have a future here. They can go to school for trades and than get a job in this industry in the future. It’s truly a win win situation and it’s sad the council doesn’t see this.

65. Number of jobs created will not be sourced from local job prospects and Christy Clarke is not a trusted figure in BC the prosperity fund is a carrot be dangled in the public forum to gain support for unwanted environmental projects. LNG will not reduce our gas prices. Utter hogwash.

66. With a local economy solely based on tourism the taxpayers will be responsible for all costs. Small businesses already pay too much in taxation making it hard for any new business to set up in Squamish. When the economy slows, tourism is the first thing to go.

67. Geothermal energy could power all of Canada, according to a recent article in the Journal of Geophysics and Geoengineering. It is less costly to operate than LNG facilities, and provides 10 times the jobs that LNG does. Plummeting LNG prices need to be considered as well.

68. A great majority of the citizens of Squamish live here because of the surrounding natural environment. We have the opportunity to bloom with eco-tourism. The entire foundation of this community will be negated if this project goes through.

69. We need to bring industry back into this town, it was built on industry with logging and bc rail and the pulp mill. All of those are gone now and most people that want a career job have to commute to vancouver or farther to get a decent paying job. Having wood fibre LNG in squamish provides locals with a good job. I was born and raised in squamish, unfortunately there is no good work in this town and everything is so expensive it’s almost forcing me to move away. I don’t want too leave. This is my home. Sad to say but tourism isn’t paying my bills. My family didn’t come here for tourism they came for industry. In fact 90% of the people born and raised here want to leave cause the "tourism" this town has become is driving everyone crazy, we want industry/good jobs back in this town.

70. The fact is there are businesses closing all across town, about 30% of the population commutes for work, there are people on rotation, house prices are rising, rent is rising, tourism jobs bring in some of the lowest disposal incomes, the tourism industry is one of the lowest creators of spin-off jobs, tourism is completely dependent on other foreign people’s wallets, Squamish’s new brand is more exclusive than inclusive and more along social engineering than actually allowing the free market dictate growth. What is occurring here will eventually create a huge gap between higher earners and lower income people - the middle class will not be able to afford the taxes and the lower bracket people will live off the government hand outs and the higher earners will be the only ones able to successfully live without assistance … A long ways away from Squamish’s "Inclusive" brand.

71. BC has been plagued by unwise reliance on boom-bust models of industry for over 100 years. We had a choice in the 1950s to support a locally sustainable forest industry that would have kept us at the top of the heap in wood products manufacturing into the 21st Century. Instead our politicians married us to foreign capital, and designed a mass export business predicated on selling cheap semi-processed pulp and timber. This cost the province billions in the end, and delivered ownership of our resources into foreign hands, leaving many small communities in ruins. We should learn that selling off our resources at penny-fractions on the dollar is the worst way to proceed, and we should take a longer view of how to build the prosperity of our province by ensuring sustainability of the resources we currently rely upon. We have some of the richest resources in the world, and foreign capital is dying to control it, and wants us to sign onto more long-term contracts to ensure their access to cheap resources without commitments to ensure longterm employment or benefit. Any political economist recognizes this as a mistake, and we must avoid it if we want our children to have future in this province. The jobs promise is revealed as an
utter lie, and LNG continues to provide vague details, instead of clear promises.

We must realize that this project is a volatile boom-bust operation that will only profit as world oil prices allow. We have NO CONTROL over the success and sustainability of the industry, and are promising a cheap and easy first decade to the developers, without any regard for the future peaks and valleys, upon which foreign capital will abandon us when profits no longer return high enough returns to their out-of-country interests. It is long term economic suicide to tie our fortunes to things that we no control over whatsoever.

72. The jobs will be short lived and there is no guarantee that those employed will be from Squamish.

73. The perceived tax base is based on old figures from 20 years ago and new numbers would be more palitable at 5 million not 2million

74. We have had promises but do we really trust in these promises? I cannot see that we will gain an economic advantage to our town from this project. Now is a terrible time in the world of gas and oil to be putting out taxpayer dollars (government subsidies) to build an industry which is now very expensive to build and will not make any money unless the oil and gas price situation changes drastically. All the promises have been highly exaggerated. Not once in the report from the ITA to council did I read anything about establishing a training school in Squamish or our region. All of the talk-promises related to Northern BC. Why believe governments are trying to force this project on a region that it does not fit into. We are not a heavy industry town anymore.

75. short term or long term we need the jobs. Have any of the councillors tried looking for full time work lately? its home depot or nothing.

76. Consider the authority of Squamish in the process for the project and also consider leveraging the opportunity to bring additional contributions to the community (Brennan Park facility upgrades, Fire Hall Upgrades, etc.) Perhaps looking at it from the same side of the table compared to opposite ends.

77. JOBS. Don’t let the name fool you. The old labour intensive Pulp Mill employed an entire community of 750 residents; the new WFLNG Export terminal may only employ a handful of local residents. According to WFLNG’s Environmental Assessment Application, only 38.5 jobs out of 895 jobs will be for Squamish locals during the two-year construction period (Table 6.2-8). The remaining jobs are going to folks in Vancouver, other areas of BC or Canada, and overseas. While these jobs are temporary, the terminal and the effects it will have on Howe Sound will be permanent. For a community of almost 20,000 it isn’t worth the trade-off for 38.5 jobs for two years.

78. Where do you plan on getting any tax revenue other than what’s staring at you in the face.I have not heard one person on counsel speak of a long term plan involving tourism

79. Uncertain jobs for the future should not trump existing jobs that will last, tourism for example.

80. Thinking green is good but don’t let council run this town into the ground by thinking only green & not economically.

81. the tax base and spin off that come with projects

82. Tax money and jobs don't mean much in the big picture.

How much tax money was the district being paid by the woodfibre plant before the LNG purchase??

You can't really put a dollar value on health and the environment.
Say a worker is injured during the construction or operation of the facility. Most of those tax dollars would be eaten up just getting the injured person to a hospital.

I’ve seen areas in the US where fracking is going on. The biggest arguments there is that all the labour has come from Texas or Australia. The companies spend more money for security at their fracking sites than they spend in the communities.

83. We need the jobs. Pure and simple.

84. I started a business here. An organic farm. We contribute. I am also building a green home. It will employ local trades to build and house a new family. There are many many many entrepreneurial people like me in this town that are happy to carry a tax burden through the short term as new exciting tourism, green, electronic, and recreational industries set up shop in our town.

85. Many former workers from Woodfibre may be able to return to their former worksite. Woodfibre pays taxes now and may pay more if the project goes ahead. For every job created on site, there are many more jobs and benefits created off site.

86. Not sure what the 4th bullet point above means. I think we need to put much more emphasis on renewable energy. Maybe that’s what it’s about.

And I am very unsure re the financial benefits to Squamish re WF LNG. The jobs involved mostly have pretty high skill sets. And WF admitted, when questioned carefully, that they consider “local workers’ to include people who live in Vancouver! Tracy Saxby asked that q and it took 3 tries to get the answer.

The Squamish gondola hires the same number of people, for recreation based jobs, that WFLNG will hire! The Gondola promotes nature. WF will not.

87. We need to turn the page on oil and gas as economic engines.

88. We are seeing just how volatile the oil and gas industry are. The economics just aren’t adding up when you look at global natural gas reserves (especially in Russia) and the changes to Howe Sound in the past decade with a thriving booming population that is moving to this corridor to establish businesses, industry, and families that are far more environmentally linked. We cannot underestimate how a town’s population dynamic can change over night and if Squamish becomes an oil and gas based town this will definitely change the demographics of who will be moving to this town. Should we be compromising a hopeful future in high tech and clean industries for the uncertainty of the LNG industry? I think not!

89. It has been exaggerated the amount of jobs LNG will produce. Not worth the pollution it will create and the danger we will face everyday.

90. Look at the record of the owner of the company Petronas, and ask yourselves if you actual trust him to do anything he says he will. He has broken environmental rules with impunity, and he is known for not paying taxes. How is any of this good for Squamish? Most of the potential jobs will be given to TFWs.
91. That we employ locals and not foreign workers

92. Short term renters during construction phase lining pockets of landlords and little to no benefit to DOS. Loss of attractiveness of Squamish as a residential destination sees loss in potential community growth and decreased residential tax base potential.

93. This project will have obvious negative effects on tourism in the area.

94. First of all this is some of the most beautiful scenery in the world, why would anyone want to jeopardize it with any questionable industry. There are enough countries selling LNG in the world, we don't need to join up. It has been repeatedly stated that there will be 100 jobs. That's not very many in relation to the revenue they will be making. I don't believe Squamish will see any revenue from taxes on this as once again, Sukanto Tanoto is a crook and has been charged with tax evasion and fraud, so, why would anyone think his company will be paying it's fair share of taxes?

95. We do not really know how many jobs this will create for Squamish and the tax benefits seem uncertain at best. We are finding out the Microsoft project in Vancouver may not bring the desired and promised jobs to local Canadians as expected. Everything is promised but rarely are these promises delivered. The risks are extremely high both economically and environmentally. The global energy markets are also highly volatile and unstable. We can not predict with any accuracy what the global economy will do. What we do know is that you cannot have an economy predicated on infinite growth when we live on a finite planet. We are now up against resource limits, economic limits, population and ecological limits. Climate change is a fact. We should act like we accept that fact.

96. Yes, tax revenue is attractive; but at what cost? seems a shortsighted carrot on a string vs long term harm to health, environment, aesthetics of Squamish. Are the projected local job numbers accurate?

97. A) the money we get in tax revenue is peanuts B) whatever we gain coming in the front door will be lost out the back due to the incredible damage this project will do to our image and our brand C) the 'jobs' argument is a total whitewash. There will be very few overall jobs and EVERYONE knows this already.

98. We need to focus on tourism and renewable fuels as opposed to fossil fuels. They are a dying breed and if we are looking to the future we need to focus on the future and not the past.

99. We're already way behind the curve ball in terms of being ready to sell natural gas. Other countries are ready to go and we haven't even built the facilities. The prosperity fund? What a farce. Political jargon. They promise to reduce taxes and people think they can't afford to say no but what happens? Either they renge on their deal of cutting our taxes or they cut services such as schools, healthcare to pay for the tax cuts. Harpa and Clark have already promised huge tax breaks to the LNG sector. The tax payer is getting majorly ripped off. And what jobs? For how long? This is incredibly short sighted. The global push is to find alternative sources of energy. Fossil fuels are not an attractive option and have a limited life span. What about our economic future? Of course entered politicians don't care about long term futures. They just want to get elected. Let's hope council are more ethical than that!

100. Jobs in Squamish are very important considering the number of residents who commute to either Vancouver or Whistler daily. I would really like to see as many locals as possible afforded the opportunity to work at WLNG and would not like to see workers brought in from elsewhere unless the skill set required cannot be found in Squamish. A training centre in Squamish would benefit residents as well as WLNG. The initial construction jobs would also benefit the town.

Squamish is in desperate need of industry and the taxes which would be collected. A town cannot live on
tourism alone. We have failing infrastructure and at present, the only way to pay for it is with increased taxes. It is very idealist to think that we do not need industry in this town. The history is that of mills and forestry - of which we now have very little. People moving to Squamish expect high quality recreation facilities and the cost to replace and maintain is above the ability of the current tax base. This will not stop people from having these expectations. It is not possible to have things both ways - if you want to be able to maintain your infrastructure and have good recreation facilities, trails and roads you have to be able to pay for them.

101. **The potential costs far outweigh any benefits.**

102. **The benefits of these jobs do not stack up to the health of the environment.** People can always go elsewhere for work, not ideal but it is possible. Where are we all going to go when we’ve destroyed our environment?

103. **Tourism seems to be an ever growing business opportunity in Squamish.** Is there any revenue tracking system in place for this industry? It may actually be more beneficial and profitable long-term industry that could provide more jobs in Squamish. LNG could jeopardize this new industry. Is it worth the risk to have the facility operating for the short term and there is a market shift away from LNG?

104. **Our brand is much more than Tourism.** It targets Tourists, but that is not the same as being an (exclusively) tourism economy. Our brand does not determine who we are as a town, it reflects and communicates who we are. Squamish is appealing to those looking for something natural and authentic. It appeals to innovators and risk-takers. It is attracting entrepreneurs looking to start businesses locally and serve the world from Squamish with progressive products and services. They see Squamish’s values reflected in their own. A big push into an antiquated fossil-fuel industry does not align well with the value of many of these well-educated, well-paid people looking to invest in Squamish. How many of them will we turn away for a handful of jobs that other less-impactful industry could provide?

Both EA documents are really insufficient in terms of socio-economic impacts of these project. Both WLNG and Fortis have demonstrated they didn’t understand our community before bringing the proposals forward, so I don’t think they can evaluate whether they are a good socio-economic fit for Squamish. Many have raised concerns and questions about the broader, longer term impacts of this project on other growth (rec-tec, education, tourism etc). Are we going to lose more than gain with this? Will it scare away entrepreneurs? Will it impact tourism? Are there things we can/should/must do to mitigate against negative economic impacts to other sectors? We need some solid, 3rd party analysis on these topics.

105. **Our economy is being fueled by tourism more than anything now,** and this industry will have a very big negative effect as it is totally contrary to the reason people flood into this valley - to escape it in the first place.

106. **Unlike projects with questionable economics and a long-tail of future costs to the district,** like the Oceanfront, WLNG offers substantive tax revenue benefit with no real downside.

107. **Squamish is an outdoor paradise.** Who will come and watch tankers and flare and breathe the air with chlorine and dead fish smell?!

108. **The impact of FIPPA on this project.** Can Tanoto consider his Chinese identity and come in under FIPPA using all the foreign labour he wants and bypasses our laws?

109. **This will make the labour pool even less skilled in town for service jobs.** I own a cafe and there are countless ways this projects effects my business and my ability to hire locally.

110. **I think the economic benefits may be exaggerated,** and even if they are accurate do not provide nearly enough benefit to the local communities. **The economic benefit does not justify the risk to Squamish.**
future; it reputation will be severely degraded (clean mountain town...except for the LNG plant), eco tourism industry will be damaged, the Howe Sound marine life (including species that have not yet returned), could be severely impacted (do we know otherwise, whales and shipping do not mix), the project does not meet community values and resident’s vision for the area... why are we considering this?

111. The number of future local jobs is not clearly stated. There are no FACTS to consider in this category! There are only speculations and vague promises of a questionable integrity and value.

112. Squamish needs a larger commercial tax base so that it can begin to bring the business tax in line with the residential tax. A genuine concern is the high business tax in this community hindering new business starts and businesses moving into our community.

113. There are other profitable industries and businesses that are much more compatible with a sustainable environment and the outdoor lifestyle here than is Woodfibre LNG. There is relatively solid data to indicate that it is very likely that:

Countries such as Russia with its vast supplies and closer proximity to Asia will out-compete our LNG industry.

Our Canadian gas will be more expensive for Canadians than for this company.

The $2/$2.5 million tax revenue would be a giveaway compared to the costs that we would incur as a result of this industry (See on the net the many examples of almost irreversible harm done by this parent company.) Woodfibre LNG would be controlled by a very different set of ethics and operations than we use (see extensive coverage on the net). Even though Woodfibre’s public relations plays the fact down, this company is owned and controlled by a parent company who have paid hundreds of millions of dollars in fines for destruction of the environment, who are accustomed to suing those who oppose what they want and have bottomless pockets of money to do so. This would be the first LNG venture for Imelda Tanoto, Sukanto’s elder daughter. On the net you can read her own words that her goal is to increase her father’s empire.

Our clean water, rare in the world, essential to survival of life, may become our most valuable economic asset, more expensive than oil and gas. Will we have wasted and polluted our clean water by fracking?

114. I’d be willing to pay mor property taxes for a community owned windfarm in Howe sound.

115. As a northern Howe Sound marine tourism operator and long time Streamkeeper and Herring Recovery Project volunteer, I must say that this statement is UNTRUE: " Tourism (eco-tourism, whale watching, boating, water sports, etc.) and commercial fishing are important employment areas for Squamish that could be negatively impacted by these projects."

116. Then unknowns associated with the project, and the reality that Squamish will benefit little, and our environment and health will be impacted beyond measure.

117. During the last municipal election, it became apparent that there were already employees of the LNG facility that had moved into Squamish and were working on campaigns of some of the candidates. Just because you move here with the intent to occupy a position at WLNG, that does not make you a local and that distinction must be recognized.

118. No doubt, there may be short term financial benefits to Squamish. However, the industry and government would have us believe it is the environment versus prosperity; I do not buy this (besides, prosperity at what cost!). We could and should be developing alternative forms of energy which would create lots of jobs. Canada, one of the richest countries in the world, should be leading. Squamish is a good place to start.

119. The globe and mail April 2014 a quote taken:

It is late afternoon on Goodoon Street when two members of the “fluoro army” swagger into the middle of
the road and yell suggestively at a group of three women standing on the corner. “You got to see it first hand,” Anita Street sighs. She and her friends describe a boomtown that has become increasingly hostile to women as workers flooded in for LNG projects. The women said they no longer go to clubs or bars any more because they get grabbed, and even while shopping in grocery stores they are ogled, hit on and heckled. “I have a son and they still do it,” Ms. Street says.

Mr. McLeod, the real estate agent, describes an increase in drug use, drunken fights and public urination downtown. Rents on some properties doubled or tripled quickly, to the point where the town opened nearby showgrounds so locals driven out of the housing market could live in RVs. Firms responded by building new houses and apartments, which in turn led to an oversupply of housing, and prices have fallen.


This article indicates life near an LNG plant in Australia. The LNG plant bring increased policing costs, negative impact on community values, negative impact of transient job seekers here just for the money and the job and a lack of respect for the community. Increase cost of living, pressure on all community infrastructure, hospital wait times, school class sizes etc from an influx of new people and families in the community. Loss of tourism dollars coming to the community because Squamish would have nothing to offer left, sea life gone due to noise and pollution. Air quality reduced due to plant emissions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>120. Communities need economic activity to have a sustainable future. Businesses provide this activity. We need a mix of economic activity, and the project provides another type of industry. Large industrial investments in communities are rare. As such, we should be ensuring that the project proceeds - albeit with strong environmental protection measures, and minimizing negative impacts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>121. I assume bullet point 1 means the finances aren't looking good re any new LNG plants, with low LNG prices and lots of LNG plants around the world. Also we need growth of renewable energy, not more fossil fuel industry.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>122. This project is going to cost tax payers money. Maintaining the debris barrier, nt tax revenue until a profit is made, foreign workers for construction etc. we are mere pawns.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>123. Our community needs to have a master plan. Build on more than the recent tourism rebranding initiative that is falling short of implementation. While tourism is one of the drivers, we need to work with the natural gifts our environment is blessed with and create aligned economic models that build on health, well-being, recovery, strengthening and wellness. Outdoor recreation is merely a part of the potential portfolio. Building economic models that enhance and leverage with aligned industry clusters is what will provide sustainable, economic certainty in line with a harmoniously planned and executed master community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 124. It's a popular refrain that claims economic diversification is crucial for a community's viability. Although this would seem self-evident, and is no doubt ideal, there are various examples of exceptions to the rule. We need look no further than the mega-prosperous Whistler to realize that an economy heavily dependent on tourism can indeed thrive. Canmore ditto. I see little evidence of heavy industry in thriving towns like these. Growing up, I was subjected to the dogma that Squamish was the dirty industrial town "on the way to Whistler". NEVER did I imagine I'd have PROUDLY called it my home, let alone for 14 years, even less while holding high hopes of the community totally re-inventing itself as a example of sustainable economy based on "clean-living" recreation/rec-tech and light industry. Nonetheless, here I am. The proposed LNG project flies in the face of all Squamish's recent publicity, all of which touts our stunning setting, small-town homespun vibe and endless outdoor activity as synonymous with our appeal. The inevitable noise, pollution, unsightliness, damage to the environment from a project like LNG is at crushing odds with our new image. Granted, a tax base increase would be welcome, but this is
coming anyway. Patience while the slower growth of our tourism-heavy accrues would be richly rewarded, making us the envy of all. Nobody would be proud to label Squamish as an enthusiastic supporter the fossil fuel industry.

125. Most people that live here either do not work here. Many of those that work were recruited outside of the corridor. They are still valued members of the community. Like any industry you need to hire those that are qualified for the job if that means local, great. If that means outside of Squamish and they become members of the community, great.

126. I have first hand experience in implementing policies in contracts that ensure Aboriginal, local and diversity spend is guaranteed on projects. The opportunity for Council is to work to ensure there are S.M.A.R.T. goals for local spend included in any agreement, with enforceable penalties for falling short of the targets.

127. Tourism is Squamish's future. Clean, natural and beautiful viewscapes with recreational opportunities at every turn. Squamish will be thrown back in time and lose its potential as a world destination for sport and adventure. Who wants to come to a smelly industrial town that is polluted and ugly. Are the tax benefits (yet unknown) worth this?

128. I distrust government projections of vast economic benefits for Squamish. Big investors undeniably have the ability to provide large injections of short-term cash for infrastructure support, as well as well-paid jobs. In the longterm, however, I'm suspicious that soon after Premier Clark has basked in the short-term glory of "providing for" our community, her political life will end, the price garnered for this magical fluid will fall, few locals will have a job at the facility, much less any enduring interest (economically) in the project, and we'll be left with another industrial nightmare to clean up in the aftermath. Not growing our economy through smaller businesses, with vested interests in the local community, seems more like a reversion to past times, than anything terribly progressive or imaginative, much less sustainable.

129. I feel that many people would move away & house prices could fall. This project could kill the squamish boom & the magnetic alternative vibe we have in our community. People who choose to live in squamish put recreation first. Not jobs or tax dollars.

130. squamish is awesome and tourism is greatly increasing and as an ACMG rock and alpine guide i rely on people wanting to come to our town, LNG will change that NO LNG

131. Too risky! Not the eggs we want in our basket.

132. With Squamish's aging infrastructure, and less revenue to put into citizen's safety, we need to realize the monetary benefit to the town, over the long haul.

133. In 1980 we were sponsored by BCR to come to Squamish. My hubby was to work on engines. We fell in love with the community, the town and the scenery. There were jobs in Woodfibre, BCR and Weldwood! Good paying jobs, which meant people had disposable income and a nice lifestyle. Unfortunately things changed, as they do, and all the above business failed. Lots of unemployment, poor paying jobs, long commutes to Whistler or Vancouver. Our tax base was gone too. So after 30 years we too left Squamish, only to return 5 years later (we were homesick) and found a very yuppyified Cleveland Avenue. Now we have folks who have been living in the town for barely a year or two telling us what we should and shouldn't do. Who are these people. Don't they know that employment and tax revenue pays for the communities infrastructure, etc. Wouldn't they feel good knowing that because of employment our community is thriving!! Bring on the LNG plant, we need the jobs, we need the taxes,

134. I highly doubt that the current price for LNG will remain at its current level as other countries, Australia, China and Russia also get their NG reserves on line. The damage to the estuary and Howe sound will be done but we will not get the economic benefits being promised by the proponents.

We do need to diversify our economy and can not rely completely on tourism but this project will negatively impact the tourism as noted in the third bullet point. We need to seek other economic
diversity but not from the fossil fuel industries. We need to attract industries that are in line with our community values and branding.

135. This project is brilliant. Long term good for Squamish

136. Not enough evidence that there will be significant benefits from this plant and too many risks and adverse effects.

137. Again, I have a big issue with all of the statements of "benefits" as well as the wording of some of these "concerns."

1) It is not just about industry versus tourism. It is THIS industry versus every other small business and existing industries in Squamish.

2) REGARDING JOBS IN SQUAMISH

If you look at the Labour Market section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application, the jobs for Squamish locals have all but disappeared. During construction, only 4.3% of jobs will be for locals living in the Squamish/Whistler corridor (Table 6.2-8). The rest of the jobs are actually going to folks in Metro Vancouver, other areas of BC or Canada, and overseas. Deals have already been signed with foreign workers and foreign companies. Most of the construction is happening overseas.

Table 6.2-8 is difficult to understand, for while it looks like 4.3% of jobs for locals equals 77 full-time jobs, that number is the sum of jobs per year, over two years. So there are really only 38.5 jobs for Squamish locals each year during the two-year construction phase out of the 895 estimated jobs (page 6.2-24).

But what about once the plant is up and running? There are 100 full-time jobs up for grabs then right? Well, that’s also not clear. The application states that an estimated 70% of jobs will be filled within the Metro Vancouver/Sea-to-Sky corridor (page 6.2-28), but exactly how many of those jobs will be for Squamish locals isn’t specified. It’s also not clear whether the workers will live and work in Squamish, or just within the Metro Vancouver/Sea to Sky region. Woodfibre LNG has already located its head office in Vancouver rather than Squamish. It states that it will be bussing workers in from the Metro Vancouver area, which completely limits any other economic benefit.

More info: http://www.myseatosky.org/where_did_all_the_lng_jobs_go

3) REGARDING THE BILLION DOLLAR PROSPERITY FUND

This has all but disappeared.

LNG prices have plummeted 61.7% from a historic high of $20.20/MMBtu in February 2014, to the rock-bottom price of $6.80/MMBtu in February 2015.


This has made LNG exports from BC unable to compete with exports from the USA, Australia, or Russia. The only way LNG exports will be viable is for Christy Clark to slash the tax rates, which she’s already done, slashing the proposed LNG tax rates in half to Tier 1 tax rate of 1.5% and Tier 2 tax rate of 3.5%.
Proposed tax rates:

Adopted tax rates:

Also note that BC's royalties on LNG are not paid on units of gas but rather on the net-profits of the LNG producer/exporter. In other words, if there is no profit, BC will get zero royalty income. Norway, on the other hand, claims royalties by the unit of North Sea oil. It now has a trillion dollar heritage fund. Compare this to Alberta, which, like BC, claims a tax on the net-profits and its heritage fund is... empty! On top of that, add the subsidies and tax brakes offered by the Provincial and Federal government and the balance is pushed right into the red.

More info here:
http://www.bowenislandundercurrent.com/opinion/letters/letter-follow-the-money-considering-the-lng-question-1.1799399#sthash.5Mj3Hk2t.dpuf

The federal government has also given the LNG industry an accelerated depreciation write-off from 8% to 30%.

Our government is essentially giving our natural gas away for free, if not costing taxpayers money to do so!

Using this "Billion dollar Prosperity Fund" statement as part of the survey is a real concern to me as it is a false statement that you are promoting here.

4) DECREASING VIABILITY OF THE LNG INDUSTRY
See above.

5) TAX REVENUE FOR SQUAMISH
The amount of taxes the District has been collecting has nearly doubled from $12.3 million to $21.6 million SINCE THE PULP MILL SHUT DOWN! That’s an increase of $9.3 million, and that’s without the $2 million in tax revenue that we lost when the pulp mill shut down (Reference: http://www.cscd.gov.bc.ca/lgd/infra/statistics_index.htm accessed 16th February 2014). This increase is partially due to increased property values, contributions from new developments, contributions from new businesses, and slight increases in residential tax rates along with a slew of other factors.

We still don't know how much tax revenue Woodfibre LNG will be contributing as the Province may cap the tax rate, same as they’ve done for ports.

The requested socio-economic study still has not been provided. What about the LOSS of taxes that might result if property values are negatively impacted? Or the LOSS of taxes if businesses move away due to
increased air pollution and reduced quality of life if we have an LNG plant here? How will this NEGATIVELY impact our tax revenue? These are the questions we need answered.

6) THIS PROJECT DOES NOT FIT THE SQUAMISH BRAND

Absolutely. But note, that our focus is not just on tourism! It is on developing a vibrant, resilient community with good, high-paying jobs that will contribute to our collective wealth and well-being. Putting all our eggs in one basket, especially a boom and bust fossil fuel industry, does not make sense. This project also doesn't fit our OCP!

138. We need to provide financial opportunities for people living in squamish. People should not have to work elsewhere to provide for their families

139. The proposed LNG plant and it’s huge tankers will destroy the outdoor tourism in Squamish. Just as the marine life is returning after years of cleaning up the Sound after industrial pollution, it will be destroyed again. I don’t believe the jobs created from LNG would outweigh the jobs lost from the pollution both visual and in the air and water that would be generated from LNG.

140. We need some Industry.

141. The Squamish economy should have a main focus which I believe is the outddor sports and leisure: any future project should be assessed on that basis. Does it conflict? Yes or No. This one conflicts with the potential and real environmental damages. So NO to LNG.

142. The tax revenue is not enough to justify this project. We’ve all supported the hard work that squamish has done to develop a new brand. This brand will bring more diverse businesses and intelligent and conscientious people to our community. The pipeline and LNG plant will not.

143. When the labour pool is requested if the Squamish residence have the skills and experience they will get the jobs, if they do not have the skills then the jobs will go elsewhere, that is the way all businesses run. I would hate to see a labour force that has no skills build something this important.

144. Im concerned that foreign trade workers will be hired.

145. I believe that the Woodfibre LNG Project can and will show that both Tourism and LNG Industry can coexist. The location and visual distances will hardly be noticed after a while or upon proven nontoxic environmentally.

146. We need well paying local jobs - doesn’t matter that it’s not 400 - they are needed. Tax money in - low impact on infrastructure in terms of cost - hooray!

147. Jobs and economy are a priority.

148. We need employment for our citizens.

149. tourism will hire more people

150. Jobs was one of the big selling points of WLNG yet in their own EAO application, the number of Squamish jobs are negligible. If Squamish is to suffer the negatives of this plant, then we should reap the benefits. Local jobs should be a priority and we should discourage transients as this has very little long term value for Squamish.

It is already nearly impossible to find rentals and very expensive. WLNG would put a huge strain on the
local housing market and put housing out of reach of locals.

A high number of transient workers would increase crime. This has been experienced in places like Kitimat. It also results in a boom/bust cycle once construction is complete.

The DOS tax revenue proposed is the same that the original plant was paying 10 years ago and doesn't even take inflation into account. There is also no guarantee we would get the two million figure quoted. It may be even be less.

LNG prices are plummeting and downward pressure is set to continue as world supply increases. Provincial tax rates have halved and as the profit margins decrease and thus profit, it leaves very little in tax revenue. The tax arrangement both at the local and provincial level seems to heavily favour the proponent.

151. How many people in Squamish are there who are qualified for a long term career with LNG? Short term labour during construction may be hired from Squamish residents, but it's more likely that cheaper labour from elsewhere will be brought in, housed on-site and bring little to the economy of Squamish. Furthermore, how long is natural gas going to be a player in world economy? It doesn't look good right now, I think it's time to look elsewhere for energy sources.

152. They say in there proposal that Squamish will get 3.9 percent that is nothing in the realm of Jobs For B.C. That we keep hearing about?

153. Russia is providing LNG to China for rates that Canada could never entertain. The economics of the project do not make sense. LNG value is decreasing. It is unlikely to have a net benefit to British Columbia, let alone Squamish, particularly with the tax breaks being granted by the province, and the lack of clarity around the tax revenue to the DOS. People want jobs and believe this is a good opportunity for local jobs. I want to know if there will be even 10 percent of locals employed if this project went ahead. BC has signed on to a memorandum to provide temporary foreign workers. I don't think that jobs are going to be there for the locals.

154. Squamish needs industry

155. Woodfibre may be jobs and tax dollars, but at what expense. What expense to public health 10 years down the road with increased exposure to pollution. What expense to reduced tourism and tourism jobs?

156. The proposed economic benefits of LNG are all bull****! Ultimately we will a pay if this goes through and they're going to bully and try and milk is for everything. We have way better economic opportunities here and LNG can burn off like the blue angel I have pointed at Mr Tonatos face!

157. This project will bring both direct employment and indirect employment to Squamish as well as supporting local businesses and community groups. The tax revenue will be a relief to those of us who pay taxes. We have already have tankers plying the waters of Howe Sound, it is wide and deep enough for these ships navigate safely. While tourism and outdoor lifestyle do contribute to the wellbeing of Squamish it will never bring in the same $$ as industry

158. As mentioned above, Squamish is now thriving as an outdoor recreation based community. The majority of businesses, home owners and residents have based their entire lifestyle and livelihoods directly or indirectly around recreation and the unique outdoorsy lifestyle that Squamish offers. I have friends who work in the pipeline industry that are opposed to this project. They have told me that projects like these generally bring in people from outside the community. Which makes sense. If the project goes ahead, I certainly would rather have a highly trained individual from outside the community operating LNG than providing make work projects for unqualified local residents that may further endanger our safety and
Sure there will be locale short term benefits to the construction of LNG, but how much with the BC government signed deals for labor from China and India? As for long term it is minimal jobs most lower paying. Investment in technology and renewables is what Squamish should support.
160. It is obviously desirable for the Province and DoS to get revenue from large-scale projects and this is really the only significant benefit. The number of permanent jobs will be actually be few and small in comparison to the overall workforce in Squamish. By now probably 75% of our local workforce commute to work. This is thousands of commuters compared to the mere dozens of potential long-term jobs, and current residents will not likely get many of these jobs.

161. I hear a lot of promises: tax base, local jobs, economic benefits - but I have yet to see anything real or substantial. The reality is that any jobs will go to Asian workers off-shore on the rig or to immigrant workers (we have seen this track record elsewhere in BC so I don’t know why we can expect anything different).

The economy of oil and gas is volatile (as is reflected in our current markets) and we just are not seeing a huge market for natural gas right now and this will definitely affect the economy around LNG.

We are seeing every week the Federal Government and local governments giving tax incentives to big oil and gas companies as can be seen by some of the promises being made to the WLNG - how will this lead to a good tax base for Squamish? We should be seeking industries that can actually pay the municipality the taxation reflected for development at that site (i.e. $2 million) and not a penny less.

In the past, Western Forest Products contributed to the economy of Squamish through numerous jobs and employment opportunities. The same just cannot be said for the WLNG and DOS council needs to consider if this is the best use of the land base for the communities economic welfare.

162. Wikipedia lists 180 ghost towns in BC. EVERY single one of these towns were resource-based. Of those 180 towns, 7 still exist as business viable. All of them now rely on either tourism (like Barkerville) or their proximity to a major city. Barkerville once had a population of 16,000, it now has 100, and they are all staff. Fact: resource-based towns fail. It is 99% certain. Fact: Tourism doesn't dry up if you have a good product. Fact: We have a GREAT product. Fact: The LNG proposal is short term. They have a 35 year vision. After the project has run it's profitable course there is no further plan. Do we need to fix Howe Sound again??

163. Council should consider the full economic benefit of the LNG project and weigh it against the loss in Eco-tourism opportunities resulting from the LNG effects as well as weighing it against the environmental damage that will affect the community citizens.

164. 2015-03 Note to DOS on Economic Downsides of BC LNG Export

(1) With the increasing power of development companies and government to blanket media with propaganda on environmentally unfriendly projects like private power, Enbridge Northern Gateway, the Kinder-Morgan expansion and LNG liquid natural gas export, it is also common for them to not only minimize the environmental problems, but to constantly FRAME these developments as having obvious economic advantages.

It is therefore important for us to realize that many of these "obvious economic advantages" of environmentally damaging projects are actually non-existent, and that in fact these projects are ECONOMICALLY DAMAGING as well.

In the case of private power, only a few warned us about the economic downside of private power over a decade ago, while most objections revolved around kayaking, wild rivers, fish problems, etc. We are now seeing the economic downside of private power with massive electricity rate increases coming, and $60 BILLION in future contractual obligations for overpriced private power now totalling an amount equal to all the other debt accumulated in British Columbia over its entire history.
These brief comments following will tend to focus a bit more on the relatively small WOODFIBRE LNG (2 Mt/a) project on Howe Sound near Squamish because is currently furthest along in development, but almost everything also applies to the northern projects commonly agreed to total about 50 Mt/a.

(2) Electricity Subsidies for Woodfibre and other BC LNG Export Corporations

If LNG plants are electrically powered off the BC Hydro grid, as Woodfibre LNG already proposes to do, they will only be charged the bulk industrial rate of a little over 8 cents per kilowatt-hour, while the incremental cost of ALL new power to our publicly owned BC Hydro is 12c/kWh or more (18c/kWh for wind, etc) in escalating contracts. This comes to a SUBSIDY of $40 Million/year for the small Woodfibre LNG, and $1 BILLION per year for the anticipated five larger northern plants if they follow suit.

Another local aspect of the $40 Million electrical subsidy for the small Woodfibre LNG plant is that this amounts to an annual subsidy of a half a MILLION dollars for EACH of the 80 local jobs. This is NOT a one-time subsidy to create a job; it's an ongoing loss of a half a MILLION dollars EVERY YEAR for each job.

We will never make back the cost of this subsidy in taxes and royalties on LNG. All that will be happening is we'll have the illusion of economic activity, but we'll just be throwing the costs onto our already deeply indebted BC Hydro and all the residents of the province.

(3) the Imaginary "Prosperity Fund" from LNG Taxes and Royalties

For those that believe there might still be significant benefits to the government's LNG "Prosperity Fund", it's worth remembering that Enbridge set up Enbridge Northern Gateway as a separate corporate entity from Enbridge itself to limit financial exposure in the event of environmental damage.

In the same way, because LNG taxes and royalties are based on corporation "profits", all the foreign owned LNG Export corporations are being set up in such a way that the entities subject to BC taxes and royalties will be severely limited in their "profits", while actual profits will go to entities unavailable to BC taxes and royalties.

In any event, there are long waiting periods of low or no taxes or royalties anyway, because of the manner and timeline of legislation, allowing corporations to pay off their capital costs first over many years, and only being charged taxes and royalties on "profits".

Woodfibre LNG adds another aspect to tax and royalty avoidance by proposing to build some significant infrastructure elsewhere, and tow it in to float offshore from Woodfibre. We will not know until it's too late how much this will diminish municipal taxes to the District of Squamish.

Recent dialogue in the BC Legislature also reveals that even the maximum LNG taxes and royalties possible after many years of capitalization payoff are insufficient to even cover the INTEREST on our growing provincial debt. It's therefore impossible to ever grow the imaginary LNG "Prosperity Fund". Furthermore, any LNG plant running off BC Hydro power at bulk industrial rate will be SUBSIDIZED $1 for every $1 in taxes and royalties that might possible be returned down the road. BC LNG export thereby
becomes the poster-boy for fiscal insanity.

(4) Higher BC Domestic Prices for Residential and Small Business Heating

One of the big economic problems with ENG Enbridge Northern Gateway is that once bitumen gets to tidewater for export to Asia, our BC domestic cost of all associated liquid fuels (gasoline, diesel, heating oil, etc.) will increase far more than the value of any taxes from the pipeline. (Best information on ENG is at http://robynallan.com/)

The same thing will happen in a more damaging way with LNG export, because natural gas is worth so much more in Japan/Asia. Our BC domestic cost of natural gas will rapidly inflate from its current reasonable price. So all that will be happening is we may get some amount of provincial taxes and royalties from LNG export - the "Prosperity Fund" - but personal and small business costs for electricity and natural gas will rise dramatically, affecting us personally - negatively, far more than the possible small boost in provincial taxes and royalties.

(5) Loss of Other Future Possibilities for BC Natural Gas with LNG Export

Before the push to private power, and the push to LNG export, BC had a good chance for developing a unique British Columbia personal and small business economy based on economical electricity and natural gas.

Now, with private power and electrical subsidies to the LNG export lobby, electricity prices will rise dramatically; while with the BC domestic price inflation of natural gas due to LNG export, our currently low natural gas prices will also rise substantially. We will never make back these personal and small business costs with LNG taxes and royalties. This entire exercise is simply a transfer of value from regular citizens to the energy power brokers.

We were on the forefront of a BC economy based on economical natural gas for home heating, especially in our long, cold interior winters, and on greater use of economical CNG compressed natural gas serving our entire provincial transportation system, including cars and diesel-cycle buses & trucks. This will be totally crushed with the natural gas price inflation that comes with LNG export.

(6) No Greenhouse Gas Benefits from Shipping LNG to Asia

Something for sacrificing environmentalists to remember, when government mouths the false mantra that BC LNG will get Asia off coal, and thereby reduce worldwide GHG greenhouse gases: It is important to realize that the 20 year GHG equivalent or GWP global warming potential of natural gas is 86 times that of carbon dioxide - that over the next 20 critical years, methane has a destructive greenhouse gas coefficient or global warming potential 86 times that of carbon dioxide.

So with current natural gas leakage already around 3-8%, and with every leaked methane molecule having 86 times the GHG or GWP power of a carbon dioxide molecule from burning coal, natural gas may create less particulate pollution than coal, but greenhouse-gas-wise, it's already a poor deal compared to
coal. Then once we factor in all the extra leakage from handling of natural gas to cool and compress it to a liquid, transfer and ship it to Asia, then unpack it to finally burn it at the other end, there is absolutely no environmental benefit in shipping LNG to Asia at all.

(7) Reputations and Track Records of the Owners

Since the entire point of BC LNG export is supposed to be to generate taxes and royalties for the (mythical) LNG "Prosperity Fund", why in the world would we be considering a bid on local Woodfibre LNG export from a foreign corporation with a known record of TAX EVASION, including millions of dollars in fines levied after court convictions? (Google Sukanto Tanoto tax evasion.)

Isn't it obvious that this corporation will deliberately structure itself to limit apparent profits on taxable components, while profiting elsewhere?

And since this corporation also has a very questionable environmental record, including destruction of rain forests, it also appears doubtful that we can trust them on local issues like airshed quality, marine noise harmful to the whole food chain in Howe Sound, etc. (Google Sukanto Tanoto environmental record.) If they’re allowed to establish themselves, we won’t be able to go back to our currently environmentally improving situation.

Overall, this isn’t the kind of company we would hire for the simplest personal construction job or reno. Why would we trust them on this much more complex project affecting the entire provincial economy?

165. Squamish needs and will benefit from the tax revenue and jobs that this project will bring.

166. Bringing Job's and Tax revenue to Squamish. Squamish needs this, have you looked around lately...businesses are closing down everywhere in Squamish. We need job's not ART!

167. Long term employment for generations...we want people to WORK and play here...jobs, jobs, jobs!!!!!

168. Squamish will no longer be the "outdoor recreational capital of canada" with this piece of pollutant in the way.

- lacks transparency.
- amount of jobs made is not worth the risk to the environment.
- The prosperity fund..? BRIBERY??? Is everyone ebing bough out by this deal? THe questions alone in this feedback are imposing positive benefits to this disaster. "bring in tax revenue..."

- we need to work in industry that is sustainable, green and healthy. Feeding Chinas energy need is not our problem. especially when canadian industry still uses coal! its hypocritical. Why not invest in ways to get them off coal on their own home turf. NOT OURS.

169. WLNG, the Fortis BC pipeline and Tankers WILL and just the thought of them IS NEGATIVELY IMPACTING THE ECONOMIC FUTURE OF HOWE SOUND

please remember the FILM INDUSTRY and SAVE THE SCENERY!
We should be most concerned about quality (e.g. well paying, full-time) and duration of jobs, than where the workers are coming from/live. Support training of qualified trades to support these types of projects. The community needs to benefit from tax revenues and understand the strong linkage between the resource industry and the ability for local government to provide much needed infrastructure and services.

I do not believe that most of the jobs will be available to local workers. The environmental risks are not worth the few jobs that will be created. We have other growing areas such as tourism that should be pursued (let's improve the eagle viewing area and build on our nature attractions).

We say No to LNG.

During construction, only 4.3% of jobs (=38.5 out of 895) will be for locals living in the Squamish/Whistler corridor (See Table 6.2-8 of the Labour Market section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Why are there so few jobs predicted to be filled by workers in the Squamish/SLRD area? The EA application is also very unclear about how many of the 100 full-time jobs will be filled by residents of Howe Sound once the LNG terminal is operational. What are the benefits to Squamish? What are the costs? There is still no clarity around how much in municipal taxes will be paid to the District of Squamish. How will this project impact existing small businesses and existing industries in Howe Sound?

I own a business in town. I employ 8 people. If we provided opportunities to draw small and medium size green tech businesses into town we would employ the same amount if not more than the LNG projects to employ once it is up and running.

There has been considerable speculation that the need for the natural gas isn’t there and there won’t be the huge financial impact everyone assumes. As well, I don’t see many long term opportunities coming from this project.

As a small business in Squamish we will benefit from construction phase, annual shut downs, and general operations of the project. We lost considerable annual revenue when wood fibre shut down.


The Government of Canada will increase immigration levels significantly in 2015. Citizenship and Immigration Minister Chris Alexander announced that Canada aims to welcome as many as 285,000 new permanent residents this year.

Persons who are qualified under one of 90 skilled trades from the following NOC Skill Level B:

- Major Group 72: Industrial, electrical and construction trades;
- Major Group 73: Maintenance and equipment operation trades;
- Major Group 82: Supervisors and technical occupations in national resources, agriculture and related production;
- Major Group 92: Processing, manufacturing and utilities supervisors and central control operators;
- Minor Group 632: chefs and cooks;
- Minor Group 633: butchers and bakers.

BC govt working group report on LNG states a challenge for workers

BC legislature Hansard Nov 4, 2014 great debate about foreign
The tax revenue is not significant, if estimated as $3 million. Squamish has not had an industry tax base like wood fibre for 10 years and its tax base has grown to 22 million.

There is Uncertainty on the number of local jobs during construction and operations of the proposed projects.

A socio economic study should be done to assess the real costs of this business.

There has been no proof that there will be a large number of jobs for actual Squamish locals over the long term.

The economic viability of LNG projects in BC is marginal. The provincial government keeps lowering their tax demands from companies proposing LNG projects.

If out-of-town construction workers are based in Squamish, there is a risk they would use up most available rental and hotel accommodation - thus displacing accommodation needed for existing tourism businesses.

I think we should be pursuing clean industries, that match the brand and lifestyle of Squamish and that don't have negative environmental impacts. The economic benefits, including local jobs, provincial revenue, etc. are uncertain at best; and are outweighed by the negative environmental considerations. The provincial government has no idea how much revenue will be generated. The $100 billion prosperity fund is a load of bunk.

The proposed projects do not really fit with Squamish's new brand and tourism focus.

Also, Why are these projects requiring tax breaks and incentives from governments if they can afford the massive ad campaigns they are currently running.

It would be a shame if the brand is used to limit opportunities to Squamish. I believe the brand is broad enough to allow for industry. In fact, we need a diverse economy.

Tax revenue to Squamish... no matter which case studies I compare us to: Japan, Australia etc... there is no greener side and any benefits are shortlived and FINITE. Yes, in our current economy GDP takes precedence... that can't be the way of our future. GDP doesn't measure the well being of communities and it's people- what you are working to do!! This is hard for many to wrap their heads around as economic prosperity and development is the current way of our world however, wrapping heads around brisk and sudden change down the road with the drastic effects CLIMATE CHANGE will have on us all will be even harder.

During construction, only 4.3% of jobs (=38.5 out of 895) will be for locals living in the Squamish/Whistler corridor (See Table 6.2-8 of the Labour Market section of Woodfibre LNG's environmental assessment application). Why are there so few jobs predicted to be filled by workers in the Squamish/SLRD area? The EA application is also very unclear about how many of the 100 full-time jobs will be filled by residents of Howe Sound once the LNG terminal is operational. What are the benefits to Squamish? What are the costs? There is still no clarity around how much in municipal taxes will be paid to the District of Squamish. How will this project impact existing small businesses and existing industries in Howe Sound?

I feel that the point - The proposed LNG project will bring tax revenue to Squamish. is not as significant. At an estimated $3 million in tax revenues, this is far, far too little for the cost to our health, our current
186. The economy has historically been dependent upon industry. However the demographic of this town has changed significantly
There is new soft tech industry that wants to move to the outdoor capital of Canada
The LNG will be the worst thing that can happen for this light smart intelligent industry
Let’s not get caught up in the past but create a new paradigm shift in thinking.
When we follow our passions and act fearlessly the jobs and money follow

187. Declaring the Howe Sound a marine park and World Heritage area would do so much more for our economy and local job market. In WLNG’s EA submission they state that 38.5 out of 895 jobs during construction will be for S2S locals. These are their own numbers - how is this not something that the pro LNG crowd see and understand. Most of the construction will be overseas and while still vague, most of the long term jobs will not go to current Squamish locals - our population just doesn’t have the skills - we will be bringing in immigrants. So we have our resources being shipped overseas for the profits of a foreign owned business and foreign workers. Crazy!

188. The economic promises may just be that - a promise. Are there legal guarantees that Squamish will receive what is promised or can the Provincial Government decide to give more tax breaks to this project? We know that long term jobs are very minimal for Squamish residents - certainly not worth all the risk and damage that will ensue.

189. Council needs to be able to explain where they would get the tax $$ from if they do not support this project.

190. WLNG has not done any comprehensive socio-economic analysis so we do not know what the net cost or benefit of this project is. WLNG could damage our existing industry and attract less people to Squamish, who generally bring new business with them.

191. Jobs: How many will go to locals? It is looking like very few but how do we know? If the workers are from out of town will they even spend any money in town? What are the chances of major lay-offs if the market prices for gas continue to fall? Do we have the public services to accommodate the transient workers?
What is the impact of the known gender inequity of this industry? Why would we support or encourage an industry that is so pitiful in meeting gender equity targets? How does this imbalance affect the citizens of Squamish?

192. Our fledgling tourism industry and the positive changes it is bringing to Squamish are threatened by this project

In the last year, Squamish has received a lot of attention as a tourism destination, being named “Best Mountain Town in North America” by CNN and listed in the top 52 places in the world to visit by the New York Times. I have seen a number of comments from supporters of WLNG that Tourism doesn’t create highly paid skilled jobs. Firstly, perhaps our fledgling tourism industry doesn’t have a lot of highly paid jobs yet, but look north to Whistler and there are plenty of very well paid executives at the top of the industry there. Secondly, Tourism goes hand in hand with making Squamish an awesome place to live. This does, and is, attracting tech firms to town... and they certainly bring with them highly paid, skilled jobs. OneUp Components, 7Mesh and of course, PinkBike are just some of the tech companies who are
proud to call Squamish their home.

The requested socio-economic study has not been provided.

During construction, only 4.3% of jobs (=38.5 out of 895) will be for locals living in the Squamish/Whistler corridor (See Table 6.2-8 of the Labour Market section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Why are there so few jobs predicted to be filled by workers in the Squamish/SLRD area? The EA application is also very unclear about how many of the 100 full-time jobs will be filled by residents of Howe Sound once the LNG terminal is operational. What are the benefits to Squamish? What are the costs? There is still no clarity around how much in municipal taxes will be paid to the District of Squamish. How will this project impact existing small businesses and existing industries in Howe Sound?

193. Our fledgling tourism industry and the positive changes it is bringing to Squamish are threatened by this project.

In the last year, Squamish has received a lot of attention as a tourism destination, being named “Best Mountain Town in North America” by CNN and listed in the top 52 places in the world to visit by the New York Times. I have seen a number of comments from supporters of WLNG that Tourism doesn’t create highly paid skilled jobs. Firstly, perhaps our fledgling tourism industry doesn’t have a lot of highly paid jobs yet, but look north to Whistler and there are plenty of very well paid executives at the top of the industry there. Secondly, Tourism goes hand in hand with making Squamish an awesome place to live. This does, and is, attracting tech firms to town— and they certainly bring with them highly paid, skilled jobs. OneUp Components, 7Mesh and of course, PinkBike are just some of the tech companies who are proud to call Squamish their home.

The requested socio-economic study has not been provided.

During construction, only 4.3% of jobs (=38.5 out of 895) will be for locals living in the Squamish/Whistler corridor (See Table 6.2-8 of the Labour Market section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Why are there so few jobs predicted to be filled by workers in the Squamish/SLRD area? The EA application is also very unclear about how many of the 100 full-time jobs will be filled by residents of Howe Sound once the LNG terminal is operational. What are the benefits to Squamish? What are the costs? There is still no clarity around how much in municipal taxes will be paid to the District of Squamish. How will this project impact existing small businesses and existing industries in Howe Sound?

194. For the amount of tax a few jobs it's not worth it.

195. With lower industry revenues (federally and provincially), could the cost of doing business result in senior levels of government downloading more responsibilities without funding to local governments?

The federal government is providing a tax relief for LNG-related capital assets: http://commonsensecanadian.ca/harper-slashes-federal-taxes-bc-lng-industry/

The provincial government lowered the tax rate from 7 to 3.5% and halved the project LNG revenues. http://thetyee.ca/News/2014/10/21/BC-Halves-Projected-LNG-Revenue/

The amount of a Prosperity Fund needs to be seriously questioned.
196. More people will come to work in Squamish and help expansion of existing businesses

197. Only 4.3% of jobs will be for locals during the construction phase. It is unclear how many of the 100 plus jobs will be filled by Squamish residents. There is no clarity around how much municipal taxes will be paid to the District and if it is adequate

198. Squamish needs an industrial tax base to provide for its residents. Local jobs are required.

199. Today in Squamish there are far more than 100 people employed in tourism and forestry that could be jeopardized by WLNG

200. After being voted the best little mountain town in N.A. recently, surely we can use this to develop new economic opportunities

201. If LNG is so great - why do we need tax subsidies to get this project off the ground? Prices for this will drop in China as they increase their use of their own gas fields and renewables.

### Economy - Values |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>We do not live in isolation anymore or in fact anywhere. The world is connected for better or worse more then it ever has been. The economy is truly global. Climate change is global. Therefore it makes sense that in order to reduce greenhouse gas and replace it with cleaner alternatives we all need to participate. We send cleaner fuel to places that depend now on less clean fuels. And we improve the economy as a result.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nothing in life comes without risk. Separating fact from hearsay and hype from deliberate thought will be a challenge. Hype after all is part of the problem not part of the solution.

I am always mystified by those who would like to participate in the benefits of a global economy without taking part in any of the byproduct of said economy. Minimizing that risk is the key.

From an environmental and economic standpoint this project makes sense.

| 2.  | Balance the economy the environment and social aspects. |
| 3.  | see above |
| 4.  | If they stop this project out, if they in fact have that power, and continue to go against it, what are they planning on doing to replace it? |

If the project does go through will they work with LNG and use them as a possible resource and work with them to help fund local projects for Squamish if LNG was so generous to assist in local community joint venture projects and or donations to things like a new local ice rink etc.

| 5.  | I think that Squamish needs to decide what it wants to be - a town geared up for tourism/start ups/entrepreneurism or does it want to go back to the dark ages of industry. I don't think it can be both. I really feel strongly about the Woodfibre project and if it goes ahead it could drive other businesses and people away. I will certainly be considering my family's future here! |

| 6.  | Only those who are mesmerized by fossil fuels will enjoy looking down from the Sea to Sky Gondola to see Woodfibre and LNG tankers in the Salish Sea. What an abomination. |
7. This project has the potential to be a drain on local resources while providing very minimal benefits.

8. Squamish is poised to become a Bend, OR or a Jackson Hole, WY. We are a mecca for mountain bikers, climbers, hikers and sightseers. This is where our future lies. Not with a dirty technology with no long-term future. Let’s invest in green renewable energy instead. This project will negatively impact our brand and tourism economy right at a time when it is taking off.

9. I think it’s a farse. It passes me off that our government pitched a plan that originally had great tax benefits in the range of 7%, and now we’ve dropped our pants to take it from a reclass foreign investor who doesn’t give a **** about anything, let alone our well being and nature.

10. These LNG jobs are NOT the type of jobs Squamish needs. The people who live here are not looking for this sort of work. Kill this project before this project kills other better more inspiring opportunities for our community and our people.

11. Outdoor Capital of Canada
   Let’s honor that title

   It is why Squamish is beginning to flourish, with young couples flocking here to raise healthy outdoor families

   Industry failed, let’s try something else. We have such a unique and precious opportunity to make an amazing community blossom and grow, and it does not include tankers in the Howe sound.

12. I have personally heard and learned enough about this LNG adventure It’s one scary ride!

13. I value tourism as an economic driver. Tourism and hospitality have brought more jobs to Squamish in the past 10 years than LNG will bring overall.

14. I’ve worked in the oil and gas industry and I’ve worked in the tourism industry. I can tell you that oil and gas jobs tend to provide a greater ability to pay mortgages. I feel our community is overpopulated by commuters. They are not as concerned about economics in our town as they are more connected to the city.

15. I feel very strongly that there is no long term benefit to Squamish from the LNG woodfibre project.

16. I see no negative impact on local tourism activities.

17. This project does not bring enough significant long-term benefits to the community in order to justify the HUGE long-term risks to the health, safety and quality of life in the community and the region.

18. Squamish is a beautiful place and because of the recreation opportunities here, tourism will inevitably be a part of our overall economy. It is instructive to see where Whistler has gone with low paying, seasonal jobs, few opportunities for well educated, qualified people and good people leaving because they can’t afford to raise families there.

19. I don’t want to hike up the Chief or the gondola and see the LNG facility, the swath of trees cut down for the pipeline or the tankers going up and down the Sound. I don't want to paddleboard in the estuary and see the destruction from the pipeline installation. I don’t want to ride down the road on my cruiser bike and see/hear the compressor station. All of my outdoor recreation opportunities will be forever changed and I won’t like it- and I won’t be the only one. The recreation scene here is absolutely booming (see gondola success, see amount of mtb riders/bikes on the trails, around town, see the climbers out on the Cheif, the hikers, the walkers, the trail runners, the sailers, the kitesboarders... why throw all of the work away to attract these people for a temporary facility owned by a foreigner for a dying industry that could collapse our fragile but now thriving Howe Sound, that could compromise the reason why so many people are attracted to visit and move to this awesome town?

20. Reality is that there will be short-term jobs for construction but most of the employees will not be from Squamish.
There will be few long-term employment positions and again, it is doubtful that they will be existing Squamish residents who are hired. We really need to keep the focus of this town on tourism and light-industrial, and resource-based economy. Shouldn’t we be promoting the reduction in fossil fuel use? Shouldn’t we be focusing on keeping our environment intact and healthy, because without clean water, air and land, we won’t have an economy in the future.

21. Remember the BC shares issued to every BC resident in the 80's? Remember SuperNatural BC? Remember support for families with special needs children? All promises made to the people BC. No value now.

22. Council needs to obey the law. if there is something you don't agree with work towards change. don't pick and choose which rules, regulations, laws you obey

23. Squamish needs help with its tax base. With no industry here to support it, we cannot keep increasing the costs to tax payers. Those who do not own property and are not affected by what it costs to own a home or small commercial property won't know the importance of this. We have failing infrastructure and no new capital projects. I have lived I. This town for more than 30 years. Not much has changed except more houses and some big box stores. We need help or we are going to be able to afford to live here.

24. It seems that the province has decided to proceed regardless of our input and that Woodfibre's old site was chosen for the specific purpose of an 'easy' review and fast startup. And in a way, for the province, it makes sense. But for Squamish, it's unclear to me how the town will benefit now and in the future.

25. A lot of people are saying that the direct employment in the operation of this facility is not significant, and that tourism will pay the bills. There seems to be no consideration to all the indirect jobs that large industrial facilities bring with them. Local machine shops and fabricating shops that make parts. Local electricians helping with upgrades and maintenance. Local biologists and engineers doing environmental monitoring and rehabilitation work. Local stores that supply parts and goods needed for the operation. The list is endless and yet many just discount these jobs. Many of these trades people now have to drive to Whistler or vancouver to feed their families and fill their days. Do these people not matter?

Even if only 37 of the operating jobs are filled from locals, and that is ignoring the people that will take jobs at the facility and then move here, these are high paying jobs relative to the tourism industry. That is a lot of money in wages that will come into the community to be spent. At $30/hr this is well over $2,000,000 in local domestic product. That is a huge amount when you take into account the money multiplier effect. That money rolls around in the community to services and stores in town. It buys houses and property, which ultimately affects district tax revenue.

It is irresponsible to just discount these economic benefits and say tourism will pay the bills. It won't! Tourism jobs don’t pay well, are seasonal, and are subject to economic downturns as well.

26. Simple. Stop playing politics and get the project going. See how the Project can assist with positive initiatives such as enhancing the estuary trails system and windsurfing areas to make this area (which is one of the most beautiful areas we have here) even more beautiful and encourage recreation. Use the increased revenue to assist with our aging infrastructure system. Lots of good can come of this. Work for the greater good of the community and stop posturing for the vocal minority. Those are my thoughts and feelings.

27. I hope this plant goes through.

28. This project - or investment in any fossil fuel - is not economically viable, long-term.

Even if short-term gain could be made to the foreign-owned company, the externalities of these project have not been calculated. If they were - and the SHOULD - it would not many any economic sense.

This project is in complete opposition to the forward, positive direction Squamish has been moving in over the past 10 years. Our population has increased because young, active and healthy-living oriented families want to live in this
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I believe Industry and Tourism are both beneficial to Squamish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Local jobs help keep the local economy humming. Commuters don't have the opportunities locals do to spend money in Squamish. We need that revenue to help expand the amenities residents want and need to live here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>We have so many options of how to develop Squamish. Just because this has been proposed, doesn't mean that we have to go with it. Think of Squamish, it's people and values and choose the types of businesses we want here. Then market Squamish and create incentives to encourage those types of businesses. From what I understand, when all is in place, there will only be a small number of jobs to gain. For everyone not directly employed, there is no benefit and nothing but risk to the natural land and wildlife. This questionnaire is asking the wrong questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>My biggest issue is with the fracking (I know it doesn't happen here). Why are we using a resource we need to survive to extract one we don't? Why is BC &quot;racing&quot; the USA and Australia to sell off all our resources to China? I think big politicians saw big opportunity and jumped to push things through without really thinking about the values of British Columbians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>We are a niche community known for the natural beauty and tourism... I have met so many people who have relocated from all over the world to be in our little community for a lot of reasons... Gas plants and mills are not one of them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>This project does not reflect the values of our community, these were solicited and clearly articulated by the public during the branding exercise as recently as 2014. While feelings may be ignored, values certainly can't be. We embrace entrepreneurship and innovation, we attract knowledge and innovation in our human capital. The lifestyle entrepreneurs flock here for the lifestyle: WLNG will have a psychological impact on that character of our town. We need to be leaders and in the forefront of turning the clock back on global climate change, having an LNG export facility at the entrance to our town would be the beacon that tells the world a different story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>If the projects go through, the photo taken from the gondola for the next New York Times article will be of a tanker in the Howe Sound. Does that image align with your Squamish? For me, the answer is no. We have been truly blessed with nature's beauty here. Why take that away?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>This is a corporation who is in the business to make money and like many businesses will likely want to pay as little tax as possible or to hire a workforce as cost effectively as it can. Let’s face it, all businesses, especially those looking to get started/be approved, over-inflate their business models, revenues, labour spending etc. With Sukanto Tanoto's reputation, this is even more concerning to me. Will workers come in (similar to Fort Mac) where they are single men looking to spend their money in ways that don't align with Squamish's values of family friendly and outdoor recreation? As a mom in this town I would like to know this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Woodfibre LNG is probably the most short-sighted proposal imaginable for the district. This project completely goes against massive amounts of research which shows that fossil fuel industry is bad for the environment AND the economy. The social impacts will be immensely detrimental. The project will have a detrimental affect on all other areas of what makes Squamish awesome - tourism, live-work-play, etc etc. Everyone's right to clean air, the right to a clean ocean, and the rights of the animals themselves are all considered secondary to the economic benefits of very few people if this project goes ahead. It is projects like this that are what's wrong with the world today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>I cannot support the 'immediate economic gratification' tactics that WLNG is promoting. I believe we do have options, that we are not desperate and that we do not need this plant and is few jobs and tax revenue. But that with some hard work we can draw on our amazing setting to bring better and more innovative businesses and industries to Squamish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>I think there is a lot of risk building an export facility due to price fluctuations on LNG. There are many countries vying to export LNG and the US and Australia are already ahead in building very large facilities. Once this supply hits the market, the LNG price will drop and there won't be any profit to be made. Then we'll be stuck with all this environmental impact to our estuary and Howe Sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Regarding the brand, it's not just about tourism. It's about making choices that support a healthy environment, a healthy paradise. These families homes are threatened by this project. Many people in the community will leave - myself included - if it passes. Home values WILL drop. Squamish will be considered an industrial armpit of the Sea to Sky once again.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lifestyle, a vibrant community. We're youthful, innovative, adventuresome, connected to nature. We're not traditional, business as usual, economics above all else. The WLNG project is the latter.

41. Corporations want to make profits for their owners and/or shareholders. They do not care about the communities in which they operate in especially when the owner of the company lives on the other side of the world and is not in touch with the common person. Corporations will hire PR and marketing people to spin their agenda into something that sounds like it will benefit our community of that they give a damn about our community but it is all smoke and mirrors. I don’t want to sound cynical, but having worked for a mega corporation for years and following business in Canada and the US closely, I don't believe any of the feel good nonsense that WLNG advertises us or has their spokesperson John French try and sell us.

42. I am absolutely opposed to this "project"!

43. dumbasses

44. I feel there will not be enough long term jobs created to be an economic benefit to our community. Additionally the negative affects this project could have could also negatively impact our current economy. It feels like we are grabbing on to a dinosaurs tail and hoping it will be our saving grace.

45. LNG tanker traffic in Howe Sound is huge concern (less from safety but from acoustics and impact on tourism activities). Further, we are behind the eight-ball on LNG, med-long term viability of this project is questionable. Concerned this will be total bust, leaving Squamish with continued industrial clean-up.

46. This is a scam and anyone believing there are jobs coming is believing in a dream. It's not worth it to jeopardize our quality of life for a few low end jobs.

47. I feel that industry and tourism can co-exist. Squamish can benefit from partnering with industry to promote and attract new businesses while still growing its new brand. Also having diversity in its revenue base should be an important objective for the District of Squamish.

Also - I feel the concerns regarding the marine transportation infrastructure associated with this project are short-sighted. I have worked in the marine industry for over 35 years and I believe that with regard to access and safety Squamish and Howe Sound has the potential to have port infrastructure that could rival Port Metro Vancouver which could bring immense economic and growth opportunity to the region.

Council should also consider how a negative stance on the LNG Project could impact the ability to maintain existing industrial activities and businesses in Squamish - which the loss of which could further create revenue challenges.

48. Save Squamish.

49. Council should build a proper plan around the tax revenue which is built around the lifecycle of the plant. Don't just spend the money and have nothing left but a gap at the end of the cycle. Reduce taxes and put some of the funds into a fund.

50. I feel that we can embrace both industry with regulations and the tourism potential. However, tourism jobs are typically low paying and seasonal. Industry jobs are higher paying and allow people earn enough to live and stay in Squamish.

51. We who live in Squamish, British Columbia are blessed to live in what could be classified one day as a world heritage site. It is rare to find anything in the world equivalent in natural beauty and the 360 degree views. Take for example, the water front with; the 'presence' of the Chief to the east, Shannon falls to the south east, Howe Sound to the south, eagles or wind surfers soaring to the west, and Diamond Head to the north. It is awesomely beautiful but extremely vulnerable.
This is what we in Squamish, we as British Columbians and we as Canadians are entrusted. It is unique in all the world and we are responsible to be stewards of it and conserving it for centuries to come. Our clean air and emerald seas are a precious and increasingly rare resources.

Squamish could become a place where people will flock because it is NOT industrialized or just to breathe clean air.

52. I think Council needs to get a grip and step back to get a sense of the big picture here. Just as the new highway improvement opens this area to more traffic and we become a destination for year round tourism and droves of people are moving into the region we risk losing an attraction that will draw many creative people to live here and the confirmed trend is that business follows these people. Look at how Austin Texas grew or San Jose and the silicon valley. Lots of progressive businesses will look to moving to this area to attract employees that are sought after by others as a method of securing their employ. To approve Woodfibre LNG would change Squamish irreversibly in many ways understood but mostly in lost opportunities that will not ever be understood.

53. The Prosperity Fund does not exist and will not necessarily exist. It’s propaganda that the Province drummed up to sell LNG to BC. The amount is a wild estimate and should not be planned for. Buying into LNG is like buying a lottery ticket, not working for a paycheque.

54. Seriously?

55. I did not start my family here for a economic prosperity potential of Squam us I moved here for the natural environment and the peace and tranquility of Squamish.

56. I really see a strong values based community here in Squamish that focuses on local economy, buying local, buying Canadian - look at The Farm, Refresh Markets, Farmers Markets, Rebuild, the sheer volume of small local businesses we have in Garibaldi, the Industrial area and downtown. Its awesome! I would love to see more of that encouraged/invested in and building a more co-operative like culture where we could support each other and be more self reliant. It may be a tough challenge but seems like a more sound, sustainable and ‘naturally Squamish’ type desirable option that leverages our values and benefits for an even better place to live - rather than depleting our resources and overrunning our adventurous, sportingly challenging, healthy living, environmental, community based culture for a 'sell your soul to the devil' money grabbing (if the money is even there) promise. I thought/hoped/believed we were better than that.

57. An LNG plant will negatively impact the view that Squamish is a recreation capital and affect tourism.

58. See above.

59. The company owner is a known tax dodger and environmental abuser in other countries why is our govt willing to do business with this company it is all about the money not the jobs or our town being sustainable for the future generations.

60. When the Woodfibre pulpmill was operating it contributed 25% of Squamish tax base without receiving a single service from the municipality, in other words, free money. LNG would be the same. Who else is going to pay for the aging infrastructure in town, the tourists? Council has done such a job of driving away business that I now feel the situation is hopeless. It would be nice if they felt the same for the taxpayers as they do for the environment.

61. As recently published by an SFU study, Squamish rock-climbing alone promises to attract 75 million dollars/year in only 3 years! But we need to continue to carve out this brand of Eco-Adventure-tourism, and say no to this unpopular and unnecessary project. I feel that the economic benefits are short-term, and have been over-hyped.

62. We are intelligent people, who have the capacity to go forth with conscious, affordable and sustainable energy. Every revolution takes one more participant at a time until the masses join. Its not easy, but it has to be the future if we want one.

63. My feelings and values on this are totally not represented by council. I am more of a optimistically cautious person... I think all my I's are dotted and T's are crossed before spreading out too thin. I would think taking care of our basic needs in Squamish is the Mayor's and Council's intention, but it less about that and more about cultivating a certain town... three villages together, raw, rough around the edges, down to earth ... what if I am not those things? If I am paying my taxes I want my sewer, water treatment, roads, basic municipality roles fulfilled by the leaders in this town to the best
ability that they know how to do, rather than dictating who should live in this town, who can do business here, what jobs people from Squamish should work in. I like a government that knows their place ... and it is not on a high horse.

64. This argument is often used to defend Woodfibre LNG, but what if the great jobs don't materialize? Besides, how will that negatively effect other industries and peoples choice to come to Squamish to live and recreate?

65. We should be leading with the change to renewables.

66. I value clear and honest politicians. I do not value those who promise the "moon and beyond" but fail to deliver. The province only gets involved when a disaster occurs (e.g. Mount Paley). The area around this mine has been destroyed as have the lives of those employed in the area. How can we trust the former VP of this mine to be able to avert disaster with our proposed LNG project? How can we trust the feds who have let down the country in many aspects of rail safety etc. Do you really think these governments have our communities best interests at heart? I do not believe they do. They are hanging their re-elections on a dead horse, fossil fuel extraction.

67. Please support growth, development, long term infrastructure needs and a diversified economy.

68. TAXES. WFLNG has proposed $2 million in property taxes, which constitute only 4% of our total revenues. In reality, any operation on the site would add to the municipal taxes, many of which would have a vastly improved net benefit due to more jobs and less damaging impact. Provincially, we are practically giving our resources away at the expense of our ecological and cultural integrity for 3.5% tax after the capital expenses have been written off.

69. We need Tax revenue. We are slowly becoming a town that regular people will not afford to live in

70. We need people to make & spend money in this town for it to grow successfully.

71. i want this

72. balanced approach please.

73. As a council representing ALL of the interests of Squamish, they should welcome the positive contribution to our economy since Squamish provides no services to the site.

74. I feel that recreation and tourism are very important to Squamish, I value the beauty of Howe Sound and Squamish a great deal, and don't think an LNG industry fits well with this.

75. Jobs and tax benefits to our local economy remain a question mark. I personally do not believe that the claimed benefits will outweigh the damage this project will do to the Squamish brand, tourism and our long-term economy. We need to move away from the boom-and-bust culture of resource extraction and invest in cleaner, more sustainable industries with long-term job prospects.

76. We currently have heavy industry in the forests and waterfront (log felling, log sorts, active port). In spite of this, tourism driven by wind sports and mountain biking have grown exponentially. There is little evidence that a LNG facility so far from our town will have any impact on this activity and on our brand.

77. We are building our tax base on a steady reliable population of people wanting to live and bring business here. They are here for the beauty and alot of these businesses are not going to get along with a large polluting plant.

78. We certainly could attract cleaner, more ethical industry to our town without potentially destroying our tourism industry.

79. will this ACTUALLY bring tax revenue to Squamish in our lifetime if at all?

80. Don't believe the spin, this is a bad deal for Squamish. I don't see the tax base seeing a significant net increase. The industry will tank, WLNG will look for tax cuts, the government will support their request. Squamish will be less attractive as a result and we all loose.

81. Squamish has decisions to make; to move forward or to repeat the past. Squamish should be working to attract businesses that are the future and are an asset to the environment such as solar and wind energies, eco-tourism, high tech businesses. Squamish should not repeat the past over and over.
82. We just spent a fortune rebranding ourselves. People are moving here because of the lifestyle and because they want an authentic experience of a healthy place. We have come from an industrial past. And we are now recovering ecologically from its implications. Let’s not repeat the same pattern.

83. **REJECT this proposal- we can do better. LNG is a "gold rush" for an industry that will destroy the planet (albeit a little slower than coal, perhaps)**

   How about a massive medical marijuana grow-op? Some infrastructure already in place:
   - electrical supply, fresh water, remote location (enhances security)

   Benefits: profitable, tax revenue, jobs creation, construction work, non polluting, only slightly controversial

84. We need to be thinking about the bigger picture for 5 or more generations as opposed to just our current one

85. I am in support of the project and feel that the no side has been much more vocal than the yes side. The Woodfibre site is zoned for industrial use and is a good location for this use.

86. I do not want Pacific Oil & Gas and Sukanto Tanoto as my neighbour. How can we ignore what the parent company of WLNG has done in other parts of the globe?

87. It just isn’t a fit for Squamish, none of their marketing will change that. Squamish needs to stand up for itself here - the brand and tourism focus has already been decided upon, lets stick with it.

88. How many sustainable local jobs would this project really bring and at what cost!!! Do not endorse this project!!!

89. My main concern is that the majority of these jobs are temporary and only last for the duration of construction. Also, big companies often say they employ local and don’t. Look at upper lillooet hydro: innergex claims to hire locals but a great majority of the crew is from Quebec, and go back to Quebec on their days off. They live and work in a work camp. No benefit to local economies. I am also afraid this type of "gold-rush" ruins opportunities for the people that make this community what it is. Already the housing market is through the roof and so many of my friends are in situations where their house has been sold and they have to move out and their is nothing to rent. It seems like to me we are driving out the outdoor enthusiasts and opening the door to construction types, I feel bad stereotyping but you know what I mean, the Budweiser drinking smokers.

90. I think tourism could be an important industry for Squamish, in the short number of years I have been here I have already noticed a big difference. It can be annoying to have so many people all over your town, but it has it’s benefits over industrial development. I am concerned how these tow industries will work together.

91. Whoever wrote this survey needs to take a course on making unbiased non-leading questions. The positives are highlighted by language and the negatives are diminished. If unintentional, please try again. Many of the economic positives are overstated (spun), and there are negatives inherent to each that offset the gains. The truth is, there is no attempt to examine the socio-economic risk to the wider business environment, in particular the negative effect on our primary and most sustainable desired industry of eco-tourism. They say 100 long-term jobs for Squamish locals; Do they mean existing locals as they try to make it sound? And where is a written promise to back this statement? How many future jobs in eco-tourism are we likely to lose with a lesser than recovered environment by which to attract visitors? And what if, as is happening, there is a sustained growth in population and housing starts, resulting in too many jobs and worker shortages? I don’t think the promise of jobs or the relatively minor tax base this project offers (in the big picture) is anywhere near enough to offset the various economic risks...

92. The answer about the Prosperity fund is very troubling and misleading, but again presented as fact. The government itself has admitted the $100 billion number is now merely, "aspirational", and it has also come out that the single study the government used for its LNG jobs and revenue numbers came from research firm that only spoke to a couple of Liberal ministers as their information source ... in other words, we are severely lacking solid information about the true jobs or economic impact of LNG in BC (good or bad). Of all the answers in this Questionnaire, this one is the most problematic in terms of spreading misinformation.
When I step back, I think there are only two reasons that people are advocating for this project: jobs and tax revenue. There are a multitude of concerns people have about the project. According to WLNG's Labour Market Assessment in their EA, they will not be adding a lot of jobs for local residents. Tax benefits are unknown at this point in time, but the numbers being thrown around at this time are small relative to the annual tax increases we've seen. Even if we received $3 million in extra tax revenue from WLNG, at our current rate of tax increases (8-12% annually) we'll have spent away all of that increase in a few short years. WLNG won't solve our financial issues. We have to get a hold of annual spending increases.

93. With so many resources in this town to generate income LNG is far from needed and will only harm the direction in which we truly should be heading towards

94. I'd rather sleep in a dried up ditch than accept any profit from anything to do with LNG

95. The district of Squamish should maintain a level playing field for potential investors of all kinds. Projects that pass environmental assessments should receive support regardless of whether they are in fashionable sectors (film, "rec-tech", etc) or in unfashionable ones (resources, mining, oil&gas, etc). I do not want or trust an activist council that thinks it can cherry-pick some industries as attractive and rejects others.

96. We live in paradise. Why transform it into a piece of hell?

97. Fracking!!!! Where will the LNG come from when the rest of Canada finally bans this practice? BC cannot continue to ignore the science.

98. Hypothetical benefits of a limited number of new jobs created by LNG are unclear. If they become reality, they would be negligible comparing to the negative impact on Squamish attractiveness as a tourist destination and an outdoor hub providing GROWING pool of jobs for the locals over the many years to come.

99. Squamish desperately needs reliable non seasonal meaningful employment. As a business owner, commercial property and residential property owner, tax payer, and resident of Squamish I feel the benefits far out weigh any concerns regarding safety and minimal risk to the Environment. All the environmental studies show the risks to be minimal. Most everyone I have discussed the LNG project with is in support, yet all I hear is that the community is against it. I think the nay sayers are protesting louder than the supporters are giving their affirmations.

100. Nowhere in my research can I find solid evidence that our BC LNG industry will be profitable or even economically viable long term. I sincerely hope that even the most gullible will not be taken in by Christy Clark's "pie in the sky" $100 billion Prosperity Fund concept.

I wonder whether those who are needed by Woodfibre LNG - such as Fortis - would be encouraged/somewhat forced to do other actions, such as suing, actions that they would not normally take. It could make a difference if a company like Fortis were somehow provided with enough money.

SQUAMISH CAN LEAD in encouraging more compatible businesses. For example, head offices to locate here instead of Vancouver; IT industry; Quest University related; tourism of course; sustainable logging.

101. This investment is so short sighted! We need to look to a future of sustainability. The construction jobs have a very brief lifetime, the operation jobs a longer but still defined expectancy. When the shale runs dry, we will be left without this promised tax revenue, without employment and with a massive scar across the province. Please, please, please consider investing in sustainable and renewable energy production. Imagine the future this town could have with infrastructure in place for the unforeseeable future. We are in such a unique location for tide and wave focused energy, why not use it!

102. I value forward thinking, looking at new ways to bring economic growth to Squamish (gondola!), and respecting the voices of our community, things have really changed in the past 10 yrs since i have moved to Squamish, i see the positive view provided by the more progressively minded approach.

103. Eco tourism brings valuable economic dollars. While our cities and countries are not protecting their land. We have an opportunity to protect ours and promote it to the world for generations to come.
The new industry has the potential to provide additional revenues to support BC for years to come. The commitment to a prosperity funds supports the notion of converting the natural resource to a financial resource for the long term benefit of BC residents.

Council, over the few years, has shown itself incapable of operating within its means. Continual tax increases far beyond the rate of inflation are affecting housing affordability. The industrial tax base needs to be increased so that the gown does not become one where workers cannot afford to own (actually, we're there already).

I am very much opposed to this project.

see above

We can't control where people want to live so to argue that the jobs won't go to locals is a waste of time. Don't we want people living here that want to? Are you asking WNLG to build employee subsidized housing or supplement salaries for locals? Do you really think people will commute to the Vancouver area daily when they make a living wage in Squamish? The tax revenue, both direct and indirect, and the impact it can have on making Squamish affordable for locals is not getting attention that it deserves by council.

Hello, My name is Jamie Martin, I live on 1109 Plateau Crescent, Squamish, B.C.

I have lived in Squamish since the mid 1960’s. I have witnessed personally heavy industry here and seen the devastation both on land and in the air. I went to the elementary school down town and saw 2 of my class mates develop asthma and had to go to school in Brackendale due to the air pollution. There were warning siren towers placed around town and would go off periodically. The smog down town in June during a high pressure weather pattern with no clouds around was astounding. I have been windsurfing here in Howe sound for 30 years. We have held world cup windsurfing races and the Canadian Windsurfing national championships here. We have unique inflow wind thermals that also blow straight thru town from wood fiber. Our wind sport society operates off of the end of the spit just down wind and not far from the woodfiber site. We will be up to 800 members this year. When woodfirber was in operation our members were the first to get the smell of the air pollution. I am a director and past president of the society for 15 years. I also have been sitting on the Squamish Estuary Committee for the past 15 years where I have learned a lot about the Howe sound and the recovery it has been going through. I have witness wales, dolphins and orcas all returning right up to the river mouth. Never in the past have we seen this until the last 3 to 4 years. I had a Whale spray in my face when he or she was feeding off of the river mouth and I was down wind on my kiteboard. The Howe sound fiord is unique and due to the lack of activity at the old woodfiber site has allowed the large water mammals to return. If you look at the geography of the site of woodfiber it is like doorway as the mammal’s round the corner to come into the harbour and to the river. Those ships that LNG are proposing are huge. They will be assisted by 3 to 4 Tugs all the way up the sound. These tugs noise decibels will not be good for the retuning mammals. I am getting sick and tired of the LNG propaganda as they compare themselves to other places around the world and try to spin off the impact of the pollution and activity under water that this plant will create. We are not other places, we are a unique Howe Sound Fiord. It has been said that Howe Sound is the worst place to set up industry.

The other frustrating point about this plant going in is it is the only plant that Christy Clark and the Liberals can get up and running first to make good on their mandate to start delivering LNG before the other plants come on line that are not near populated areas. We are being used as a political pawn here on this plant.

These pipes are 24” diameter and will be able to double the shipping in the Howe Sound in the near future, of course they will deny this. I know you are supposed to make recommendations but that is what they want regardless of the risks because they are recommendations only.

I could mention the safety, the economy, and more on pollution but I will let the others write in on this.

I thank for your attention and hope you will do the right thing.
Best Regards

XXXXXX

11. We have spent a great deal of time on the gondola since it opened and feel like proud ambassadors in showing off the view of Howe Sound and the mountains beyond. The gondola has been a fabulous addition to the Squamish area, and what a shame to mar the view by not only the LNG facility itself, but a large clear cut swath that BC Hydro is proposing. Additional questions come to mind about what level of noise, smog, smell? If these exist, they will be carried over to residents and tourists by prevailing inflow winds.

How will this affect tourism and change our town's appeal? I believe it will destroy Squamish's image as a natural, unspoiled destination, which will affect people coming to visit, live and work here.

11. Tourism is great but alone does not sustain community. There are multiple examples provincially, nationally and internationally of communities that have suffered greatly because of their focus only on tourism – tourism works with not apart from sound economic growth.

1. Technology and filming are great but inadequate to sustain Squamish economically at this time and cannot be relied upon as the sole producers of economic benefits to the community.

2. This community needs industry or it will become a bedroom community.

LNG can work if there is serious but not prohibitive regulation and environmental protection, benefit to the local community financially (employment, housing and revenue) and in meaningful partnership with local First Nations communities. The site is a good one.

11. I would move my family elsewhere & my business that employs 2 people.

11. The town of Squamish cannot rely on tourism alone. We need industry with decent paying jobs and an organization that will contribute to the towns needs. (taxes)

11. NO LNG

11. Our community needs to bring in more tax revenue so that the burden does not fall on home owners.

11. There is a great deal of confusion as to the amount of real jobs potentially available for Squamish residents. I understand the amount of tax for Squamish is not commensurate with other types of industries of similar sizes. the BC Prosperity Fund is a good idea, but it is sad that it has to hung on the hat of LNG while the timber industry has eaten this province out with minimal residual benefits. There are other ways that Squamish can and will grow that do not require an LNG plant in Howe Sound.

11. Bursting water pipes, and fire halls that are ready to fall down, and you are worried about how you will look in the next election.

11. I don't believe that tourism jobs provide decent wages. Squamish came about as a resource town. Resource jobs pay a living wage. We can have resource jobs and preserve the environment at the same time, as I think this project will accomplish.

11. The number of jobs created and the tax revenue earned are not sufficient to justify accepting this plant in our community.

12. Love this project. Squamish needs the jobs
1. Squamish needs a broader and deeper tax basis. This can best be done by attracting business which fits with our core values to preserve the area.

2. I understand that lots of long-time locals see this industry as a way to bring back local jobs for those that have had to find work elsewhere, breaking up families and their community. This industry won’t do that. These jobs are highly skilled, and the labour pool in Squamish simply can’t provide workers with enough training to work at this LNG facility. We need to look at other ways to create employment for that part of our community.

I am also really concerned by the "Industry versus Tourism" dialogue that keeps getting promoted. This is not why I am against this project, in fact, far from it. I am very concerned that tourism will also destroy this community if it is not done in a way that fits our branding.

When I first visited Squamish in 2001, I was attracted by this feeling of excitement... that things were on the cusp of change. But I was also attracted by the fact that Squamish was a REAL community. When I visited Whistler, I was completely turned off by how contrived that community is. Squamish is not like that, and that is the whole reason that I decided to live here.

I recognize that we need jobs, and to increase our industrial tax revenue. My biggest concern is that this project will decrease the number of jobs and tax revenue from other businesses and industries that will either leave town, or not come here because of the environmental and social impacts of this LNG industry.

3. Bull***.

This project will not effect the cost of gas. Natural gas or otherwise. The demand for gas is ever increasing, and the supply is finite. Any economist can simply show that in the short term there will be little to no change, and in the long term the trend will stay the same.

It's simple math, although government taxes and subsidies add complexity to this, the truth of it is it's a losing battle.

4. But more than that, being a wealthy first world country, we have a responsibility to lead the way to create a productive, safe world for the future. Fossil fuels are always going to be a part of life on earth, but at this point they are overused and destroying this world.

We need to step forward to create safe air, water and land for ourselves, our neighbours and the world. Please be a part of this. Don’t let history point it’s finger at you as the one of the ones who chose to do the wrong thing.

5. We have no Industry here, most must leave town to work camp jobs in this sector of work, construction, it would be good for our community.

6. This project will negatively affect the brand of squamish and will affect tourism and reftech, proven to be successful here. The taxes made by the LNG plan are not worth the potential impacts on other successful tax generating industries.

7. We need this for the betterment of our community

8. Council as a group have not considered the long term impact of their short term decisions. It takes three to five years to look at the results of council level decisions and to this date they are only looking out one year, at best. Think outside the box and consider what Squamish will be in 15 years, not tomorrow.

I live in Squamish because I value an active, healthy, outdoor lifestyle. I do not view Squamish as a community that is
9. desperate for economic revival.

I don't think an LNG plant will have an adverse impact on the tourism sector. The project will be hardly visible from most parts of Squamish. Well paying jobs and tax revenue from the LNG plant will benefit Squamish more than poor paying tourism and service job.

Since when is tourism a clean industry - it has horrendous impacts here in the corridor and throughout the world - it's just popular so the impacts are overlooked. Just because we now have brand - doesn't change who we are or how fabulous it is to be here - it was so 40 years ago as it is today. Branding is just marketing!

The economic value of this project is minimal compared to the negatives and risks involved. Fossil fuels are a step backwards and are often cyclical resulting in a boom and bust economy. I would prefer to see stable and sustainable industries in town. We have all the ingredients in place and amazing infrastructure for a small town - a deep sea port, an airport, a rail line, a great highway and a major city and international airport only an hour away. We should be trying to attract (clean) manufacturing, IT and tourism businesses for example.

Why in these particular questions are the ones that are for LNG written by a scholar and the ones against a high school student?

LNG is based significantly on fracked gas. Fracked gas is slowly being banned on a worldwide basis as the research becomes clearer regarding the negative environmental and health benefits. Why would we want to support this type of industry? Why would we not want to do something positive for the planet, and focus on renewables, become a centre of excellence in renewable energy instead of going for heavy industry owned by a foreign company with questionable scruples? This does not fit my values of improving the health and well being of my local environment, or the world.

I have spent a good portion of my working life working on corporate finance deals and I'm not a stranger to oil and gas deals. While I certainly regret my earlier decisions, I'm also proud for having shifted my focus to the renewable sector sooner than many of my peers.

Renewables are the future. There simply isn’t any doubt about this. Bank after bank releases pro renewable assessments and oil and gas continues to feel downward pressure. Money is flowing to R&D in the renewables sector, prices are plummeting and efficient is increasing at almost exponential rates.

It boggles my mind that as a community, we are even considering jumping into a sector nearing the end of it's lifecycle. We could be a hub for renewable technology and manufacturing. We could be leaders in a rapidly growing industry rather than passengers going down with the ship. Let's aim higher. Let's build jobs that don't cost this community everything that makes it such a wonderful place to live.

I hope he liked that Blue angel, it had at least 3 Btu's.

I am not happy with Council, the decisions they have made in order up hold tourism and outdoor lifestyle and reject real sustainable industries.

I feel there will be more work available in Squamish if we preserve the health and environment of our area by opposing LNG. What exciting healthy environmentally conscious company wants to move to a community that is embarking on an LNG project? vs a community that opposes such a project is bound to attract companies that are likeminded in cherishing health and sustainability.

I do not see the economic benift of LNG for Squamish, B.C., Canada or the world at large.

I am more concerned about the long-term implications. The negative environmental impacts will endure long after the LNG project is defunct. The maintainence of residential and commercial infrastructure after the tax revenue has
1. dried up will be left unfunded by the project, and humanity will be entering an era of scarcity of resources globally. The DoS will likely find itself in an untenable position financially. It would be much wiser to develop a long-term sustainability plan now rather than become dependent on revenue from non-renewable resources.

2. Squamish is in a state of boom with young families moving to our town because of the opportunities to raise their family in a supportive community that encourages active lives. We are heading more towards small businesses, high tech industries, and even those that commute contribute to our economy.

By supporting a heavy industry such as the WLNG the DOS will be changing the demography of who will want to move to Squamish. This cannot be overstated enough! Look how we've changed in the past 20 years from a red-neck logging community to a far more educated and globally experienced community that now brings this wealth of knowledge and insight back into the town. We have two universities right in town and many of them are making Squamish their home after they graduate. Can you honestly tell me that any of them (even graduates from the BCIT industry program) will find even one job at the WLNG?

3. Depending on a resource to build jobs and a town has proven over time to fail 100% of the time. It seems ludicrous for us to sacrifice our obvious advantages and branding directives for what has already been deemed a short term resource based goal. The numbers as far as longevity and jobs do not make sense. The district should be looking to the government for tax incentives for tech, tourism and eco-tourism development here. Unfortunately our current provincial government will be hard to sway, but encouraging local effort will make a big difference. 35 long term jobs over 35 years is not worth it at all. How many people are currently employed in the digital film-making industry in Vancouver? Remember, this was an industry that our current provincial government pull tax incentive from, and it is still thriving. How many of those employees come up to Squamish for a hike or ride, and tweet about their experience every weekend??

4. For one, this project will directly impact the Sea to Sky Gondola who's amazing vistas will be tarnished by this heavy industry project.

I don't believe this project will provide a significant number of permanent full time positions to warrant the environmental destruction that comes with it. Are a few dozen jobs in a town of 20,000 worth ruining the beautiful environment. The scenery is one of the main reasons people choose to live here. If this project goes through, you will see population growth decline because it will be a less attractive area. We should focus on eco-tourism from sightseers, hikers, rock climbers, mountain bikers, kite boarders etc. If you want to increase our tax base, focus on these individuals who are moving here all the time.

5. I am not convinced that the number of jobs brought to town will be as large as they are advertising. The Sea to sky Gondola brings lots of people to town and provides jobs for locals. I don't think Woodfibre LNG will bring people to town.

6. Many workers who come here from elsewhere to work for WLNG will make this their home- just like the majority of people who are here now

7. Squamish needs the Tax dollars. I think Squamish would be silly to let this go. Open your eye's council! I

8. If you want it to work, both tourism and industry CAN and DO work well together...it's called being open minded and finding solutions.

9. unethical, wrong, there is no transparency.

10. My submission to EAO on WLNG

I will first draw on the expertise of others:

1. SAFETY: Siting an LNG facility in Howe Sound violates international safety standards and practices, putting Howe
Sound residents at risk

As LNG tankers transit Howe Sound, there is a high-danger zone for 1,600 metres (1-mile) on either side of the LNG tanker. If an accident happens, people within this zone risk death by asphyxiation, or death/injury by fire or explosion. Every time a tanker travels through Howe Sound (approximately 6-8 transits a month according to Woodfibre LNG) several Howe Sound communities will be in this high-danger zone, including: Bowen Island, Bowyer Island, Anvil Island, Passage Island, Porteau Cove, West Vancouver, and parts of the Sea to Sky highway. The Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) LNG Terminal Siting Standards states that LNG terminals should not be located in narrow, inland waterways with dense local populations and significant commercial, recreational, and ferry traffic. Why would that guideline not apply to Howe Sound? The proposed siting of the Woodfibre LNG terminal and associated transit of LNG tankers through Howe Sound poses an unacceptable risk to safety of people in communities along the shores of Howe Sound.

Sources: Sandia Report, 2004 and SIGTTO LNG Terminal Siting Standards

2. ENVIRONMENT: The once-through seawater cooling system proposed by Woodfibre LNG is outdated

Woodfibre LNG is proposing an outdated and damaging cooling method to help cool the LNG facility. They propose to extract 17,000 tonnes (= 3.7 million gallons, or 7 Olympic-sized 50-meter swimming pools) of seawater from Howe Sound, chlorinate it, heat it, and then spit it back out into the sound every hour of every day for the next 25 years. This method has been banned in California and several other places as it is very damaging to marine life such as juvenile salmon, herring, and plankton which are the building blocks for all other life in Howe Sound. If the herring are impacted, the dolphins, orcas, and humpbacks are also impacted as they no longer have a food supply. The impacts of increased water temperatures and the addition of chlorinated seawater will likely reverse the recent revival of marine life in Howe Sound, which is just now recovering from the toxic legacies of previous industries. This is unacceptable.

3. HEALTH: Social costs and health impacts of air pollution

Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Emissions of NOx and SO2 interact with other compounds to form fine particles, which can affect both the lungs and the heart. Exposure to these particles is linked to increased risk of respiratory symptoms, such as irritation of the airways, coughing, or difficulty breathing; decreased lung function; aggravated asthma; onset of chronic bronchitis; irregular heartbeat; nonfatal heart attacks; and premature death in people with heart or lung disease. A new study published in the scientific journal, Climatic Change, estimates the true social costs of air pollution that aren’t accounted for in the cost of fossil fuels and other pollutants. Social costs include the health impacts of air pollution as well as impacts from climate change. The study found that sulfur dioxide costs $42,000 per tonne, and nitrous oxides cost $67,000 per tonne. Sources:


4. SITE SUITABILITY: The Woodfibre site is not a safe location for a hazardous LNG facility

On February 15th, 2015, a 3.4 magnitude earthquake hit Vancouver’s coast that was felt throughout Howe Sound. The Woodfibre LNG proposal is located within this zone of moderate to high earthquake risk, on two known thrust faults. The Woodfibre site also has a history of slope failure. In 1955 a wharf and three warehouses collapsed into Howe Sound at the Woodfibre site, causing $500,000 – $750,000 in damages (Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4). A
recent, but unreleased, geotechnical study by Knight Piesold identifies that approximately 46% of the study area was mapped as having rapid mass movement. This means landslides and slope slumpage... including existing natural landslide hazards as well as terrain where construction activity may increase landslide initiation. Why hasn't the geotechnical study by Knight Piesold been released?

Sources:
Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4
B.C. Ministry of Energy and Mines

5. ECONOMY: The requested socio-economic study has not been provided

During construction, only 4.3% of jobs (=38.5 out of 895) will be for locals living in the Squamish/Whistler corridor (See Table 6.2-8 of the Labour Market section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Why are there so few jobs predicted to be filled by workers in the Squamish/SLRD area? The EA application is also very unclear about how many of the 100 full-time jobs will be filled by residents of Howe Sound once the LNG terminal is operational. What are the benefits to Squamish? What are the costs? There is still no clarity around how much in municipal taxes will be paid to the District of Squamish. How will this project impact existing small businesses and existing industries in Howe Sound?

6. CLIMATE CHANGE: 142 thousand tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions is unacceptable

Woodfibre LNG is now estimating greenhouse gas emissions to be 142 thousand tonnes of CO2 equivalent every year. These annual emissions of CO2 equivalent from Woodfibre LNG is equal to adding over 18,000 cars to the highway, driving to Vancouver and back, every day. This is more than six times greater than current highway traffic. It is irresponsible to approve this kind of polluting industry at a time when we need to transition away from fossil fuels to mitigate the risks associated with climate change, and to reduce the economic and health impacts of air pollution in general.

7. GOVERNMENT REGULATION: Inability of government to monitor, enforce, and respond to issues

There are no regulations adopted to regulate this LNG industry from a technical standpoint. Any of the current standards are not applicable to the LNG industry. Do the regulators have the knowledge and the expertise and the capacity to oversee this industry or will they be relying on the proponent to monitor themselves and report to the regulator? Self-monitoring industries have created several examples of accidents with resulting environmental destruction in recent years, including the Lac Megantic rail disaster and the Mt Polley tailing pond spill.

8. ENVIRONMENT: Removal of water from Mill Creek unsustainable for fish life

Woodfibre LNG has secured the water license to extract water from Mill Creek, which flows through the Woodfibre site. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans has objected to this because the amount of water that WLNG is proposing to remove will reduce water levels in Mill Creek to levels that will no longer support fish life, especially in the summer months. Woodfibre LNG needs to source water for this project from somewhere else to protect this important stream habitat which is home to several native fish species.
9. ENVIRONMENT: Missing baseline studies

The following baseline studies are either missing or are inadequate as they do not conform to any recognized scientific standards: fish, birds, marine mammals, air quality, shipping, water quality, marine sound, and atmospheric sound, marine life near the Woodfibre site, and the cumulative impact assessment. Proper studies need to be completed before any decisions can be made regarding this project.

10. VIEWSCAPES: BC Hydro clearcut of two 64 metre swaths of forest at the Woodfibre site will impact viewscapes from the Sea to Sky highway and the gondola

BC Hydro is proposing to clearcut two 64 metre swaths of forest at the Woodfibre site which will create visible scars in the Howe Sound viewscape which will be very visible from the highway and the gondola. This information was only made available during the recent BC Hydro open house held on 19th March, near the end of the public comment period. This information is not included in the cumulative impact assessment of the Woodfibre application and it should be. This late release of information pertinent to this project and the timing of the BC Hydro open houses is unsatisfactory.

11. ENVIRONMENT: 9000 year old glass sponge reefs endangered by tanker traffic

LNG tankers do not have enough clearance to get over the 9000 year old reef if they go off course. These 9000 year old glass sponge reefs have been called "Living Fossils" by National Geographic as until recently this species was thought to have gone extinct over 60 million years ago. MLA Jordan Sturdy recently made a statement in the House about the importance of this discovery in Halkett Bay near Gambier Island, and to support the proposal to expand the Provincial Park Protected Area to ensure these reefs are protected.

Sources:
http://jordansturdymla.ca/bcltv_videos/mla-sturdy-halkett-bays-glass-sponges/

12. ENVIRONMENT: Will there be smog? Will there be a smell?

Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application).

Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2) is a reddish-brown gas with a pungent, irritating odour. It absorbs light and leads to the yellow-brown “smog” pollution haze seen hanging over cities. It is known to irritate the lungs and increase susceptibility to respiratory infections. In combination with either ozone (O3) or sulphur dioxide (SO2), nitrogen dioxide may cause injury at even lower concentration levels.

Sulphur Dioxide (SO2) is a toxic gas with a pungent, irritating, and rotten smell. Current scientific evidence links short-term exposures to SO2, ranging from 5 minutes to 24 hours, with an array of adverse respiratory effects including bronchoconstriction and increased asthma symptoms. These effects are particularly important for asthmatics at elevated ventilation rates (e.g., while exercising or playing). Studies also show a connection between short-term exposure and increased visits to emergency departments and hospital admissions for respiratory illnesses, particularly in at-risk populations including children, the elderly, and asthmatics. The addition of these air pollutants in Howe Sound is of particular concern as recent research by MSc student Annie Seagram (studying under Professor Douw Steyn,
Department of Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Sciences at the University of British Columbia) has shown that the Howe Sound airshed and Lower Fraser Valley airshed are connected. Emissions from Woodfibre LNG will add to the pollution in Howe Sound, exacerbating the existing air quality conditions, particularly in the Squamish-Brackendale corridor.

Note that Metro Vancouver annually issues several Air Quality Advisories due to high concentrations of ground-level ozone. This pollution also impacts the Howe Sound and Squamish, and exposure to these pollutants are of particular concern for infants, the elderly, and is directly linked to health issues such as lung or heart disease and asthma.

In addition: the BC government needs to ensure the protection of the 9000 year old glass sponge reef at Halkett Bay off Gambier Island.

About Glass Sponge Reefs: http://www.eao.gov.bc.ca/pcp/forms/Woodfibre_LNG_form.html

Glass Sponge Reefs in Halkett Bay off of Gambier Island

MLA Jordan Sturdy spoke in Legislature about the glass sponge reef at Halkett Bay off Gambier Island.
http://jordansturdymla.ca/bcltv_videos/mla‐sturdy‐halkett‐bays‐glass‐sponges/

Tankers do not have enough clearance to get over the 9000 year old reef if any off course action happens.

Transport Canada Dangerous Goods Dept. is not at all ready for LNG. In fact they now have a task force for rail and road.

I have been a member of 2 Stakeholder Teams focused on the protection and restoration of salmon habitat. I include information and links for your convenience and ask that a similar project be implemented for the WLNG and Fortis BC applications.

2005 SALMON RECOVERY PLAN
Entire Salmon Life Cycle
$250,000 Pacific Salmon Foundation

$2 million
5 year plan
Cheakamus Salmon Recovery
Squamish Nation and Stakeholders

CERT C
Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Technical Committee

The Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Technical Committee (CERTC) website, provides information on Cheakamus
ecosystem restoration activities. CERTC was formed in August 2005 in response to a train derailment and subsequent spill of sodium hydroxide into the Cheakamus River. CERTC’s mandate is to understand ecosystem-level impacts and develop restoration and monitoring strategies for affected species to accelerate the return of the Cheakamus ecosystem to a pre-spill state as quickly as reasonably possible. CERTC Terms of Reference (pdf).

CERTC recommends programs for implementation to the Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Steering Committee based on input from experienced professionals, external specialists, interested parties and the public.

Both committees include representatives of:
CN
District of Squamish
Fisheries and Oceans Canada
BC Ministry of Environment
Squamish Nation

Thank you for your interest in Cheakamus ecosystem restoration. Comments can be made to CERTC at comments@cert.ca

Fish Assessment

Following the spill, B.C. Ministry of Environment (MoE) fisheries biologists, technicians and contracted staff documented fish survival and compared fish density information to available previous data.

Fish mortalities were collected from the Cheakamus River downstream of the spill, with activities including:
Recording mortalities by species and location;
Collecting length data to determine age classes of impacted fish;
Collecting scale samples to further supplement brood year identification; and,
freezing and storing of samples for further examination, if required.

Fish Impact Assessment (MoE and DFO) (pdf)
MoE Estimated Impacts on Salmon and Trout Populations:

Chinook
- 25% of juveniles from 2004 spawning population
- 50% of 2005 spawning population

Chum
- juveniles not affected
- 2005 spawning population not affected

Coho
- 50% of juveniles from 2004 spawners
- 2005 spawning population not affected

Pink
- juveniles not affected
- between 3 - 10% of 2005 spawning population

Steelhead
- 90% of mainstem juveniles from 2003 to 2005 spawners
- 2006 and 2007 steelhead spawning populations not affected

Estimated Impacts on Other Fish

Ninety percent of resident fish in the mainstem Cheakamus River may have been affected by the spill including:
Dolly Varden/Bull Trout
Rainbow Trout
Lamprey (2 species)
Sculpins (bullheads - 2 species)
Sticklebacks
Juveniles rearing in tributary streams at the time of the spill were not affected.

Benthos Recovery Presentation - Triton Environmental, 2008 (pdf). New!
Appendices (pdf) New!

Ecological Assessment

A screening level qualitative assessment of ecological effects has been conducted for CN to understand the potential effect the spill could have had on receptors other than fish in order to identify and target the need for ecosystem restoration activities.

Given the broad scope of the project and the limited amount of available data (i.e., exposure data, such as concentration of NaOH in environmental media, NaOH ecotoxicity toward specific species) it is not possible to conduct a comprehensive ecological risk assessment for each species present in the ecosystem. The screening level assessment focused on the functions of populations and communities within the ecosystem. This recognizes populations are less sensitive than their most sensitive individual member and some effects may be observed at the population level without impairing the functions of the ecosystem as a whole.

Qualitative methods using subjective ecological effects ranking categories, such as high, medium and low, were used to describe the likelihood of adverse effects rather than providing a numerical estimate of effects. To minimize subjective influence, the interpretation of ecological effects contain a clear explanation of the lines of evidence leading to the conclusions, including a description of the uncertainties and assumptions used. Additionally, matrices were used to provide a structured framework for the characterization of ecological effects. The assessment used existing information from baseline and monitoring reports and from previous scientific literature.

This screening level assessment of ecological effects consists of three main steps: problem formulation, analysis and characterization of the likelihood of adverse ecological effects. Results from the ecological effects assessment will be used to determine the direction of future recovery efforts for other components of the Cheakamus River ecosystem.

For more details, view the
Ecological Final Report (pdf) New!
Amphibian Assessment – October 2007 (pdf) New!
Study Design: Screening Level Assessment of Ecological Effects (pdf)
[ Back to Top ]
Water Quality

River Sampling

Water quality professionals tested and monitored the following:
Water quality in the Cheakamus and Squamish Rivers, August 5 - 8, 2005
Water quality in the Cheakamus during site remediation activities, August 10 - 26, 2005
Water quality in the Cheakamus after rainfall events, August 17 - October 28, 2005
Monitoring was conducted over a variety of meteorological conditions and river levels. The parameters monitored included: pH and conductivity, sodium, total dissolved and total suspended solids, total and dissolved organic carbon.

Results

The Cheakamus River was cleared for recreation after 24 hours by Vancouver Coastal Health on August 6, 2005. Water quality downstream of the derailment site was determined to be similar to that upstream.

Well Sampling

Forty-eight wells within 100 metres of the Cheakamus River were sampled on August 6 and 7, 2005. The parameters monitored included pH and conductivity, sodium, total dissolved and total suspended solids.

The sampling was coordinated by Environment Canada, Vancouver Coastal Health Authority, Triton Environmental Consultants Ltd., and Quantum Environmental Services.

Drinking water from wells was cleared for drinking by the Vancouver Coastal Health Authority after 48 hours on August 8, 2005.

No additional detailed water quality sampling is required.

Water Quality Report – September 2007 (pdf)
Water Quality Report Appendices – September 2007 (pdf)
http://certc.ca/recovery_fund.shtml

CERT C Stakeholder Team

The Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Stakeholder Team (Stakeholder Team), established by CERTC, is a public advisory group comprised of representatives from interested organizations and individuals with local knowledge of and
experience with the Cheakamus River.

Meeting Notes

September 30, 2010 (pdf) New!
June 24, 2010 (pdf)
March 25, 2010 (pdf)
October 29, 2009 (pdf)
June 17, 2009 (pdf)
March 5, 2009 (pdf)
November 27, 2008 (pdf)
September 25, 2008 (pdf)
May 27, 2008 (pdf)
March 27, 2008 (pdf)
January 24, 2008 (pdf)
December 6th, 2007 (pdf)
September 27, 2007 (pdf)
June 21st, 2007 (pdf)
April 25th, 2007 (pdf)
February 28th, 2007 (pdf)
December 6th, 2006 (pdf)
July 6th, 2006 (pdf)
May 25th, 2006 (pdf)
April 27, 2006 (pdf)
March 25, 2006 (pdf)

Presentations

Overview of the Cheakamus River Large Woody Debris Stream bank Protection and fish habitat development project, June 2011 (pdf) New!
Update on Cheakamus River recovery strategies and monitoring programs, March 2009 (pdf) New!
Update on Cheakamus River recovery strategies and monitoring programs, January 2012 (pdf) New!
Cheakamus River Sculpin Recovery Presentation to CERST - Fall 2010 (pdf)
Adult Wild-and Hatchery-Origin Steelhead Returns to the Cheakamus River in 2009(pdf)
Cheakamus River Bull Trout Radiotelemetry and Enumeration Program, 2007-2009(pdf)
Cheakamus River Side Channel Re-watering Projects, March 2010 (pdf)
Role
The Stakeholder Team provides input into the development and implementation of monitoring and restoration programs for the Cheakamus ecosystem.

The Team helps coordinate and communicate comments and recommendations from interested parties to CERTC, and also receives updates on CERTC activities, as the information becomes available. All input from the Stakeholder Team is considered advisory in nature and final decisions regarding monitoring and restoration programs rests with CERTC and the Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Steering Committee.

**Stakeholder Team Terms of Reference**

**CERTC Communication to the Stakeholder Team**

CERTC Responses to Dec 6 2006 Stakeholder Team Questions (pdf)

http://certc.ca/public_events.shtml Events and Brochures.

http://certc.ca/monitoring_programs.shtml

http://certc.ca/recovery_plan.shtml to 2012

**SQUAMISH ESTUARY MANAGEMENT PLAN**

[PDF] Skwelwil’em Squamish Estuary Wildlife Management Plan


PDF] View the 1999 Squamish Estuary Management Plan


**REPORT OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE ON THE PROPOSED SQUAMISH ESTUARY MANAGEMENT PLAN**

Volume One and TWO THE PLAN  September 1982

Volume TWO Pages 211 to 233 re: PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT WORK GROUP REVIEWS OF SEMP DRAFT 1982


PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT WORK GROUP MEMBERS
Squamish Estuary Nature Centre ad hoc Committee
Squamish Council
1999
SEMP
https://squamish.civicweb.net/document/10318/February%202,%201999

Page 19 Signatures to 1999 SEMP


1982 TO 1992
SEMP!

Howe Sound has also been improved because the Fraser Basin Council has successfully restored the waters at Britannia Beach on Howe Sound BC.
http://www.fraserbasin.bc.ca/about_britannia.html

Clean up after industry pollutes is never complete and restoration actually takes centuries.

The economy here in Howe Sound no longer depends on big polluting industry. What is evolving is self-employment in businesses that depend on "the scenery". Like the film industry. Also tourist activities because HOWE SOUND NOW HAS WHALES! DOLPHINS! HERRING!

Eagles and salmon have always drawn the public to the wilds of Howe Sound. People stay to live in a healthy environment and to co-exist with nature. There are economic benefits to all aspects from the sea, keeping the wild fishing industry to the sky where Whistler/Blackcomb are world class ski resorts with a growing population in what was once a village. Our proximity to Vancouver BC, also a source of employment, allows those who live in the Howe Sound area to park the car and enjoy recreating without it when not commuting to work elsewhere.

The LNG Project needs to be assessed as a having a negative impact on a recovering Howe Sound.
Many have written who have been able to study and report on the negative impact of the WLNG project, the Fortis BC pipeline and the gigantic tankers.
For me this is a forced endeavor. I feel quite intimidated by the fact that the WLNG company can afford $250 million dollar fines for environmental atrocities elsewhere.
It brings to mind that Woodfibre had 600 pollution violations that could have been charged against the owners and the government would not allow that to happen in 1983.

When in 2005 Woodfibre was closed, there was a statement from the government that the Woodfibre site would never again be used for industry. The re-zoning never took place and now this is a legal application with deadly consequences. Global warming could have been avoided had alternative energies been used these last 40 plus years.

I have lived here since 1977 and I have enjoyed the transition to a Howe Sound that is recovering. Those moving to Squamish now, afford to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars to buy a small accommodation here. This isn't so as to return to dirty industry and the putrid polluted smell of money when industry has an "accident".

Sincerely

XXXXXX

1. even if the new jobs brought by the project are specialized and current residents wouldn’t qualify for them, the workers would move to squamish, which betters our economy and tax base

2. Squamish must have a diverse economy to thrive now and in the long term. It is not one industry at the expense of another.

3. No amount of money can fix an environmental disaster. No to LNG.

4. I think choosing "job" over the impact on the environment is shallow. I own a business in town. I employ 8 people. If we provided opportunities to draw small and medium size green tech businesses into town we would employ the same amount if not more than the LNG projects to employ once it is up and running.

I will never choose something with such a small positive labour and economic impact and such a huge negative environmental and cultural impact over finding new innovative ways of bringing tax base and light industry to Squamish.

5. I grew up in a community/island Haida genii where the economic focus was logging/fishing. I feel this is a similar situation where big business will take and take the resources raping a striping the land abandoning the community as soon as the resources are gone. This devastated the area both financially and economically. You will have undereducated people that for a stretch of time have been making big money and suddenly they are without a wage or skills. I feel squamish is working towards being a tourism destination spot not just a stop on the highway. Putting the plant in a fouling up the air/water/sound would destroy the image we are trying to portray.

6. Industry and tourism can coexist! Just look at all the empty spaces in the downtown core... I don't see the tourism industry rushing to fill them!

7. Simple we need tax revenue, House tax increases, utilities increase etc etc... Here it is (tax revenue) on our doorstep!!

I would rather have LNG Fortis etc... coming to town than the Chekeye fan developed!!!

Trail favorites for many... walking, biking etc... destroyed (if housing development occurs) Recreation = gone!!!

..... LNG.... well ... industry replacing industry (woodfiber)... at least Woodfibre LNG isn't taking away from Squamish's.. world renowned biking trails...

8. The Prosperity fund??? That is a very old concept with little regulation behind it to give it teeth.

9. Want to make sure BC and Squamish locals are hired.
I would rather pay more taxes than give up the Squamish I moved to and the health of my family and the environment.

Alligning with LNG takes Squamish and BC down the wrong economic path. That is not the type of economy or the type of jobs we need.

I don't trust the owner of the WLNG company - he has a record of tax evasion. Why would we get into business with that?

I'm skeptical about the long term economic benefits via tax revenue at municiial and provincial levels.

There doesn't seem to be that many jobs that would results during operations, and the project would put existing economic drivers at risk.

The proposed compressor site location is in prime land that could be used to create many more jobs and benefits than would result through this project.

What happens if the project goes bankrupt part way through construction or operations? Who will clean up the mess? Will we have put a pipeline through our estuary for nothing?

It would be great to get significant tax revenue, from a major industry in Squamish - but I don't believe the negative impacts are worth it.

There is more to building a community of the future than creating a few dozen jobs.

Really, 100 billion $ prosperity fund? Even Christy Clark doesn't talk about that anymore since it has been made clear that market for Lng is now saturated and that LNG plants closer to the original projected buyers can sell for cheaper than we could sell with exporting. Overall this whole survey is seeming pretty biased and like Lng propaganda.

The $100 billion prosperity fund has not been mentioned by our provincial government for months - why would it be included here with a link to a press release that is 2 years old? This misleading, outdated information should not be in this questionnaire!

Woodfibre LNG would be an asset to Squamish as it would help diversify our economy.

a socio economic study should occur that would look at other costs. Costs to health with air pollution, costs to other industries, etc. Costs seem skewed in industries favor, AND the amount of jobs / BENEFIT provided is extremely low to locals!

Follow truth and passion and monetary gain will occur naturally

Don't fall for habit of the past but follow what is naturally meant to be here .

We could be so innovative and we can thrive in many different ways.

Just try to think outside the box .

Einstein did and so can we

While we live in times that are on the cusp of making transitions towards decreasing our fossil fuel dependancy it is incumbent upon all countries to minimize projects that are not absolutely necessary. The future is companies who are developing alternative energy sources - we want these industries in Squamish. We also need secondary industries which
operate regarding the communities values of supporting our air water and land towards healthy eco systems in which humans can live symbiotically.

it is 100% NOT okay with me that i will be paying more taxes because Council turns down this project.

I do not support they can not justify the jobs and taxes

It should provide safe well paying jobs

The values I would pursue are to do with tourism not LNG. Tourism is more positive than a company that is not honest and forthcoming with their plans. Requested socio-economic study has not been provided.

This industry and tourism can easily co-exist. Done correctly, it can enhance our tourism product

I am not in favour of this project. The value of this project will be detrimental to Squamish tourism and environment.

Squamish and Howe Sound have already given their contribution to heavier industry (Woodfibre pulp mill, Britannia mine, and others) Lets really focus on a new direction that take full advantage of the local beauty and natural attractions.

We can do so much better by encouraging other light industry and tourism.

### community impacts - Facts |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>&quot;Woodfibre LNG is responsible for all services and infrastructure (water, sewer, power) on site, thus not impacting our community services.&quot; The idea that covering the costs of bringing the utilities to them covers the whole cost is false. Who will pay the ongoing costs of maintaining this new infrastructure and the increase in demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>We have more oversight in Canada than we ever have. We care about the environment, we care about the economy, we care about the future generation and providing education, health, protection. The world will always be evolving in energy needs and energy production. As a father and grandfather I think we need to be both stewards of the economy and the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Social impacts include good jobs for citizens, both direct and indirect; as well as the ability of our citizens to improve their quality of life through Provincial revenues that will allow for our social spending to improve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Damaging our views and air/water will pull us backwards as we are finally making progress in tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I understand the compressor station is going to be in the most state of the art building enclosure with the best sound abatement measures and therefore noise won't be a problem. I'd like to make sure this is enforced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Squamish is more recreationally based than it was even 20 years ago. The draw to this area is not only the activities but the beauty of the area. Just like residence speaking up about the scow freighter sitting in the Squamish Harbour, we do not want the LNG plant to be a blight on the landscape. There is currently only access to a very few people to the 'West' side of the river. Just like the Gondola opened up hiking views on the East side of the valley, hiking and recreation on the West side will be a very real opportunity if the back country access was allowed through this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>It would really give a poor brand message. That this up and coming Green Community is tied to this outdated fracking fossil fuel industry. Shipping accidents have happened all over the world, and they could certainly happen in Howe Sound....definitely not worth the RISK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I came here for the mountains and the views. I know I'm not the only one. LNG would be a huge eyesore. It would ruin the beautiful, tranquil, isolated sound we live in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>None of the above in my humble opinion. The greatest community benefit is tax revenue and perhaps some construction jobs for trades like electricians, welders and support industries such as marine transport of materials and people to site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The location of the compressor terrifies me. WAY to close to residential areas including mine. We are not equipped to evacuate adequately. This compressor location is unacceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>As I said before, I live in the kill zone of the pumping station. Add a couple hundred meters to that radius and now you've included 2 schools. Even the thought of an explosion, which will happen is tragic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I live in Dentville and am appalled at the idea of a compressor station around the corner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Please I'm begging you .. No LNG for all of us!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>The compressor station is best located away from town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>You have hit on many important issues, and again it's hard for me to say what is most important, though I imagine that the District of Squamish should focus on local issues (i.e., impacts on ferry traffic is something that BC Ferries can worry about).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Since the shut down of Woodfibre the demographic of Squamish has changed significantly. What was acceptable then to the community certainly will not be acceptable now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Stable employment from Woodfibre LNG will increase our commercial and residential tax base. Our town has aging infrastructure and limited industrial and commercial taxpayers. Increased tax revenues without increasing tax rates will help us to afford improvements to our infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>The LNG facility will change the landscape of the community- we will see the facility from some of the most popular spots to recreate in the community- the Chief, the gondola, the estuary, the Spit, Nexen beach, the ocean where people sail- which are all big tourist spots as well. But the impact will be further reaching than that as well- you will see the tankers going up and down the sound- in fact that might be the first thing you see as you get closer to Squamish. You will see the swath of where the trees are cut down for the pipeline, the trees, grasslands and marshes in the estuary will all be changed, damaged or gone. As will be the wildlife. We won't see the whales, dolphins and fish that are all coming back. The facility and tankers will undoubtedly create more pollution, even if there isn't a spill. The flaring will be a sore sight to see that will be visible from afar and a constant reminder of the fact that we are allowing someone to pillage our ressources and damage our forests, oceans and environments. The noise will take away from the nice outdoor experience that we all come here for and love. The Sound is already a busy area most of the months now with sailers, kite boarders/kite surfers, paddleboarders, fishery boats- not to forget the ferries as the tankers get further away from the Sound - it's a pretty small area to now throw in massive tankers. Surely an accident will eventually occur and our community and environment will suffer the most.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Council will have many new factors to consider should this proposal happen. To get an idea regarding the noise smell and light pollution, they should read the EA comments from Environment Canada Protection operations: <a href="http://a100.gov.bc.ca/appsdata/epic/documents/p408/1425490115555_ZyrT%5D30QhXLSVDQh3TcB0Q9tpC211lYkkFp1HG1K1NT9cVVPsLy6113783384551425486896594.pdf">http://a100.gov.bc.ca/appsdata/epic/documents/p408/1425490115555_ZyrT]30QhXLSVDQh3TcB0Q9tpC211lYkkFp1HG1K1NT9cVVPsLy6113783384551425486896594.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>the project has already proven they want to support Squamish! I have seen many donations made to community programs and events.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concern about "impacts to views" seems a lot like nimbyism. Industry must exist and sometimes it has to exist where we live. If we're really concerned about views, stop allowing these mega-houses to be built that block out the landscape.

Woodfibre LNG will be a significant taxpayer to the municipality, but will provide all their own infrastructure services. That really is the district getting something for nothing! I don't know what else there is to say about this. This is revenue desperately needed to pay for our own infrastructure services that were mismanaged by past councils and if council is smart then a portion can be put away into a reserve fund for future years.

I really feel the concerns about marine traffic are overstated. Howe sound is a wide body of water with lots of room for all users. We are only talking about maybe 4 return transits a month. This is hardly a lot. I grew up sailing off lions gate bridge in West Vancouver and that is a narrow busy waterway and yet in all the years I have never seen an incident in the narrows.

Large companies provide great sponsorship opportunities for local sports teams and facilities. This can increase the opportunity for youth participation in sport making Squamish a healthier community. Squamish could easily become an education and training centre for the LNG industry in BC. With our close proximity to the major post secondary education institutions (UBC, SFU, BCIT, etc) and the huge population base of the lower mainland this could be a huge opportunity for trades training.

Research opportunities also exist in better utilizing waste CO2 and heat from the facility, foreshore rehabilitation, environmental monitoring, etc

I do think that the location of the fortis compressor station is not a great use of our small amount of employment lands. I would like to see this in different location, but that may or may not be feasible. I don't have concerns about the safety of this, just that the amount of land in the industrial park is limited.

Compressor stations are noisy, and are occasionally detrimental to air quality

I have a problem with the impacts of the windsports people to local marine traffic. They do not stay within the proscribed area under the Wildlife Area Management Plan 2007 and have caused many near misses.

This is again power and money. This idea is being bought and paid for by community events and its crap. The site of lng is not a pretty one, pollution to water air and social is there and I'm sad it's being told it's happening not asked. Political approval for environmental messes is not cool.

The more people we have working locally, the more people we have with time on their hands to volunteer in the community. People who commute to Vancouver or Whistler every working day, have little time or energy left to volunteer.

W LNG will be self sufficient therefor no financial risk in that sense. As far as light pollution goes - the lights from the gondola can be seen from Pt Mellon and Sechelt I don't see WLNG should be judged any differently. I would like to see WLNG change their docking facilities from Darrel Bay to somewhere downtown like the Yacht Club for example. Squamish would certainly benefit from having 100 employees pass through D/T every day. The congestion at Darrel Bay is considerable and becoming more of a problem with increased visitors to the Gondola.

impact on tourism,
Council should not consider any donations or sponsorship of local organizations and events WLNG has done so far, as it is completely inappropriate that the proponent is buying support while in the approval process. This is in no way indicative what they may do once the project is approved and public decision-making ought not be affected by what essentially equates to bribes. Squamish has fantastic natural assets and water-based recreation and fishing, this marine traffic will be impacted by the large LNG carriers which typically must have exclusion zones around them. The carriers are significantly larger than the current freighters using the Sound, it will also double the amount of traffic. This does not happen without impacts to other marine activities in such a narrow fjord. The flare stack, site and operations will be visible from our biggest tourist attraction and the highway and we have no guarantees about the timing of flaring and volume of it.

Fortis compressor station takes up a large amount of industrial land base with no employment associated with it along with being close to the centre of commercial and light industrial activities not to even mention residential neighbourhoods. Any accidents, even minor ones, will be impactful on many people.

It's irrelevant that WLNG has its own infrastructure as that would be the case for any operation and this should really only be a consideration when calculating real net gains of the project. Regardless of the site use, it's not realistic that the district would ever supply infrastructure to the site given its location.

The council should give careful consideration to the psychological impacts in the community from this project. It's clearly visible from the highway, sits at a highly visible location at the entrance to the town. It will say something about the community, I am afraid none of it matching the brand and profile we are currently enthusiastically building. Our brand is that of a sustainable community, not one of industrial boom and bust town.

I believe the visual impact on an LNG terminal will be significant. It will create a negative visual perception on our town, especially from tourist attractions like the Gondola, smoke bluffs and the Chief. As a paddler, I find it disconcerting to think about kayaking by an LNG facility. I recognize that the danger is mitigated however it is still present and difficult not to think about. When I think about beautiful, natural places like Squamish - for example, Banff, Revelstoke, Victoria - I truly believe an LNG terminal will impact traffic to our town. Can you imagine skiing in Banff with a massive pit mine visible form the ski lift? This would be similar.

A compressor station in the middle of town, close to residences and a command centre is increasing risk in the event of an accident

Accidents do happen
A percentage of tourists will be put off visiting the area due to the LNG plant.

It is not the view of the plant that I object to but what that sight says about us. It says we are like every other community in BC that only gives lip service to environmental concerns. That we are not prepared to do the hard work required to reduce GHGs either here or abroad. That we might encourage our citizens to ride the bus or their bikes but we still want the jobs and dollars from fossil fuels.

We have just finished building the Sea to Sky Gondola which attracts tourists from all around the world. It provides awesome views of Howe Sound. However the proposed LNG facility would be right in the middle of this view of Howe Sound. Why jeopardise the gondola which is employing a lot of local residents.

What better of a location can there be for an industrial operation than at the Woodfibre site? Concerns about visual impacts? We have been living with the site for a century and it is on the opposite shoreline. Sorry, but the recreational 'industry' does not properly pay the bills. As an outdoorsy person myself, I find that there are more than enough places one can go to enjoy nature. We are so fortunate to have the space in this corridor, and country as a whole, to be able to have both industry and recreational areas side by side. Listening to new commuting residents from the city, who view Squamish as a bedroom community, complain about industry really irks me. Many of these people, who I believe support the LNG ban, do not have the interests of this town in their reasonings. As a 20+ year resident of this town, and fierce
supporter of it, I want to see balanced books and fiscal responsibility before embarking on political gamesmanship.

35. The pristine views form the Chief and the Gondola will be scarred by this project possibly reducing tourism. People will not want to kayak or boat tour past an industrial site spewing hot, chlorinated water into our sound or seeing flaring or hearing loud buzzes and industrial noise. The compressor will create a large amount of buzzing sounds that can negatively affect humans and animals and cause great stress and anxiety and decrease property values for both business and residents. Squamish has finally seen a water sports company offering rentals of kayaks, paddle board etc from Downtown Squamish. this is just the first of many of these kinds of businesses if we continue to let the Sound heal itself so that people can recreate on it in spring, summer, fall and winter.

36. **** you are stupid.

37. Currently recreation access to the area above the Woodfibre site (e.g. Henrietta Lake, Mt Sedgwick) is just about nil because it has to accessed by boat, and it is very difficult to get permission to dock a boat there.

38. I believe that the proponent has the community in mind regarding the site look and effects. I actually think that this will create an attractive effect at night with a well thought out lighting strategy. Woodfibre added something interesting at night on the other side of the sound. Not all industry has to be bad.

39. How many people are going to move away if this project comes? How many jobs will leave or never come because LNG goes against the belief sytem of the people/companies who moved here? Squamish is booming and it’s not because of this project. Howe Sound is seeing a revitalization that most people have never seen in their lifetimes.

40. LNG is not wanted here. No amount of money is worth this dirty industry. It concerns me that so much of the community is opposed to LNG industry yet they are still here pushing it. That should be a concern on the list, LNG/Fortis bullying and pushing unwanted industry on an already healthy and growing community. LNG does not fit in our community- period.

41. Woodfibre LNG will be paying significant taxes to the district while creating very little burden on community services - this is a good thing.

42. It is important for the Project to develop and maintain its own Social License, over time this will be how the community measures its success.

43. Woodfibre spokespersons have outwardly admitted that this development will have an impact. Is this the kind of impact citizens are willing to accept? That should be a primary question in regards to community. Undoubtedly, industrial development will impact views, property values, and the overall societal view of the sound. Regardless of the measures taken, there will be noise, smell and light pollution. These things are unavoidable with industry. The fact the Woodfibre has invested in community events should have no bearing - other than to acknowledge the political bribery that occurs with any such project. An environmental organization that is funded by LNG interests is on very unstable, compromised ground indeed.

44. A refinery on Howe Sound that lights up the night skies flaring off gas and puts an ugly esthetic scar on the horizon. Yeah this will be wonderful for all things that appeal to a sense of beauty. It will effect property values and it will cause many people to move and others not to settle here in the first place. Britannia Beach is more effected by this proposal than Squamish is. We live directly across from it and the Taicheng development that is proposed might not even be viable with heavy industry scarring the views. This effects Furry Creek and the Porteau development too. In which do we realize the greater benefit, industrial marine traffic or recreational marine traffic?
The people who have moved to Squamish in recent years have moved here for lifestyle choices and not career choices. You now have a population of people who choose to live here not because they need to for work. If the LNG plant were to go through, would the workers have the same desire to be in Squamish if the LNG plant closed?

The residents of the new era of Squamish are different than the ones 50 years ago, where heavy industry ruled town. This project does benefit a few (the Asian company and the few lucky locals that might get a job cause they have the relevant special skills) but a lot will loose.

Don’t let them buy their way into our community, that is unacceptable bribery. We can’t build a community on such an unpredictable business that is owned by such a questionable person who is not Canadian. The profits will leave, they will not be re-invested in the Canadian economy.

In any community, large or small, enterprises are a large contributor to the community because they cultivate community. Bedroom communities - communities that serve as a place for one to rest their head ... it is not a town where people get involved. Having large and small employers in town are a place for communities to begin; cohort relationships, company sport teams, corporate fundraising ... all happening locally. Large industries have been know to contribute to high school graduates in the form of scholarships and awards. Also this site has been apart of the history of this town, where there has been industry that gave to Squamish for a long time; friends met there, mentors were found, partners fell in love and married, generations saw their families there, children seeing their parents going to work - crossing the Howe Sound. This can be an important cornerstone in our community.

The security controls to protect these tankers will inevitably result in severe restrictions on tourist and local water traffic. They will seek to mitigate all threats, and expand their control as far as they can (they/LNG investors). We are losing Coast Guard capacity at an alarming rate, and LNG will install their own security and control measures that will not serve local interests.

Also there is no mention of other social impacts, such as the inevitable rise in crime, drugs, prostitution, and drains on social resources (ie medicine) that will occur. Research shows that these impacts are a near certainty with any large industrial operation, and our town will be overrun with speeding jacked up pickup trucks, short term workers with no bond to or respect of the community, an our highways will be clogged with dangerous heavy industrial trucks. We don't need more deaths on the road, or more people selling drugs, or more people packed into our already stressed hospitals and clinics. Short term boom that goes with construction will be the worst part of this impact, and all the good that we have done in this town will be quickly undone with the first wave of outside workers descending on our town, acting like they own it, and walking all over the local residents while justifying their actions on the shoulders of a few measly tax dollars.

A LNG plant will detract from the beautiful surrounding of Howe Sound, which many businesses have invested many millions of dollars.

LNG tankers have been demonstrated to be huge unwieldly ships...requiring great distances to stop and long views by the captain to operate. I've heard they will go slow, but that is relative. Putting these behemoths in the same waters as cargo ships (coming into the squamish terminal) and sport boats doesn't seem appropriate.

Rerouting of ferry traffic is an economic cost to that area.

I think Fortis has picked the worst place to put in a compressor station. It is right in the middle of town. It is near housing, brand new car showrooms and other new facilities, a school, the Railway Museum, etc. What were they thinking? Oh, yes, I remember this location is cheaper than others that were considered. How does the increased tanker traffic (80 trips per year) fit into our recreational boating, kite-surfing etc. Can you picture the kite-surfer and the LNG tanker side by side? We have it all, for water related activities, why ruin this?

Opening up public access to Tiampo Park, perhaps a trail along the new gas line on the West side of the Squamish River. Public Ferry use for Backcountry access, camping, mountain biking, etc. Amazing logging road network available from
The SOCIODECONOMIC IMPACTS of WFLNG could be devastating. So much so that very little is written about it in the WFLNG EA Application. According to a report released by the David Suzuki Foundation, Howe Sound’s watersheds at risk provide up to $4.7 billion in natural services to the region each year (http://www.davidsuzuki.org/media/news/2015/02/study-shows-abundance-of-natural-wealth-in-howe-sound/). We need to have a much larger conversation around how this LNG export terminal will affect our current economy, lifestyle, and how we want the world to see us.

LNG tankers and facilities are supposed to have a sustained clearance at all times. Does that mean that when tankers are in transit or at the terminal the Howe Sound will be closed to ferry and recreational boating??

How can LNG allow access to back country when they have to maintain a security perimeter around the facility?

There are too many things being said by LNG that conflict with rules and regulations, I just can't trust much of what they say.

It's not maintenance that makes the noise its the flare, these things can be heard over 5km away in open areas who knows what it would sound like in a confined valley. And I'm sure these would occur randomly at all hours of night and day, disrupting lives and creating undue stress in the community.

These are the SITGTO regulations for an LNG Terminal (http://www.savepassamaquoddybay.org/lingtss/standards.html)

SIGTTO LNG Terminal Siting Standards
Abbreviated Summary

The LNG industry has a good safety record. Any LNG catastrophe could destroy public confidence in the industry, ending the import of LNG.

Observing the industry's best practices and standards helps to preserve safety, public confidence, the industry, energy security, and the economy.

• There is no acceptable probability for a catastrophic LNG release [1];
• LNG ports must be located where LNG vapors from a spill or release cannot affect civilians [2];
• LNG ship berths must be far from the ship transit fairway; • To prevent collision or allision [3] from other vessels;
• To prevent surging and ranging along the LNG pier and jetty that may cause the berthed ship to break its moorings and/or LNG connection;
• Since all other vessels must be considered an ignition source;

• LNG ports must be located where they do not conflict with other waterway uses [4] — now and into the future. [This
requires long-range planning for the entire port area prior to committing to a terminal location;

• Long, narrow inland waterways are to be avoided, due to greater navigation risk;
• Waterways containing navigation hazards are to be avoided as LNG ports;
• LNG ports must not be located on the outside curve in the waterway, since other transiting vessels would at some time during their transits be headed directly at the berthed LNG ship;
• Human error potential always exists, so it must be taken into consideration when selecting and designing an LNG port.

>> Additional items exist in the standard than are summarized here. Please refer to "Site Selection and Design for LNG Ports and Jetties."

1 While risk of small LNG spills is acceptable, any risk of catastrophic LNG release is unacceptable. 2 Sandia National Laboratories defines for the US Department of Energy three Hazard Zones (also called, "Zones of Concern") surrounding LNG carriers. The largest Zone is 2.2 miles/3,500 meters around the vessel, indicating that LNG ports must be located at least that distance from civilians. Some world-recognized LNG hazard experts, such as Dr. Jerry Havens (University of Arkansas; former Coast Guard LNG vapor hazard researcher), indicate that three miles or more is a more realistic Hazard Zone distance. 3 Allision — (nautical term) Collision between a moving vessel and a stationary vessel or object. 4 Conflicting waterway uses include fishing and recreational boating.

Unfortunately WLNG doesn't seem to meet any of those guidelines and is contrary to all but one and even that comes into question as the terminal would be in a confined valley.

58 Even having this in proximity to our town will make us look bad. Are we progressive or not? Status quo...

59 The site is several kilometers away from town and saves our local government a great deal of money in that they do not have to provide roads, water, sewer, garbage, fire services to name some. The proponent has already shown that they are good citizens in supporting some community groups.

60 I am worried about the LNG tankers going through all those recreational boats and ferries, water taxis, whale watching tours, water skiers, etc.

I have great concern re loss of dark night skies from the flaring, as well as from the safety lighting. And re loss of quiet in Howe Sound.

And having a compressor station literally in Squamish is not safe...nor is having a 24” natural gas pipeline go through residential neighborhoods. Google "compressor station fire image" or "natural gas pipelinei fire image" and see how many incidents come up - it's impressive.
Nature has worked hard to remediate the Sound and industry is working hard to make money. Woodfibre LNG doesn't care about marine life, land life, its impacts—it cares about making money and contributing as little as possible to Squamish to get our consent. They offer a few jobs, do what's expected, do some clean-up, and pay for some jerseys for kids teams—it's all corporate pandering. They don't want to build Squamish, they want to use Squamish.

Ha Ha Ha (as I read the statement that WLNG has invested in community events etc) - more like bribed - and it has paid off in spades for them. Groups like the Squamish Streamkeepers are on their pay bill as is Quest University (who is telling their students the WLNG is all but a done deal) and heaven knows how many other "investments" WLNG has doled out have provided them with their desired results! It is sad that there is not more integrity or intelligence in this town!

As for the other statements I think it is safe to say that the compressor station will definitely have an impact on the residents and businesses in the vicinity of the proposed site in the Industrial Park. I would hate to be within 1 km of that station and the deep throbbing hum it will be generating - not to mention the odour!

WLNG does not add anything to Squamish and the Howe Sound, except pollution on all levels. It will be an eyesore. It will destroy habitat that has recently recovered from the last round of polluting industries. The company is in Singapore so all profits will leave BC. There will be no financial gain for Squamish from taxes, GST or PST. Even property taxes WLNG wants a big break on and the federal government is offering them big tax breaks too.

There will be up to 100 jobs. How many of these will be given to Squamish residents? Not many, I'll bet. And 100 jobs is a pitance for a company that plans to ship 2 million tonnes of LNG annually. It's a lousy ratio and does little to provide Squamish residents with good jobs which is what lots of people are pinning their hopes on.

Also, I believe it will cause some companies that might be thinking of moving here to move elsewhere because they won't want to live and work near an LNG plant, taking their jobs and taxes with them.

Noise, smells, flaring, light pollution, tanker traffic. All a front and centre view from our new gondola. A project which we are getting very positive recognition for. The two do not integrate with one another.

There will be a sulphur smell, 377' tall flare seen from our brand new tourism based gondola...yuck!! It will not be attractive from any perspective, sea to sky highway, boat on the water, or gondola on the mountain. Then boats will have to keep quite away from the tankers (1.6 km) in an already narrow passage. Then there is the potential for the tanker traffic to increase even more in the future, the inherent potential!

Our taxes should be paying for community events and youth sports. Not LNG. It was a very calculated and cynical bribe. No surprise though considering the head of the organisations business track record. Very unsavoury and dishonest.

Woodfibre is trying to buy local support by donating money to all local youth sports! This does not change the fact that this is a terrible idea!!!

Have you ever been to kitimat?? Enough said.

The impacts to views actually may have a negative effect for the industry, especially if it is strongly contrasted with the beauty of Squamish. Wondering if people may leave questioning what they themselves are doing for the environment and why we keep spoiling it.

Canada has limited regulation on LNG carriers so there will be less impact on BC Ferries, recreators, etc than their might be in other jurisdictions. However, this is not necessarily because Howe Sound is a suitable location for this sort of traffic, but rather just that Canada doesn't have as strict rules as other places. It is not clear to me whether Canada's rules
are sufficient. I would feel much better if WLNG/Fortis were adhering to the highest international standards, and not just the bare minimum of Canadian regulations.

73 Safety? worst case events can and do happen. what about the impact of dividing residents? morale of residents..we are proud of Squamish and excited about our future, and this is important to why Squamish is so great. Could this optimism and energy be squandered? will that affect our prospects of reaching our potential. Hard to quantify but very important.

74 Development and operation of Woodfibre LNG will be visible and detrimental to environment, wildlife, people health and tourism focused businesses in Squamish and vicinity.

75 Safety

76 LNG supporting our community culture will be a huge benefit. LNG is self supporting in it's infrastructure and therefor will not be negatively affecting ours. However the extra tax revenue could sure help to fix our aging infrastructure.

77 You have identified my main concerns in your first three points.

78 Lets be realistic...the community will be impacted in a variety of unfortunate ways. This really worries me.

79 Squamish has made it into the focus of many around the world and when I tell people where I reside, they comment on how lucky I am. And I am, but returning the area to a smelly town to keep on driving by, is short-sighted and lacks vision for a healthier, more robust and life enhancing community. We have long since past this model.

80 I doubt that the New York Times had an LNG plant in mind when they recommended Squamish as a must see place. Our credibility as a recreation paradise would be badly damaged if we support LNG. I think that all that we stand for would take a big hit. Squamish is a great place to live and, over all, there is prosperity. Let us not throw that away for promises of a few jobs and a bigger tax base. The cost is far too high.

81 All community and eco tourism industries will be effected. Noise pollution from the plant and large commercial marine traffic noise will effect cause loud noises and effect sleeping patterns. If its foggy the ships will blow their fog horns, moving large ships with tug boats make large noises, attaching industrial lines to ships cause noise and noise travels clearly and for large distances on water.

82 a new major industry in the community will provide benefits for the social aspects of the community.

83 Bullet point 2 should be part of bullet point 5. It's all stuff that will affect the community, tourism, recreation.

84 Same as previous comments

85 Its going to impact our water ways and environment.

86 Every professional asked about the impact to current and future marine traffic has said the tankers will have minimal impact, so this should not even be an issue, just like backcountry access will have minimal impact on recreation opportunities. Focus on the big rocks and stop wasting time sifting through gravel.

87 This facility will detract from our scenic surroundings.

88 The negative effects of the smell, viewscapes and noise will have untold effects on tourism, well being and satisfaction of
residents and tourists alike. The effects of marine life are not fully studied. The whole facility will be front and center from the highway, the gondola and anyone in the sound (kiteboarders, sailors, kayakers, and standup paddle boarders) in all its ugliness and pollution.

89. No doubt the project will damage the natural settings in which it sits. Visual, auditory and olfactory insults are inevitable. They may not be reasons to spurn the prospect of "good jobs" for Squamish, but once again, recent INTERNATIONAL attention to our community has all focused on our natural beauty and recreational opportunities. One need only look to Whistler to understand these are viable economic drivers for a THRIVING community. Or, consider Canmore, if you want an example closer to that of Squamish i.e. a formerly industry-based town who's re-invented itself as primarily a tourist destination.

90. With Howe Sound de-industrializing it is not appropriate to re-introduce heavy industry which will destroy any possibility of the Sound becoming a UNESCO World Heritage Site with all the benefits this brings - tourism, increased spending in the area by visitors, increased employment and tax base.

91. Woodfibre LNG are trying to buy our acceptance by funding community events & facilities. It's bribery corruption & propaganda IMO. Not to mention all the fliers and radio ads and even cold calling.

92. Woodfibre LNG will contribute to our taxes (growth). Squamish is a growing community and will continue to expand and our taxes will just keep going up but at least Woodfibre LNG will help with these costs.

93. Compressor stations are not legally allowed to be that close to residences because of risk of explosion. Noise from tankers will prevent herring spawning damaging the food chain immensely in howe sound. World class wind/kitesurfing site ruined

94. Squamish is just starting to be recognized as a tourist destination. Let's not pollute the view from our gondola or the Chief with industry.

95. Consider what Squamish is becoming not where it has been. We are no longer a strickly resourced based economy and we need to consider how this will be detrimental to tourism and the young families and business that want to invest in Squamish as a clean healthy place to live and work. Not another kitimat

96. Marine sports will be negatively impacted. Compressor in residential area will have negative effect on housing values.

97. WLNG donating to youth sports and services, and local charities is a good thing. Considering that most business's in this town can't afford to donate a lot these days.

98. I am very concerned about all three of the items checked here. None of these are acceptable.

99. LNG plant not a fit for this community.

100. 1) How will temporary construction workers impact social services?
   Studies during construction of similar industrial projects show that:
   - the number of workplace accidents increase.
   - crime and substance abuse and misuse increase which leads to an increase in traffic accidents and collisions, as well as increased domestic violence.
   - the additional demands on hospitals, counselling, police, and ambulance services results in reduced service capacity for residents.

   2) Property values along pipeline and tanker routes can decrease by 10-40% 
   Resource development projects, such as pipelines, or in this case, the proposed Woodfibre LNG export facility and transiting tankers, have the potential to impact property values. Both direct impacts (following an accident with tankers
or pipelines) or the perception of impacts (the possibility that an accident may happen) were clearly linked to reduced property values. Directly impacted properties can devalue by 10-40%, while properties nearby can also see a 5-8% reduction in value.


3) Rental accommodation costs can skyrocket as temporary construction workers look for local accommodation. This puts low-income families at risk as they can no longer afford to live in Squamish.

4) Will there be smell? Will there be smog? You bet.

Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2) is a reddish-brown gas with a pungent, irritating odour. It absorbs light and leads to the yellow-brown “smog” pollution haze seen hanging over cities. It is known to irritate the lungs and increase susceptibility to respiratory infections. In combination with either ozone (O3) or sulphur dioxide (SO2), nitrogen dioxide may cause injury at even lower concentration levels. Sulphur Dioxide (SO2) is a toxic gas with a pungent, irritating, and rotten smell. Current scientific evidence links short-term exposures to SO2, ranging from 5 minutes to 24 hours, with an array of adverse respiratory effects including bronchoconstriction and increased asthma symptoms. These effects are particularly important for asthmatics at elevated ventilation rates (e.g., while exercising or playing). Studies also show a connection between short-term exposure and increased visits to emergency departments and hospital admissions for respiratory illnesses, particularly in at-risk populations including children, the elderly, and asthmatics. The addition of these air pollutants in Howe Sound is of particular concern as recent research has shown that the Howe Sound airshed and Lower Fraser Valley airsheds are connected. Emissions from Woodfibre LNG will add to the pollution in Howe Sound, exacerbating the existing air quality conditions, particularly in the Squamish-Brackendale corridor.

Recent research (by MSc student Annie Seagram, studying under Professor Douw Steyn, Department of Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Sciences at the University of British Columbia) has shown that the Howe Sound airshed and Lower Fraser Valley airsheds are connected. Emissions from Woodfibre LNG will add to the pollution in Howe Sound, exacerbating the existing air quality conditions, particularly in the Squamish-Brackendale corridor. Note that Metro Vancouver annually issues several Air Quality Advisories due to high concentrations of ground-level ozone. This pollution also impacts the Howe Sound and Squamish, and exposure to these pollutants are of particular concern for infants, the elderly, and is directly linked to health issues such as lung or heart disease and asthma.

5) Noise is also a real concern for me, especially as I spend a lot of time on the water while kiting. Light pollution is another key concern.

4) Compressor station location

Accidents are fairly rare, but they do happen and when they do the results can be catastrophic causing loss of life, injuries, property damage, and environmental damage. Why is this compressor station being proposed in a populated area close to businesses, homes, a daycare, a playground, and our emergency response centre? What happens if something goes wrong? What is the emergency response? What will the evacuation area be if there is an explosion or a fire? What is the worst case scenario? How far away will the shut-off valves be? What is the response-time to close the shut-off valves? Shouldn’t this compressor station be located in a less-populated area?

5) High pressure pipeline route

Pipelines and compressor stations have a very poor accident record. Why is this pipeline being located on a route so close to homes and local businesses?
6) How will this impact the desirability of Squamish as a place to live and work?
Since the pulp mill shut down, Squamish's population has increased from ~15 thousand to ~19 thousand residents. Our demographic has changed dramatically, with a large number of young, educated, and sustainably-minded people moving here to enjoy the lifestyle and start families. How will the LNG plant affect this demographic? Will it change the perception people have of Squamish? Will it impact the desirability of Squamish as a place to live? Will increased emissions and associated health impacts mean that people move away? How will that impact the value of real estate? What about our ability to attract new businesses and tech start-ups? Are we limiting ourselves to heavy industry development and scaring away more sustainable businesses?

7) There is no social license for this project
This project has already divided the community, and created a lot of social unrest. There are several sites both in support and in opposition to this project.

a) Support: Yes to LNG = 860 facebook likes
https://www.facebook.com/pages/Yes-to-LNG-Squamish/243849229149438

b) Opposition: No to LNG = 5260 facebook likes
https://www.facebook.com/notolngsquamish

C) Opposition: My Sea to Sky = 2,100 facebook likes
https://www.facebook.com/myseatosky

My Sea to Sky also has ~600 people on our mailing list, and actively works with other partner organizations around Howe Sound to campaign against this project. Partners that have provided support for our campaign so far include:

AWARE Whistler

Beyond Boarding

Bowen Island Conservancy

The Common Sense Canadian

Concerned Citizens Bowen

Council of Canadians

David Suzuki Foundation

Dogwood Initiative
Douglas Channel Watch

Elphinstone Community Association

Future of Howe Sound

Gambier Island Conservancy

Gibsons Alliance

Lead Now

Marine Life Sanctuary Society

No to LNG - Squamish

Organizing for Change

Propeller Strategy

Save Howe Sound

Skeena Watershed Conservation Coalition

Skwomesh Action

Squamish CAN

Squamish Environment Society

Squamish River Watershed Society

West Coast Environmental Law

Wilderness Committee
1. Squamish is Canada's gem of eco tourism. The instillation of LNG will scar this beautiful land. Increased tanker traffic, pipelines, compressor noise, infrastructure associated with this and air pollution. These are not positive additions to what is now a showcase piece of Canada's ecological beauty.

2. Tax base...lower taxes means more affordable housing

3. This project is not a good fit here in this community. This will negatively impact rectech and tourism. The point of LNG investing and giving back to the community is something that all companies in squamish already do to some extent. This is simply tax write offs for their bottom line, similar to all other businesses. A good business move, but not one that will be supported by this community.

4. Industrialization of the view scape.

5. There are many social problems in Squamish. These problems include homelessness, multiple barriers for those who are poor, or experiencing intersectional oppression. There is also a housing crisis, and continuing cuts to the social safety net. These problems will not be significantly helped by the LNG development. However there is the risk that the proposed LNG project could cause a smell, or negatively impact the tourism or environmental draws of Squamish. Further I am very skeptical about the ability of settler Canadian government and corporation capacity to adequately interact with Indigenous peoples in Canada. I want to ensure the consultation process is adequate and not just a cursory hoop that they are jumping through. A concrete example of my concerns is related to some things on the LNG site about Indigenous consultation. They mention that they are going to use Indigenous traditional knowledge in their project. After contacting them about this they said this was simply referring to the fact that historically the Squamish nation has used the fjord to travel and trade with other nations. This a blatant attempt to flaunt the "consultation" process for the benefit of the project. I do not consider using the same channel for the shipping process to warrant using the term 'indigenous knowledge' and I hope this is not indicative of the overall interactions with Indigenous nations.

6. Flaring noise from plant and having to look at it and worry about explosion, more tankers in our waters,

7. If allowed, a new ferry service will create about 30 new permanent jobs.

8. More positive than negative

9. I think Woodfibre LNG will be good for our community. They will help youth sports, and all aspects of our community.

10. The Squamish brand was decided based on rigorous community consultation. This project goes against that brand and is therefore out of step with the community. People haven't made Squamish their home to work in the oil and gas industry. We are here due to the outdoor lifestyle and the natural beauty.

My other concern is the project appears to be rushed through with the best interest of the proponent in mind rather than the best interest of Squamish. It was said at one of the council meetings (by DOS staff) that other locations for the compressor station weren't considered because of zoning and the time it would take to get them rezoned. We should be looking at the best possible outcome for Squamish despite the zoning. Zoning can be changed and if the proponent has to wait for this, then so be it. This plant will be part of Squamish for 25 years if it goes ahead. Let's not rush the process just because it suits the proponent.

This is also the case with the pipeline. It seems the cheapest and easiest option for the proponent has been selected with no regard to residential areas and the added risk of an explosion.
The amount contributed to community/sports groups by WLNG is miniscule compared to the value of the project.

1. The bore holes have already impacted myself and every other mountain biker, hiker, runner who use the trails around Squamish. I don’t want to see tankers anywhere near my home, not just for the aesthetics but also for the environmental risk involved. I’m looking forward to the day when it’s common to see fish jumping, seals hunting, kelp growing in Howe sound. Everyone I know who lives here chose to do so out of love for a quiet, peaceful life in nature.

2. They propose that you should NOT put a plant in a narrow place where residents are close? Why say that and then do it anyway?

3. I can’t believe we would allow a compressor station in our town the size Fortis is wanting. As said before, we have an environment world jewel here, the sight and impact of this big polluting industry here doesn’t make any sense.

4. If they have a major fire over there it will be are people going to the front lines. Who pays for our fire dept training and maintenance of equipment. Are our volunteer fire fighters prepared with appropriate level of training to handle either the compressor station or lng facility when **** hits the fan and do we have appropriate equipment and fire fighting facilities to handle a worst case scenario and who is going to pay for these improvements on all levels? None of this is needed if WLNG gets out of our town, beat it!

5. There will be little effect from noise smell and light pollution from the operation, to those living in Squamish. They are self supporting. We already have 2 compressor stations in the Industrial park, I live close to the it and have never heard anything from either. non issue.

6. Having purchased a home in Dentville, I will be directly impacted by the Fortis compressor station, resulting construction delays and any foreseeable accidents. I certainly hope that the proximity of the compressor station will not affect the value of homes in the Dentville area or potential resale or rental prospects.

From an aesthetic perspective, Woodfibre LNG will dramatically alter the breathtaking beauty of Howe Sound from both the marine and aerial perspective. At the very least, if the plant is approved, I hope that an extensive green roof system will be utilized to help reduce the visual impact of the structure as well as reduce hydro consumption and offset carbon emissions.

7. If LNG comes to Squamish, i will need to consider moving. it scares me to imagine a town that invites this. that is a fact.

8. The pump station in Squamish i see as a huge risk with a 24” pipe line coming in and out of the station. Should an earthquake rupture the pipe line or damage thr compressor station the safe radius around there area would include a large portion of housing in squamish. I base this on an event earlier in the year where a station forced the evacutai of a residential area for three days (if memory serves me (correctly)

9. A compressor station so close to residential/businesses is a disaster waiting to happen, Fortis BC can take every precaution to make it safe, but gas is volatile and can be unpredictable. Humans make mistakes. Disasters happen. This is one we can prevent all together. Massive tankers trying to co-exist with paddle boarders, kite boarders, sailors etc. Not the “get away” most people are looking for. A permanent scar on the landscape, permanent damage to our tourism.

10. We know the compressor plant will have noise and smell impacts to the Industrial Park and this needs to be addressed before FortisBC can proceed further with the pipeline proposal.

We also know prevailing winds will blow from Woodfibre north over Squamish and we will once again be breathing toxic fumes - this was not acceptable in the past and it is definitely not acceptable now.

11. Fact: LNG will be obvious and a disappointing scar in the views from our best new attraction, the Gondola. Fact, the wake
1. from the tugs and freighter traffic up and down the sound will affect the immediate ocean wildlife on the shores available to people who come from afar to enjoy them. Fact: Light emission will be immense, this is something that needs to be addressed immediately. Birds and sea life don’t like light at night, it interrupts the natural course of their day. fact: The very fact that the word “flaring” is in that question is alarming. Fact: The ONLY reason Woodfibre LNG has invested in events and youth sports is to buy our support. Fact: The previous fact is an insult to our intelligence.

2. We have had a significant improvement in air and noise quality with the closure of the old woodfibre and other industrial sites in Squamish over last 17 yrs, so hate to go backwards with this industry and impact on air / marine quality

3. Noise, smell and light pollution rank as the highest concerns, followed by impact on the land for the Fortis compressor station.

4. True facts about the Noise, smell and other pollutions should be considered. They are making money, and they will be impacting the community’s lives. Council should consider whether people in the community would sacrifice their living environment so a company can make money.

5. Discussions should take place regarding what kind of additional public safety might be required in town (not on site) that WLNG could contribute to. (ex. better coast guard monitoring/fire boat for local use)

6. we should be considering transparency. Full on honest transparency. Clearly this is not the case as it stands.

7. And it will look gross from the top of the chief and the gondola. what a stunning view of smog, factory and waste. nice one squamish! i wonder what it looks like in China.

8. The film industry need Squamish Council to SAVE THE VIEWS as do industries relying on tourism and recreation. The film industry need Squamish Council to SAVE THE VIEWS as do industries relying on tourism and recreation.

9. Community members need Squamish Council to protect us from the pollution that will affect climate and views.

10. Based on our understanding of the information provided thus far we have no concern over light, noise, smell, marine traffic, views.

11. Wood fiber has made multiple efforts to deceive the public of Squamish and is not worth the risk

12. Squamish doesn’t want LNG.

13. BC Hydro clearcut of two 64 metre swaths of forest at the Woodfibre site will impact viewscapes from the Sea to Sky highway and the gondola

   BC Hydro is proposing to clearcut two 64 metre swaths of forest at the Woodfibre site which will create visible scars in the Howe Sound viewscape which will be very visible from the highway and the gondola. This information was only made available during the recent BC Hydro open house held on 19th March, near the end of the public comment period. This information is not included in the cumulative impact assessment of the Woodfibre application and it should be. This late release of information pertinent to this project and the timing of the BC Hydro open houses is unsatisfactory.

14. If this development were to go forward, ensuring it didn’t burden our already overtaxed infrastructure would be key.

15. You just have to read the EA application to see what WLNG says they will do to air, sound and light, visuals, stresses on services. No need to repeat.

16. Impacts to views (for community members, tourism, recreation). are also important.

17. so ugly for an incredibly beautiful town

18. A new study published in the scientific journal, Climatic Change, estimates the true social costs of air pollution that aren’t accounted for in the cost of fossil fuels and other pollutants. Social costs include the health impacts of air pollution as well
as impacts from climate change. The study found that sulfur dioxide costs $42,000 per tonne, and nitrous oxides cost $67,000 per tonne. Multiply those dollars by the forecasted WLNG emissions. Who will pay that social cost? Public funding of the health system?

Sources:

Visually, the LNG project would be an eyesore clearly in view from the new Sea to Sky Gondola.

Construction of the pipeline (especially including transport of equipment, people and materials) across to the west side of Squamish River could be very disruptive to existing recreational and tourism uses such as kiteboarding.

Noise, smell and flaring have the potential to impact people and wildlife. I’m also concerned about additional hydro lines that will be required from Cheekye sub-station to WLNG, passing through the community.

BULL****: The proposed LNG project will allow backcountry access to the site for recreation. The reality of the situation is that this plant will be consider a terrorist target and no one will be allow near it. What happened to the SFU professor that just was taking photos of the Burnaby proposed pipeline site last week. In case you missed it on the news, the RCMP tracked his daughter’s phone number down and called him on it, during lunch with his daughter to question him.


Woodfibre LNG has invested in community events, youth sports and research/education/environment in Howe Sound communities: Yes, that is great... but we can make that a reality with any new endeavour in Squamish. Once we give the opportunity for other industries to prosper as much as oil & gas once did- benefits will flow from them also.

BC Hydro is proposing to clearcut two 64 metre swaths of forest at the Woodfibre site which will create visible scars in the Howe Sound viewscape which will be very visible from the highway and the gondola. This information was only made available during the recent BC Hydro open house held on 19th March, near the end of the public comment period. This information is not included in the cumulative impact assessment of the Woodfibre application and it should be. This late release of information pertinent to this project and the timing of the BC Hydro open houses is unsatisfactory.

Also the point Impact to the community on the proposed location of the Fortis compressor station for the pipeline project, is significant.

Once these tankers are in place we will have no control over how many, how load and when a spill occurs. They may say one a day and in a year it may go to ten a day. This will make this beautiful fjord look like Kaula lampur.

It actually disgusts me that they sponsored local events before they are definite part of this community - this is them buying support!

They might be responsible for their services, but it is projects like this that has brought forward the need for Site C dam, which the taxpayers are footing the bill for.

The compressor station location is crazy - noisy and potentially dangerous - there have been several explosions at NG facilities in Canada and the US in the last couple of years - do we really want that in such a populated area, or anywhere in town for that matter?
The plant and tankers will be a huge eyesore for much of the Sound. Who wants to look across from the deck at the gondola to a huge flare stack? I have talked to lots of tourists on the gondola ride and I am yet to find one who can understand how it could be allowed in such a beautiful location.

I want to touch on a qualitative topic, which doesn't get discussed much. The world of feedback is generally a quantitative one, but here's the thing. Squamish isn't what it used to be. People say that Woodfibre pulp mill paid their bills, that logging paid their bills, well sorry to say, but whaling used to pay bills, and worst things such as slavery used to pay bills. Doesn't mean we have to go back and relive those atrocities. In Squamish, polluting industries are a thing of the past. The 100 jobs that WLNG guarantees are a drop in the bucket (and they aren't obviously guaranteed for Squamish.) A few small local companies can easily provide those jobs LOCALLY, not to outsourced labour that provides nothing for Squamish. But I digress. My point is that thousands of people have bought property in Squamish, thousands more live here, companies including tech are investing here, recreation and the film industry are looking up here because it's frigging beautiful and without an eyesore on the water. People want to maintain their property values. The questions of safety with respect to compressor stations, pipelines, ships, and the WLNG terminal, are too great, and will inevitably drive our property values down, and when that happens, people leave and the town itself dies. And that is when we take another step 50 years back.

I am concerned about the compressor station in Squamish. Safety and noise impacts are something that residents should not have to be subjected to. As a climber I find the visual impacts from the site - flaring, tankers, lights to be very upsetting. When you have put hours of energy into climbing high only to look down onto the plant it is not a blissful moment. I am extremely concerned about any impact due to the GHGs that will be released into our communities air space. I am also concerned that WLNG is applying to have the power to increase the plant by 10. This would greatly increase tanker traffic and GHGs.

Howe Sound is a mecca for water-based recreation and boating, of course LNG carriers which require some exclusion around them in the narrow sound is going to have an impact. The freighter traffic will increase and the LNG carriers are much larger in size. Howe Sound is not an appropriate place for LNG carriers.

Flaring could happen a lot more than currently stated by the proponent. It will cause severe visual impacts and affect our tourism and recreational experiences. It could also impact health.

Fortis compressor station is in the wrong place and too close to populated areas. Accidents don't happen often but they do happen and this would have big consequences to people and businesses, and would likely result in deaths and injuries to many.

Very poor use of the proposed location for the compression station. Likely not even a single job there..illogical use of employment lands. Dangerous facility.

Compressor station will be in Industrial Park right beside the CN Railroad property

Fairly recently a natural gas pipeline ruptured, causing an explosion and fire in southern Manitoba. Fortunately, it happened in a farm field. The proposed Fortis pipeline (much larger) will go through a built-up part of Squamish, with the compressor station about 1/2 km from our neighborhood.

Pollution, views for community and tourism. Impact on marine traffic. Pollution could be damaging to ones helath

WLNG needs to continue be a good corporate citizen of Squamish

Job prospects are suspect, risks associated with compressor station are too great to site in a developed community
2. We live within the danger zone of Fortis compressor - I am afraid of that. Will my property devalue because of it?
3. Explosions do happen and after despite Fortis argument to the contrary
4. Easy access. Its already a challenge to get a sailboat out into the Sound on a low tide to have to contend with timing around a large vessel moving about.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>We do not live in isolation anymore or in fact anywhere. The world is connected for better or worse more then it ever has been. The economy is truly global. Climate change is global. Therefore it makes sense that in order to reduce greenhouse gas and replace it with cleaner alternatives we all need to participate. We send cleaner fuel to places that depend now on less clean fuels. And we improve the economy as a result. Nothing in life comes without risk. Separating fact from hearsay and hype from deliberate thought will be a challenge. Hype after all is part of the problem not part of the solution. I am always mystified by those who would like to participate in the benefits of a global economy without taking part in any of the byproduct of said economy. Minimizing that risk is the key. From an environmental and economic standpoint this project makes sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Balance economic, environmental and social values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>there is nothing anyone can say to change my mind. I will not support this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Great opportunities with some realistic concerns of the impact on our current situation. I think we need to proceed . . . but with our eyes open.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>If LNG goes ahead, I will seriously consider moving. It will ruin our special natural town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I am concerned about the impact of construction workers on the availability of hotel rooms. I personally think some types of camp/lodging facilities are not negative, particularly if they are donated for housing. Avoid hyperbole!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>This project will negatively impact the quality of life for many who visit or live in Squamish. Increased noise, air and light pollution in exchange for what? A few promise of backcountry access or jobs. It’s not worth it. Yes, tourists at the Gondola already see industry, but whether or not their scenic views of Squamish are affected, their perception of it as &quot;the best backyard in the world&quot; will be negatively impacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I would heavily consider moving my family out of Squamish if this went forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Will this project damage the success of our amazing new gondola? Success for one overseas businessman (tyrant?) at the likely expense of many local innovators? How can anyone in their right mind support this LNG project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>We can flourish without their blackmail and minimal handouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>The view! ... Please dont take that away Ive lived here for 32 beautiful years because of the awesome view!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I support the lng site at woodfibre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>This project is note worthwhile for the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 14. | I feel that once Squamish got over the initial "hang-over" from the shut down of Woodfibre, our community has grown in
a positive direction. I feel continued revamping to our downtown will be an added asset.

15. I don’t think anyone wants to have Squamish become a centre for heavy industry, I definitely do not. However, I also do not think reliance on tourism is a reasonable answer, either. There should be a balance to the businesses we have in our area and to include industrial, forestry and marine uses. We as a community need to ensure that our businesses behave in a responsible manner and do not cause us, in the future, to regret our decisions.

16. I feel that Squamish is emerging in its own right and becoming such a sought out destination for tourism, recreation, outdoorsy living that will all be lost if the facility comes to fruition. This facility will have such a massive impact on everything we’ve worked on for our community over the last several years.

17. The fact that accidents have happened at other compressor stations is one clear reason why this is not a safe fit for this community. Any of the proposed locations for the compressor station are in too close proximity to residential areas, schools, and other social zones. If Squamish puts a compressor station in an area that is unsafe, I will seriously reconsider living here and I have been a resident for 15 years. I am sure other people feel similar about this situation.

18. Squamish is poised to get the respect it deserves from neighbouring communities. IF WLNG goes ahead, Squamish can once again consider itself the thorn in the side of the rose of Howe Sound.

19. We need some industry to help support our community.

20. They can be a valuable community supporter. There has to be a way for both industry and tourism to work together. It happens all over the world. We can’t survive on people riding the trails and festivals. While they pump money into local businesses, big deal - not all businesses benefit. Some close because of festivals and the chaos around them.

21. I really don’t see negative community impacts from the building of the facility. There will be more people moving to Squamish, but they are moving here anyway and without some industrial taxpayer then the whole burden of servicing and running our community falls to the residential taxpayer. To me this is far more of a concern as we could end up becoming like West Vancouver which is a lovely place to live for the rich. Long time residents will be forced out due to the rising cost of living here.

I just don’t see the risks to the community in my mind are vastly overstated. You just don’t see any evidence of these plants or tankers having catastrophic failures at all. There are risks in anything we do, including driving down the highway, but that doesn’t mean that we just don’t do it. We do what we can to minimize these risks through prudent planning, the highest quality engineering, and a high standard of construction. We are well equipped to lead the world in this. As well it makes far more sense to locate a facility like this near to the huge amount to resources available in the Lower Mainland. Take for example an engine failure aboard a LNG carrier. There are a huge amount of resources available from tugs and ship yards to fix any problem in short order only and hour away. Contrast this to a remote facility on the north coast where it could take days for more tugs to arrive or repairs to be made.

I really think we have to look at the opportunities that exist through the development and operation of this project. Its way to easy to see a negative and then just say NO! If this were the case then we shouldn’t even be developing more land in Squamish at all due to the natural risks that exist here (floodings, earthquakes, the collapse of the barrier, etc). We don’t say No, we work to use our very best practices to minimize and mitigate these risks.

22. I would not like to live anywhere near a compressor station.

23. That council would be doing a great injustice to the people of Squamish if this is stopped by the four.

24. I live here and my daughter will grow up here. I love being here and I want to be here the rest of my life and hers.

25. Being able to work where you live binds people together and instills a sense of pride and community.

26. Squamish needs a diverse economy to survive. If we don’t do something to keep people working in Squamish we are destined to be only a bedroom community and the tax burden will have to come solely from residences. Home taxes are
high now and rapidly rising, Squamish is quickly becoming an expensive place to live. On the other hand people demand certain amenities to live here. Somewhere there has to be a balance industry, tourism, and a sustainable community.

27. See above.

28. The council needs to consider how people will perceive Squamish with an LNG terminal in the sound. Tourists don't consider whether it brings jobs, they consider how it impacts their experience as they recreate and enjoy leisure time. The noise, air, visual pollution will be more significant that we think.

29. I, like many residents who have bought a home here, and live, work and play in Squamish, came here for what the town and area offered. An LNG plant has the potential to negatively affect the town I love. I don’t believe the benefits outweigh the impacts of both the plant and the pipeline.

30. What would it say about our community if we took a stand for the environment and a different way of doing business? Could we be leaders in the province, the country, the world?

31. We live in "Beautiful British Columbia". And Squamish is the "Outdoor recreation capital of the world". So what would tourists and potential residents think when the first thing they see when they enter Squamish is a giant LNG export facility? As a city let's instead focus on this great momentum we have as a tourist destination instead of building giant industrial projects.

32. For me, this pillar is more values/feeling based, than facts based. The proposed projects simply don't fit into the brand and lifestyle of Squamish residents and visitors. Frankly, I'd prefer not to see it in anyone's backyard, since, as I've stated earlier, it’s time to transition away from a fossil fuel economy and way of life.

33. Just reading the last bullet above which states "noise, smell and light pollution from LNG operations" frightens the hell out of me and should be reason enough to not allow this project to be built in our very small Sound which is so fragile. The risks of LNG operations at Woodfiber far outweigh the economic benefits of this project. This project does not bring any social or environmental benefit to Squamish and the economic benefits are not enough for us to risk the healthy environment we have been fostering in the past several years.

34. I am absolutely opposed to this "project"!

35. stupid, stupid, stupid.

36. It is important that the company improves recreational access. There needs to be public boat dock, a safe and defined way to walk around the project area, and improved trails to recreational features.

37. One thing comes to mind among many others. The Sea to Sky Gondola has been such an asset to our community, to both residents and visitors. How will it be to now sit in the heavens and look out on our once again majestic skies, waters, mountains only to see the sea life gone and in it's place tankers and industry. I feel like we can do better.

38. LNG does not belong in Squamish.

39. The only reason any of us are still having a discussion on LNG in Squamish is that there is profit to be made (although not by Squamish at only $2million per year in tax revenue) so it is being pushed on our unwanted community. Clean energy is free and that does not satisfy the greed LNG proponents.

40. The small increase in the number of ships that will result from this project should not be a concern to the masters of the vessels and the pilots.

41. Once its up and running, there will be little negative impact. Start showing the business world that Squamish is actually open for good projects like this, slowly turn around the "Squamish is a place for projects to die" reputation.

42. I believe the impact on the community will add up to be more negative than positive. Council should look objectively, without being impacted by the supposed benefits of "backcountry access" and "community investment." I believe that council is called to exercise not only common sense, but wisdom in this decision.
43. Squamish is all about the beautiful environment. We love it. What effects and hurts the environment effects and hurts the community.

44. I anticipate the position of First Nations in the expectation that they will be opposed to this project for all of the reasons Council would prefer to ignore, Cognitive dissonance. With firm opposition from the Squamish nation this project will be stopped. The Courts has ruled clearly and only now has the Provincial government received an Environmental Assessment protocol from First Nations in this province that will serve as terms and conditions of any resource development in these territories.

45. see above

46. I love this community and I do not feel that the LNG plant is a good fit or of enough benefit to justify its imposition.

47. Squamish needs to choose 'green', complementary industry that complements the other core initiatives of our community. Don't bring the wolf into the sheep's pasture.

48. My feelings and values run deep in the small town that prospers from natural resources. I have known isolation, Squamish is far from it. Squamish is an hour’s drive to the city ... perfect for a bedroom community. But frankly, I love walking down the street and seeing people that I work with, bumping into them with their families at the corner store, coming home and it being 5 or 6 pm - plenty of time to eat a home made meal and still able to see a friend or go to a local club meet-up. I like being able to have all my personal business in town ... doing appointments during lunch at my local accountant's, doctor's, bank, etc. It is just convenient and I like convenience to be able to get anywhere in ten minutes - or being able to bike! I value the small town life where I work, play, sleep in all the same place! It is possible to have a diverse, prosperous with everything from heavy industry to vegan bakeries... that is how independent and diverse I want my town to be :D

49. It would desirable to have a compressor station located more closer to the edge of Squamish rather than in the business park.

50. I read in the paper recently of a sailing regatta that is to take place in Squamish for the first time this year. LNG tankers are hardly an attractive backdrop for such an event. A sailing regatta could become a popular and successful event as the Gran Fondo or the Test of Metal, or the Music Festival bringing tourists to Squamish.

51. I value the ideas put forward by our major and some councillors that we are attempting to establish a town with a waterfront presence. How can this be compatible with LNG?

52. Diversified economy is important to relieve the tax burden on the community.

53. I feel this LNG facility is a lose, lose situation for the community and Howe Sound from environment disaster to societal destroyer. Just the fact were having all these polls and community shows how wrong this is. My theory is, if you have to think twice about doing something, don't do it.

54. Council should try to be a little bit more tolerant and accepting of industry as a valued component of our area.

55. I value Howe Sound's quietness, and the dark night skies. The safe travel one knows one can have in a small boat. The wide variety of recreational industries that operate peacefully right now.

And there is good evidence that WF plans to export a lot more natural gas - 6x as much - when/if the 24” pipeline is extended down to Coquitlam. Several routes for the pipeline now along Coquitlam Lake were studied in 1989 - before it was installed. So one of the other routes studied could be used for the 24” pipeline extention. Reasons will probably be found to do so. Then there will be one LNG tanker going into HS each day, and one leaving each day. And if the LNG market fares poorly, we could be exporting oil out of HS. World class oil spill response rescues about 5% of the spilled oil.

56. LNG is an industry whose time has passed. As a province we've already missed out on the opportunity to exploit this industry with any kind of profit for ourselves. The price simply isn't there to make this viable. Even if it were, the pollution caused by fracting to extract the gas renders this industry unethical, and it has no place in our community.
57. We seem schizophrenic. We put time, energy and money into certain projects like the gondola and the rebranding, and then we want to contradict those decisions with an LNG plant.

58. Project is a slap in the face for Sea to Sky Gondola proponents, the BEST new business in town, which will be directly, negatively affected by a new industrial eyesore from their main viewing platform.

59. When I ticked the 'social' box I actually had in my mind the integrity and track record of the proponent. Byng Giraud personally delivered the greatest environmental disaster in BC history via Imperial Metals. Sukanto Tanoto is one of our planets great abusers of human rights AND of the natural world. These are FACTS. And these are the people we are welcoming into our neighborhood so they can wholesale our children's gas on the cheap to thirsty Asian markets. ANYONE in this community opens the door to such unsavory, disreputable and corrupt people should really be examining their values.

60. I just don't want to see it, smell it, or know what kind of effect or potential effect it would/could have on local wildlife and local environment. The cons far outweigh the pros!

61. The compressor station and pipeline should not be located close to a populated area.

62. Tankers are just about the last thing I want to see while hiking above the sound, diving or spending a day at the beach.

63. Don't allow this to happen!!

64. Traffic, potential for spills that could decimate ocean ecology, inflated housing and rental prices, gentrification, the list goes on and on. Besides that, why are we exporting our valuable resources? Keep it the country!!

65. These are not just community impacts, these are also very real and quantifiable economic impacts. Sure, the land is zoned for industrial, but this project has major impacts outside of the property boundaries. It will retard the general momentum of business and investment in tourism by taking away the unique value add that the Howe Sound now enjoys as heavy industry has mostly disappeared and greenspace is taking over. To add heavy industry back into the area will make us just like hundreds of other communities with the same industrial background. Undisturbed natural scenery is very much a rarely available attractant for tourists considering where they might visit. **And this questionnaire is missing discussion of a very key impact of heavy industry as an employer - those social problems that were so inherent to Squamish not so many years ago: Alcoholism, drugs, crime, etc. These were very pervasive and real in the community, and most certainly disappeared upon the closing of the prior heavy industry.

66. Woodfibre has backed away from providing backcountry access due to a need to keep people a safe distance from the plant. (And Squamish Nation has some concerns around increased public traffic on these lands). So although this idea was discussed earlier, it's not really on the table as a benefit any more and is another somewhat misleading answer.

67. Supporting LNG would be a sabotage to the evident benefits of Squamish as a prime destination and the potential of growth for it.

68. There is only one road in and out of Squamish what would happen if there was an accident how would the people of Squamish be evacuated and where would they be taken to. The proposed plant and tanker route is on the south side of the town so that would block the primary emergency route as North is the secondary route. Also the wind blows from the south over Squamish so all emissions and issues will be blown over the population of Squamish.

When you look at how cities were developed during the industrial revolution there was a reason that poorer areas were built in where the wind blew fumes and smoke over! The owners and managers of industry always built their homes and affluent neighbourhoods in the areas that were placed before the industrial areas and in the opposite direction of the prevailing winds. Squamish residents deserve the same consideration don't build this LNG plant which will distribute toxins and emissions all over our town and its inhabitants.

69. No, a green roof on the Woodfibre Plant, allowing backcountry access and donating a few dollars to the community would not begin to compensate for the losses to our community.

70. I value our natural surrounding, the trail systems and outdoor lifestyle our community prospers on. Yikes the pollution really scares me, the impact could be huge!
71. The LNG plant should not be built in Woodfibre or anywhere else. We will need gas while we develop alternative sources of energy but there is no economic need for us to sell it off to the rest of the world as fast as possible to make a fast buck. I would only support LNG export if it would clearly help other countries to clean up their act and move toward alternatives to fossil fuels. As it is, selling off our gas only stuffs the coffers of the fossil fuel industry. Come on Squamish, stand up and be counted.

72. I am very sensitive to light and noise pollution, that is why I moved out of the city.

73. Don't want it.

74. The few jobs and $2 million/year for Squamish is frankly a joke. Even from simply an economic standpoint, is the long-term income worth the potential loss in property taxes as residents move away as a result of the re-industrialization of Squamish and the feeling of being disenfranchised by a government and council that does not heed their concerns. If this goes forward against majority opinion, the council had better at least negotiate something more reasonable than $2 million/year for the community. Seriously it is insulting.

75. Hello, My name is [Redacted] Squamish, B.C.

I have lived in Squamish since the mid 1960’s. I have witnessed personally heavy industry here and seen the devastation both on land and in the air. I went to the elementary school down town and saw 2 of my class mates develop asthma and had to go to school in Brackendale due to the air pollution. There were warning siren towers placed around town and would go off periodically. The smog down town in June during a high pressure weather pattern with no clouds around was astounding. I have been windsurfing here in Howe sound for 30 years. We have held world cup windsurfing races and the Canadian Windsurfing national championships here. We have unique inflow wind thermals that also blow straight thru town from wood fiber. Our wind sport society operates off of the end of the spit just down wind and not far from the woodfiber site. We will be up to 800 members this year. When woodfibre was in operation our members were the first to get the smell of the air pollution. I am a director and past president of the society for 15 years. I also have been sitting on the Squamish Estuary Committee for the past 15 years where I have learned a lot about the Howe sound and the recovery it has been going through. I have witness whales, dolphins and orcas all returning right up to the river mouth. Never in the past have we seen this until the last 3 to 4 years. I had a Whale spray in my face when he or she was feeding off the river mouth and I was down wind on my kiteboard. The Howe sound fiord is unique and due to the lack of activity at the old woodfiber site has allowed the large water mammals to return. If you look at the geography of the site of woodfiber it is like doorway as the mammal’s round the corner to come into the harbour and to the river. Those ships that LNG are proposing are huge. They will be assisted by 3 to 4 Tugs all the way up the sound. These tugs noise decibels will not be good for the retuning mammals. I am getting sick and tired of the LNG propaganda as they compare themselves to other places around the world and try to spin off the impact of the pollution and activity under water that this plant will create. We are not other places, we are a unique Howe Sound Fiord. It has been said that Howe Sound is the worst place to set up industry.

The other frustrating point about this plant going in is it is the only plant that Christy Clark and the Liberals can get up and running first to make good on their mandate to start delivering LNG before the other plants come on line that are not near populated areas. We are being used as a political pawn here on this plant.

These pipes are 24” diameter and will be able to double the shipping in the Howe Sound in the near future, of course they will deny this. I know you are supposed to make recommendations but that is what they want regardless of the risks because they are recommendations only.

I could mention the safety, the economy, and more on pollution but I will let the others write in on this.

I thank for your attention and hope you will do the right thing.

Best Regards

[Redacted]
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>We don’t need more industry here; Property values are climbing, people want to live here. This plant will not enhance the desirability of Squamish but rather, it will detract from it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>The visual pollution coupled with the noise and smell will change the quality of life in Squamish in a negative way that will be unacceptable. It will stand out as a reminder of our greed and short sightedness. Squamish could be a leader in green energy technologies and this is not the way to go for long term prosperity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>The proponent claims to follow &quot;Best Global Practice&quot; in a number of areas of the project. But simply the location at the end of a scenic narrow waterway and keeping in mind the north towards Squamish blowing Summer winds makes it evident that this project does not follow &quot;Best Global Practice. Two ugly old LNG tankers used for LNG storage will create an eyesore for anyone driving or boating up the sound or going up on the world class Sea to Sky Gondola.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>I can't believe they think we are so stupid as to fall for their devious methods. Council i trust you to see through the bs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>I think Woodfibre LNG will contribute greatly to our communities!!! Squamish residents have all these wants but where does the $$$ come from?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>NO LNG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>The LNG plant is an evolutionary step backwards. That's how I feel, anyway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>do everything you can to prevent this so my kid doesn't have to grow up in a town that is full of air and noise pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>It will benefit the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Personally i find big box stores, clearing of all vegetation on development lots, casinos and digital billboards more offensive to views than the proposed project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>Conservation of Howe Sound is a top priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>It is heartbreaking to see how this issue has divided the community. There is no social license for this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>We all need to take responsibility for ourselves and stop government from interfering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>My concern with projects such as these is that they start out sustainably until the demand is high, the pressure from fed or prov. Govt increases, and lax environment rules and limited monitoring by third party groups such as prov ministries goes down. This is inevitable with time, and so we are much better off here to continue to build squamish's brand and continue allowing rectech and tourism to thrive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>Just approve it already</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>I am a professional Mountain Guide, and this project only deters from my product which is the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>LNG marine traffic will be minimal, no different that the few ships that service the Squamish terminals. Kiteboarders and windsurfer don't use that area of Howe Sound regularly and thus won't be impacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>My feelings and values are inconsistent with this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>Let's say no and try and get a green alternative happening here. We have the wind lets harness it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>No or little impact to other marine traffic, ferries or recreational activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>Where better to have a compressor plant than in the industrial park !!! That's what it's for. As far as visual impact - I don't think that the gondola is an especially nice scar up the mountain side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>the compressor station is in an industrial area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>Squamish is &quot;Hardwired for Adventure&quot; not &quot;Plumbed for Oil and Gas&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>Noise smell and light all issues if you are trying to be a tourism destination not to mention the impact to your lungs!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I value our scenic town and surrounding waterways. There is a peace and liviness here. You can’t put a monetary figure on these things. Its beyond money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Fortis comes in and muscles around like that... What is going on in Canada... We need to stand strong on this. Council I have your back on this and I am afraid we may need direct action to stop this and I am fully ready to rally the troops and protect our home! Chapelle give your head a shake, the garbage coming out of your mouth is ridiculous and wolfman you echo her???? Grow a pair! Doug go live on your boat you’re toxic for this community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I wish that council will stop playing to a vocal minority, and start conducting them selves as business people so that businesses and developers coming to Squamish will have faith that if they play by the rules they will be successful not have to continually have the rules and the lines change at the whim of Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>in 25 years i expect we will be delighted we opposed LNG. i can not imagine us being delighted we supported LNG! i like the idea of a block of cleveland avenue being closed to vehicular traffic and a variety of trees integral to BC ’s forest being planted in the middle with informative descriptions. this way people could be attracted to downtown and know they can learn about 7 (for example) species of trees. such a vision is NOT consistent with LNG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Wing keeps pushing the taxes and job’s it will produce however for the size and potential negative impact the project could have i see little or no positive social community impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>We just had the most amazing year - Everyone finally knows Squamish for more than just that place to get gas and coffee before Whistler. We have made a name for ourselves for the natural beauty and smart choices (Sea to Sky gondola, mountain biking, Kite boarding, hiking, small business opportunity.) Seriously, this might make me want to move...and I am not the only one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I didn't even comment on the compressor station question, cause I only get three options. BUT the impact to the community in all aspects will be negative. Unless you are one of the few local residents who are employed for big money for a finite amount of time and don't actually care how you leave this place for your children, there is NO benefit. The fact that LNG has tried to bribe residents through investing in sports is despicable. Heck, there are Hollywood movies about residents getting sucked into this type of thing. This can't happen here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I regularly question visitors to the area while on the travelling on the Sea to Sky Gondola. Many of those I spoke to were from the lower mainland and would not have visited Squamish if the gondola had not been here. Some came specifically to visit to gondola with family, friends or overseas visitors while others were on their way to Whistler but stopped here instead. (some by accident). Overall they had very positive experiences. When asked if they knew of the proposed woodfibre LNG processing plant, I noted that there is a great lack of awareness about the proposal. The visitors were often surprised and questioned why it’s location is across from a newly established tourist attraction. Another question I put forward was whether they went further into Squamish to eat or shop and many answered &quot;No&quot;. Our community has a new carrot at our gate and the above responses cause me to question the wisdom of industry that would detract from tourism. The challenge is how to maximize economic growth by encouraging people to drive a further 5 minutes into town to spend money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The drive on the sea to sky highway is one of the most beautiful in the world. Please don’t tarnish it with heavy industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I cannot support this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Potential safety hazards brought by the increased tanker traffic carrying highly explosive material concerns me. Also I do not want to listen and smell big industry. Squamish is beautiful and should be preserved. The benefits would have to be very big for me to approve of this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>This IS WRONG: Woodfibre LNG has invested in community events, youth sports and research/education/environment in Howe Sound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11 communities.
this is bribery. Full on disgusting bribery. it makes me sick to think of it. Things like the environment are not for sale.

2. My EAO submission on WLNG

I will first draw on the expertise of others:

1. SAFETY: Siting an LNG facility in Howe Sound violates international safety standards and practices, putting Howe Sound residents at risk

As LNG tankers transit Howe Sound, there is a high-danger zone for 1,600 metres (1-mile) on either side of the LNG tanker. If an accident happens, people within this zone risk death by asphyxiation, or death/injury by fire or explosion. Every time a tanker travels through Howe Sound (approximately 6-8 transits a month according to Woodfibre LNG) several Howe Sound communities will be in that high-danger zone, including: Bowen Island, Bowyer Island, Anvil Island, Passage Island, Porteau Cove, West Vancouver, and parts of the Sea to Sky highway. The Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) LNG Terminal Siting Standards states that LNG terminals should not be located in narrow, inland waterways with dense local populations and significant commercial, recreational, and ferry traffic. Why would that guideline not apply to Howe Sound? The proposed siting of the Woodfibre LNG terminal and associated transit of LNG tankers through Howe Sound poses an unacceptable risk to safety of people in communities along the shores of Howe Sound.

Sources: Sandia Report, 2004 and SIGTTO LNG Terminal Siting Standards

2. ENVIRONMENT: The once-through seawater cooling system proposed by Woodfibre LNG is outdated

Woodfibre LNG is proposing an outdated and damaging cooling method to help cool the LNG facility. They propose to extract 17,000 tonnes (= 3.7 million gallons, or 7 Olympic-sized 50-meter swimming pools) of seawater from Howe Sound, chlorinate it, heat it, and then spit it back out into the sound every hour of every day for the next 25 years. This method has been banned in California and several other places as it is very damaging to marine life such as juvenile salmon, herring, and plankton which are the building blocks for all other life in Howe Sound. If the herring are impacted, the dolphins, orcas, and humpbacks are also impacted as they no longer have a food supply. The impacts of increased water temperatures and the addition of chlorinated seawater will likely reverse the recent revival of marine life in Howe Sound, which is just now recovering from the toxic legacies of previous industries. This is unacceptable.

3. HEALTH: Social costs and health impacts of air pollution

Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Emissions of NOx and SO2 interact with other compounds to form fine particles, which can affect both the lungs and the heart. Exposure to these particles is linked to increased risk of respiratory symptoms, such as irritation of the airways, coughing, or difficulty breathing; decreased lung function; aggravated asthma; onset of chronic bronchitis; irregular heartbeat; nonfatal heart attacks; and premature death in people with heart or lung disease. A new study published in the scientific journal, Climatic Change, estimates the true social costs of air pollution that aren’t accounted for in the cost of fossil fuels and other pollutants. Social costs include the health impacts of air pollution as well as impacts from climate change. The study found that sulfur dioxide costs $42,000 per tonne, and nitrous oxides cost $67,000 per tonne. Sources:


4. SITE SUITABILITY: The Woodfibre site is not a safe location for a hazardous LNG facility

On February 15th, 2015, a 3.4 magnitude earthquake hit Vancouver's coast that was felt throughout Howe Sound. The Woodfibre LNG proposal is located within this zone of moderate to high earthquake risk, on two known thrust faults. The Woodfibre site also has a history of slope failure. In 1955 a wharf and three warehouses collapsed into Howe Sound at the Woodfibre site, causing $500,000 – $750,000 in damages (Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4). A recent, but unreleased, geotechnical study by Knight Piesold identifies that approximately 46% of the study area was mapped as having rapid mass movement. This means landslides and slope slumpage... including existing natural landslide hazards as well as terrain where construction activity may increase landslide initiation. Why hasn't the geotechnical study by Knight Piesold been released?

Sources:
Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4
B.C. Ministry of Energy and Mines

5. ECONOMY: The requested socio-economic study has not been provided

During construction, only 4.3% of jobs (=38.5 out of 895) will be for locals living in the Squamish/Whistler corridor (See Table 6.2-8 of the Labour Market section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Why are there so few jobs predicted to be filled by workers in the Squamish/SLRD area? The EA application is also very unclear about how many of the 100 full-time jobs will be filled by residents of Howe Sound once the LNG terminal is operational. What are the benefits to Squamish? What are the costs? There is still no clarity around how much in municipal taxes will be paid to the District of Squamish. How will this project impact existing small businesses and existing industries in Howe Sound?

6. CLIMATE CHANGE: 142 thousand tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions is unacceptable

Woodfibre LNG is now estimating greenhouse gas emissions to be 142 thousand tonnes of CO2 equivalent every year. These annual emissions of CO2 equivalent from Woodfibre LNG is equal to adding over 18,000 cars to the highway, driving to Vancouver and back, every day. This is more than six times greater than current highway traffic. It is irresponsible to approve this kind of polluting industry at a time when we need to transition away from fossil fuels to mitigate the risks associated with climate change, and to reduce the economic and health impacts of air pollution in general.

7. GOVERNMENT REGULATION: Inability of government to monitor, enforce, and respond to issues

There are no regulations adopted to regulate this LNG industry from a technical standpoint. Any of the current standards are not applicable to the LNG industry. Do the regulators have the knowledge and the expertise and the capacity to oversee this industry or will they be relying on the proponent to monitor themselves and report to the regulator? Self-monitoring industries have created several examples of accidents with resulting environmental destruction in recent years, including the Lac Megantic rail disaster and the Mt Polley tailing pond spill.
8. ENVIRONMENT: Removal of water from Mill Creek unsustainable for fish life

Woodfibre LNG has secured the water license to extract water from Mill Creek, which flows through the Woodfibre site. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans has objected to this because the amount of water that WLNG is proposing to remove will reduce water levels in Mill Creek to levels that will no longer support fish life, especially in the summer months. Woodfibre LNG needs to source water for this project from somewhere else to protect this important stream habitat which is home to several native fish species.

9. ENVIRONMENT: Missing baseline studies

The following baseline studies are either missing or are inadequate as they do not conform to any recognized scientific standards: fish, birds, marine mammals, air quality, shipping, water quality, marine sound, and atmospheric sound, marine life near the Woodfibre site, and the cumulative impact assessment. Proper studies need to be completed before any decisions can be made regarding this project.

10. VIEWSCAPES: BC Hydro clearcut of two 64 metre swaths of forest at the Woodfibre site will impact viewscapes from the Sea to Sky highway and the gondola

BC Hydro is proposing to clearcut two 64 metre swaths of forest at the Woodfibre site which will create visible scars in the Howe Sound viewscape which will be very visible from the highway and the gondola. This information was only made available during the recent BC Hydro open house held on 19th March, near the end of the public comment period. This information is not included in the cumulative impact assessment of the Woodfibre application and it should be. This late release of information pertinent to this project and the timing of the BC Hydro open houses is unsatisfactory.

11. ENVIRONMENT: 9000 year old glass sponge reefs endangered by tanker traffic

LNG tankers do not have enough clearance to get over the 9000 year old reef if they go off course. These 9000 year old glass sponge reefs have been called "Living Fossils" by National Geographic as until recently this species was thought to have gone extinct over 60 million years ago. MLA Jordan Sturdy recently made a statement in the House about the importance of this discovery in Halkett Bay near Gambier Island, and to support the proposal to expand the Provincial Park Protected Area to ensure these reefs are protected.

Sources:
http://jordansturdymla.ca/bcltv_videos/mla‐sturdy‐halkett‐bays‐glass‐sponges/

12. ENVIRONMENT: Will there be smog? Will there be a smell?

Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application).

Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2) is a reddish-brown gas with a pungent, irritating odour. It absorbs light and leads to the yellow-brown “smog” pollution haze seen hanging over cities. It is known to irritate the lungs and increase susceptibility to respiratory infections. In combination with either ozone (O3) or sulphur dioxide (SO2), nitrogen dioxide may cause
injury at even lower concentration levels.

Sulphur Dioxide (SO2) is a toxic gas with a pungent, irritating, and rotten smell. Current scientific evidence links short-term exposures to SO2, ranging from 5 minutes to 24 hours, with an array of adverse respiratory effects including bronchoconstriction and increased asthma symptoms. These effects are particularly important for asthmatics at elevated ventilation rates (e.g., while exercising or playing). Studies also show a connection between short-term exposure and increased visits to emergency departments and hospital admissions for respiratory illnesses, particularly in at-risk populations including children, the elderly, and asthmatics. The addition of these air pollutants in Howe Sound is of particular concern as recent research by MSc student Annie Seagram (studying under Professor Douw Steyn, Department of Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Sciences at the University of British Columbia) has shown that the Howe Sound airshed and Lower Fraser Valley airshed are connected. Emissions from Woodfibre LNG will add to the pollution in Howe Sound, exacerbating the existing air quality conditions, particularly in the Squamish-Brackendale corridor.

Note that Metro Vancouver annually issues several Air Quality Advisories due to high concentrations of ground-level ozone. This pollution also impacts the Howe Sound and Squamish, and exposure to these pollutants are of particular concern for infants, the elderly, and is directly linked to health issues such as lung or heart disease and asthma.

In addition: the BC government needs to ensure the protection of the 9000 year old glass sponge reef at Halkett Bay off Gambier Island.

About Glass Sponge Reefs: http://www.eao.gov.bc.ca/pcp/forms/Woodfibre_LNG_form.html

Glass Sponge Reefs in Halkett Bay off of Gambier Island

MLA Jordan Sturdy spoke in Legislature about the glass sponge reef at Halkett Bay off Gambier Island.
http://jordansturdymla.ca/bcltv_videos/mla-sturdy-halkett-bays-glass-sponges/

Tankers do not have enough clearance to get over the 9000 year old reef if any off course action happens.

Transport Canada Dangerous Goods Dept. is not at all ready for LNG. In fact they now have a task force for rail and road.

I have been a member of 2 Stakeholder Teams focused on the protection and restoration of salmon habitat. I include information and links for your convenience and ask that a similar project be implemented for the WLNG and Fortis BC applications.

2005 SALMON RECOVERY PLAN
Entire Salmon Life Cycle
$250,000 Pacific Salmon Foundation

$2 million
5 year plan
Cheakamus Salmon Recovery
Squamish Nation and Stakeholders

CERT C
Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Technical Committee

The Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Technical Committee (CERTC) website, provides information on Cheakamus ecosystem restoration activities.

CERTC was formed in August 2005 in response to a train derailment and subsequent spill of sodium hydroxide into the Cheakamus River. CERTC’s mandate is to understand ecosystem-level impacts and develop restoration and monitoring strategies for affected species to accelerate the return of the Cheakamus ecosystem to a pre-spill state as quickly as reasonably possible. CERTC Terms of Reference (pdf).

CERTC recommends programs for implementation to the Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Steering Committee based on input from experienced professionals, external specialists, interested parties and the public.

Both committees include representatives of:

CN
District of Squamish
Fisheries and Oceans Canada
BC Ministry of Environment
Squamish Nation

Thank you for your interest in Cheakamus ecosystem restoration.

Comments can be made to CERTC at comments@certc.ca

Fish Assessment

Following the spill, B.C. Ministry of Environment (MoE) fisheries biologists, technicians and contracted staff documented fish survival and compared fish density information to available previous data.

Fish mortalities were collected from the Cheakamus River downstream of the spill, with activities including:

Recording mortalities by species and location;
Collecting length data to determine age classes of impacted fish;
Collecting scale samples to further supplement brood year identification; and,
freezing and storing of samples for further examination, if required.

Fish Impact Assessment (MoE and DFO) (pdf)
MoE Estimated Impacts on Salmon and Trout Populations:

Chinook
- 25% of juveniles from 2004 spawning population
- 50% of 2005 spawning population

Chum
- juveniles not affected
- 2005 spawning population not affected

Coho
- 50% of juveniles from 2004 spawners
- 2005 spawning population not affected

Pink
- juveniles not affected
- between 3 - 10% of 2005 spawning population

Steelhead
- 90% of mainstem juveniles from 2003 to 2005 spawners
- 2006 and 2007 steelhead spawning populations not affected
Estimated Impacts on Other Fish

Ninety percent of resident fish in the mainstem Cheakamus River may have been affected by the spill including:

- Dolly Varden/Bull Trout
- Rainbow Trout
- Lamprey (2 species)
- Sculpins (bullheads - 2 species)
- Sticklebacks

Juveniles rearing in tributary streams at the time of the spill were not affected.

Benthos Recovery Presentation - Triton Environmental, 2008 (pdf). New!
Appendices (pdf) New!

Ecological Assessment

A screening level qualitative assessment of ecological effects has been conducted for CN to understand the potential effect the spill could have had on receptors other than fish in order to identify and target the need for ecosystem restoration activities.

Given the broad scope of the project and the limited amount of available data (i.e., exposure data, such as concentration of NaOH in environmental media, NaOH ecotoxicity toward specific species) it is not possible to conduct a comprehensive ecological risk assessment for each species present in the ecosystem. The screening level assessment focused on the functions of populations and communities within the ecosystem. This recognizes populations are less sensitive than their most sensitive individual member and some effects may be observed at the population level without impairing the functions of the ecosystem as a whole.

Qualitative methods using subjective ecological effects ranking categories, such as high, medium and low, were used to describe the likelihood of adverse effects rather than providing a numerical estimate of effects. To minimize subjective influence, the interpretation of ecological effects contain a clear explanation of the lines of evidence leading to the conclusions, including a description of the uncertainties and assumptions used. Additionally, matrices were used to provide a structured framework for the characterization of ecological effects. The assessment used existing information from baseline and monitoring reports and from previous scientific literature.

This screening level assessment of ecological effects consists of three main steps: problem formulation, analysis and characterization of the likelihood of adverse ecological effects. Results from the ecological effects assessment will be used to determine the direction of future recovery efforts for other components of the Cheakamus River ecosystem.
Water Quality

River Sampling

Water quality professionals tested and monitored the following:
Water quality in the Cheakamus and Squamish Rivers, August 5 - 8, 2005
Water quality in the Cheakamus during site remediation activities, August 10 - 26, 2005
Water quality in the Cheakamus after rainfall events, August 17 - October 28, 2005
Monitoring was conducted over a variety of meteorological conditions and river levels. The parameters monitored included: pH and conductivity, sodium, total dissolved and total suspended solids, total and dissolved organic carbon.

Results

The Cheakamus River was cleared for recreation after 24 hours by Vancouver Coastal Health on August 6, 2005. Water quality downstream of the derailment site was determined to be similar to that upstream.

Well Sampling

Forty-eight wells within 100 metres of the Cheakamus River were sampled on August 6 and 7, 2005. The parameters monitored included pH and conductivity, sodium, total dissolved and total suspended solids.
The sampling was coordinated by Environment Canada, Vancouver Coastal Health Authority, Triton Environmental Consultants Ltd., and Quantum Environmental Services.
Drinking water from wells was cleared for drinking by the Vancouver Coastal Health Authority after 48 hours on August 8, 2005.
No additional detailed water quality sampling is required.

Water Quality Report – September 2007 (pdf)
Water Quality Report Appendices – September 2007 (pdf)
CERT C Stakeholder Team

The Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Stakeholder Team (Stakeholder Team), established by CERTC, is a public advisory group comprised of representatives from interested organizations and individuals with local knowledge of and experience with the Cheakamus River.

Meeting Notes

September 30, 2010 (pdf) New!
June 24, 2010 (pdf)
March 25, 2010 (pdf)
October 29, 2009 (pdf)
June 17, 2009 (pdf)
March 5, 2009 (pdf)
November 27, 2008 (pdf)
September 25, 2008 (pdf)
May 27, 2008 (pdf)
March 27, 2008 (pdf)
January 24, 2008 (pdf)
December 6th, 2007 (pdf)
September 27, 2007 (pdf)
June 21st, 2007 (pdf)
April 25th, 2007 (pdf)
February 28th, 2007 (pdf)
December 6th, 2006 (pdf)
July 6th, 2006 (pdf)
May 25th, 2006 (pdf)
April 27, 2006 (pdf)
March 25, 2006 (pdf)

Presentations

Overview of the Cheakamus River Large Woody Debris Stream bank Protection and fish habitat development project, June 2011 (pdf) New!
Update on Cheakamus River recovery strategies and monitoring programs, March 2009 (pdf) New!
Update on Cheakamus River recovery strategies and monitoring programs, January 2012 (pdf) New!
Role
The Stakeholder Team provides input into the development and implementation of monitoring and restoration programs for the Cheakamus ecosystem. The Team helps coordinate and communicate comments and recommendations from interested parties to CERTC, and also receives updates on CERTC activities, as the information becomes available. All input from the Stakeholder Team is considered advisory in nature and final decisions regarding monitoring and restoration programs rests with CERTC and the Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Steering Committee. Stakeholder Team Terms of Reference

CERTC Communication to the Stakeholder Team

CERTC Responses to Dec 6 2006 Stakeholder Team Questions (pdf)
http://certc.ca/public_events.shtml Events and Brochures.
http://certc.ca/monitoring_programs.shtml
http://certc.ca/recovery_plan.shtml to 2012

SQUAMISH ESTUARY MANAGEMENT PLAN

[PDF]Skwelwil’em Squamish Estuary Wildlife Management Plan


PDF]View the 1999 Squamish Estuary Management Plan


REPORT OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE ON THE PROPOSED SQUAMISH ESTUARY MANAGEMENT PLAN

Volume One and TWO THE PLAN September 1982

Volume TWO Pages 211 to 233 re: PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT WORK GROUP
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT WORK GROUP MEMBERS
Squamish Estuary Nature Centre ad hoc Committee
Squamish Council
1999
SEMP
https://squamish.civicweb.net/document/10318/Feb%20-%20Feb%201999

Page 19 Signatures to 1999 SEMP


1982 TO 1992
SEMP!

Howe Sound has also been improved because the Fraser Basin Council has successfully restored the waters at Britannia Beach on Howe Sound BC.
http://www.fraserbasin.bc.ca/about_britannia.html

Clean up after industry pollutes is never complete and restoration actually takes centuries.

The economy here in Howe Sound no longer depends on big polluting industry. What is evolving is self-employment in businesses that depend on "the scenery". Like the film industry. Also tourist activities because HOWE SOUND NOW HAS WHALES! DOLPHINS! HERRING!

Eagles and salmon have always drawn the public to the wilds of Howe Sound. People stay to live in a healthy environment and to co-exist with nature. There are economic benefits to all aspects from the sea, keeping the wild fishing industry to the sky where Whistler/Blackcomb are world class ski resorts with a growing population in what was once a village. Our proximity to Vancouver BC, also a source of employment, allows those who live in the Howe Sound area to park the car and enjoy recreating without it when not commuting to work elsewhere.
The LNG Project needs to be assessed as having a negative impact on a recovering Howe Sound.

Many have written who have been able to study and report on the negative impact of the WLNG project, the Fortis BC pipeline and the gigantic tankers.

For me this is a forced endeavor. I feel quite intimidated by the fact that the WLNG company can afford $250 million dollar fines for environmental atrocities elsewhere.

It brings to mind that Woodfibre had 600 pollution violations that could have been charged against the owners and the government would not allow that to happen in 1983.

When in 2005 Woodfibre was closed, there was a statement from the government that the Woodfibre site would never again be used for industry. The re-zoning never took place and now this is a legal application with deadly consequences. Global warming could have been avoided had alternative energies been used these last 40 plus years.

I have lived here since 1977 and I have enjoyed the transition to a Howe Sound that is recovering. Those moving to Squamish now, afford to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars to buy a small accommodation here. This isn't so as to return to dirty industry and the putrid polluted smell of money when industry has an "accident".

Sincerely

XXXXXX

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>If the project passes the EA process and moves forward to implementation, we would like to see our community rally and be proud of the process we went through to ensure a best-in-class facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>We were embarrassed to wear a youth kids triathlon supported by LNG. Made us think twice about our own people in this community. I think we are more aware of LNG and its detrimental impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I don't think they can buy their way in. We are a beautiful community of hardworking citizens making do just fine for the time being. We face the same challenges as well as unique ones as every other community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I moved here to be close to nature, to raise my family to hold a strong sense of reverence for nature and to enjoy the health benefits and spiritual benefits of living in this close proximity to nature. Would I consider moving away from this area and closing my small business (which has been in Squamish for over 40 years) if the LNG plant came? Yes I would. This is not why we moved here, this in not the vision of the community that I have worked hard to portray. This is not what anyone I know thinks is the right thing. I can't believe the view from the gondola (which I imagine employs close to the same number of people that the LNG plant will once operational?) will show an ugly LNG plant with clearcutting? What is the point. It is so disappointing and disheartening that people want this and want it for economic benefit. I thank the councillors and our awesome mayor for voting no to the next steps. I also read a comment from a windsports employee who spends 6 months of his year working on the spit which is a worldwide destination for wind sports. He is concerned about his health and I don't blame him. How will the additional CO2 affect his and all our health? Will those tourists still want to come here? These annual emissions of CO2 equivalent from Woodfibre LNG is equal to adding over 18,000 cars to the highway, driving to Vancouver and back, every day. This is more than six times greater than current highway traffic. It is irresponsible to approve this kind of polluting industry at a time when we need to transition away from fossil fuels to mitigate the risks associated with climate change, and to reduce the economic and health impacts of air pollution in general.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>There could have been some more serious questions in this section. i.e. community services - hospital, fire, police. Reading the EA application regarding WLNG handling its own service is quite concerning. It gives the sense that they have not considered worst case scenario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I believe this is only about money and speaking as someone who does not have much of it, I still can’t be persuaded that money put into the community by LNG is for our benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>What is the exclusion zone for other marine traffic around LNG tankers? This could have a major effects on existing commerical and recreational marine traffic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I don’t want to live near a compressor station. I live in Dentville and am concerned about noise, vibration, air pollution, smell and just knowing that crazy operation is happening just down the street. I went to the open house and talked with the project engineers about my concerns. They told I had nothing to worry about, that there would be very little noise and pollution. I listened in detail to all their explanations. But my concerns remain, and I don’t want to live near a compressor station. It doesn’t belong in a residential area.  

What will be the effects of the compressor station on property values? I think a study was included in the EA, but it uses information from the US, not Canada. |
| 9. | Coke-a-Cola invest heavily into sports while also being one of the driving forces behind obesity. Think about it.... |
| 10. | LNG has sponsered community events? Really?  
Like the science world event where they were telling children how much income they could make when they get older. I can only hope they don’t sponsor more “altruisic” events like that. |
| 11. | Impacts to humanity and our planet. We’ve come a long way since foraging and living off our land but that doesn’t mean we have gone the right way. We have a lot to thank from oil & gas, most importantly how they are teaching us that they are not our answer. So many communities globally are taking a stand on the information we have. Let’s join them!!  
I am sickened by Woodfibre LNG trying to buy the affections of our community through event sponsorship. |
| 12. | I really love this view and scenery. It is one of the most peaceful looking space left on this planet. Let’s keep it precious please.  
I want to touch on a qualitative topic, which doesn’t get discussed much. The world of feedback is generally a quantitative one, but here’s the thing. Squamish isn’t what it used to be. People say that Woodfibre pulp mill paid their bills, that logging paid their bills, well sorry to say, but whaling used to pay bills, and worst things such as slavery used to pay bills. Doesn’t mean we have to go back and relive those atrocities. In Squamish, polluting industries are a thing of the past. The 100 jobs that WLNG guarantees are a drop in the bucket (and they aren’t obviously guaranteed for Squamish.) A few small local companies can easily provide those jobs LOCALLY, not to outsourced labour that provides nothing for Squamish. But I digress. My point is that thousands of people have bought property in Squamish, thousands more live here, companies including tech are investing here, recreation and the film industry are looking up here because it’s frigging beautiful and without an eyesore on the water. People want to maintain their property values. The questions of safety with respect to compressor stations, pipelines, ships, and the WLNG terminal, are too great, and will inevitably drive our property values down, and when that happens, people leave and the town itself dies. And that is when we take another steps 50 years back.  
I am very concerned with new legislation on the table in Parliament to give Industry the legal right to sue government and private people to ensure they get what they want without protest also bill C-51. If this bill is passed would WLNG have the green light to increase production 10 fold and change the project to bitumen at will? Regarding the few people who think that they are going to have a job here instead of going to Fort Mac would it not be wise to get a new trade? Try finding a plumber in Squamish! There are many opportunities for tradespeople in Squamish without LNG.  
I think it is great that they will open up back country access for recreation if this project goes ahead. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The local First Nations will benefit by some kind of direct payment as well as jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I have said it all. Please say no to the assault.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Stand strong Squamish nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Tanker traffic .. NOoooo!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>&quot;sentinels of the land&quot; jobs must be established and assigned to local band members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Many of these things are important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Healthy society is more than prosperity and provision. Consideration to quality of life that includes heritage, culture and spirituality. Ideas of what brings individuals and communities happiness has been explored in film and in studies around the world. Destruction of culture and heritage destroys individuals and communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Have a listen to MLA Jordan Sturdy speak in legislature about the 9000 year old glass sponge reef in Howe Sound.<a href="http://jordansturdmia.ca/bcltv_videos/mla-sturdy-halkett-bays-glass-sponges/Interesting">http://jordansturdmia.ca/bcltv_videos/mla-sturdy-halkett-bays-glass-sponges/Interesting</a> that United Steel Workers at various oil and gas plants are on strike in USA. What union will be representing the FN and temporary workers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>we dont owe first nations anything. they hold everyone in contempt, expect everything for nothing. Everything they are given they dont respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>As a Whalen descendant, some 90 years removed from actual ownership, I would like to tell you that my grandmother went to the family's summer cottage there, and I would like to see Howe Sound return to its healthier ecology if those times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11. | There will be no LNG tanker emissions! Why is this question on the survey? The ships are powered by LNG, not diesel. The District's WLNG committee had no problem with the tankers why are so many questions relating to them on this section of the survey? This is very much skewed towards the anti side. Tell me how the cooling system is going to have an impact on fishing at the site? Are the provincial regulations which this plant is actually going to be well below not sufficient? Can you say
no to a system that is more than acceptable under provincial regulations? Again, how about all the human waste from the windsurfers and campers on the spit damaging the fish!

12. The questions are curiously devoid of any potential impacts Squamish culture and heritage beyond First Nations might experience. Historically out waterways, forests and mountains have been important for the evolution of outdoor recreation and as a source of inspiration for art, design and landmarks. The visual cultural identity of the community was impacted by Woodfibre Mill, same as it will be from WLNG and that should be a consideration. Water-based activities are part of our heritage and culture and the increased amount of marine traffic, especially large LNG carriers will permanently alter that experience. Traditional fishing, hunting and gathering are affected, especially by light pollution and flare stacks and marine noise.

Industrial use in the past and proposed now have made that territory inaccessible, it is misleading to state that this new proposed use will restore it. The First Nations use of Howe Sound region will be impacted by this industrial activity, it quite simply isn’t compatible with their traditional lifestyle. The employment opportunities noted for FN above are dismally small given the highly specialized nature of LNG industry.

13. LNG is directly opposed to First Nations heritage. The industrial by products will make it harder and unhealthy to live off the land and river.

14. what **** impacts? you are all **** blind and stupid.

15. The most recent heritage of this site was as a polluting pulp mill. This is a great replacement of this dirtier industry with a cleaner, modern, more efficient industry and deals with historic contamination.

16. How can you truly know the impacts of chlorinated hated water being dumped in the sound? What impacts does this have over time if water temps rise naturally?

17. Are you kidding me? LNG and heritage? Fracked liquid natural gas is contradictory to everything First Nations Heritage is. Or how about hey here's some money for little league, take it and play on the field while you breath on our toxic emissions.

18. Once a project has started, they will NOT work with First Nations, they will be too busy trying to 'make money’...nothing else...maybe a telephone call or meeting, but that's it...'they have consulted First Nations’.

19. I’m not first nations, but I respect their stewardship of the land. I hope that our local bands will say "no" to this proposal.

20. BC stands for Bliss Country.

Our heritage is the natural resources and habitat.

Our culture is one that celebrates the beautiful outdoors and recreation.

21. It is time we start looking at the long term implications of our actions and stop being so short sighted and profit profit oriented in an economic model that creates "externalities" and "off book accounting" which is nothing short of hiding costs to extract revenue disguised as profit when we are actually leaving the real costs for others to carry. That is why we are well served to look at the way First Nations ran their economy and manged their resources. Their model worked for thousands of years. We are in desperate trouble in barely over 100 years of settlement, taking with little consideration of the long term impacts and leaving a broken environment. It needs to stop and it needs to stop with this project. Listen to the quiet voices of those that 'know'.
22. Woodfibre was a part of the community, built by the community. For the Community.

23. The UN has warned Canada that many industry-driven initiatives are violating many First Nations rights to traditional cultural expression; A pattern is evident whereby pandering and promotion often replaces proper consultation and consideration of local practices and values.

24. I truly hope that the First Nations are not bought out by this initiative. If we look at the investment for the 7th generation, this is of no value.

We are seeing the return of the Orcas and dolphins... they represent an opportunity for site seeing. I don’t think a whale tour would be welcomed with the WLNG and its ships in the background.

25. These high profile projects have come a long way from the sensationalized villain archetype that is spurred on in our media, hollywood films, etc. These projects go through a lot of consultation with the various stakeholders and basically it comes to a win win - both parties have to be satisfied. That doesn’t mean that they will come back and demand more ... which is a separate issue. But the initial discussions, consultants and agreements are based on the believe that both parties will gain from this change. A part from that, there is a lot of important information that can be discovered and documented from these projects, especially First Nations’ finds.

26. First Nations are critically important to such projects, and they cannot proceed without their blessing. However, First Nations are not the only people with heritage and culture, and there are people with several generations of family living in Squamish or other small towns in rural BC. Their use of the resources matters too.

That being said, WLNG will likely seek to develop an Impact-Benefit Agreement with the Squamish Nation. These IBAs are generally confidential, so the public may never know how much WLNG is seeking to bribe them with, and even the Squamish Members may not be informed of what their leaders are agreeing to. We have seen first hand that the local First Nation is working hard to develop their human resources so they can better manage their financial interests, but they have much progress to make. Having big money lawyers from foreign capital driven WLNG parties negotiating with Squamish First Nation is not an even affair. They simply lack the technical, scientific, and administrative capacity to engage in such negotiations while protecting all essential interests. The failure of the provincial and federal governments to provide First Nations with better support and resources for this purpose is a continuation of their failure to treat First Nations with respect. Any WLNG agreement at this point will inevitably compromise the well-being of Squamish First Nations on every level, and in turn lead to tremendous compromises on the rest of the non-First Nations population who do not have the same political rights, yet who will share equally in the negative impacts of the WLNG development...except they will share unequally in the positive impacts as non-First Nations populations have no right to MEANINGFUL consultation, and not IBAs will be forthcoming to yield our community anything other than the bare minimum of tax benefits, and some cheesy window-dressing sponsorship of high-profile events to make WLNG look like they care.

27. What about the heritage & culture that does not involve first nations groups?

28. It is good to be aware of history as well as looking to the future. They are not incompatible.

29. I find it absurd that Squamish would even consider allowing this type of industry into our area. It's impacts to all things we value far outweighs the benefits they put forward. What are jobs when fish, whales, and other dependent species are put at risk and harmed? What value is a few more corporate tax dollars when we have to stare at, listen to, boat around, smell, and endanger ourselves with this facility and pipeline? What responsibility do we take in the polluting of northern BC with the support of dangerous and polluting fracking?

30. In recent years Squamish has begun to take pride in a much more proactive approach towards our town. We are seeing young families moving here to raise their families, start-up small business ventures, look into clean industries (which we sorely need more of) and engaging in a far healthier
life style. The WLNG is unlikely to provide jobs in the long run for the locals as they undoubtedly will be hiring the Asian workers they will be bringing over (which in and of itself I understand but this does not provide a heritage or economy that benefits Squamish as the import workers will be stationed only on the tankers off shore).

31. This is traditional Squamish Nation territory and they should have the final say on any project that is proposed for the area.

32. First Nations are trying to improve their culture and restore their area as much as possible to how it once was. Wood fibre LNG has the potential and will destroy much to the local environment. Lots of damage will never be seen, whether it is underground or underwater, but it will happen. Then of course there is the inherent potential of explosions in the pipeline, plant, or even on the water with a tanker.

33. Our government has a long history of breaking promises to First Nations, or promising to work with them and not following through if there is financial benefits for the BC Government.

34. Most First Nations are vehemently opposed to this. Please listen to them.

35. 'The proposed LNG project site is within traditional Squamish Nation territory'

36. The backcountry access point is not very accurate. I have heard from WLNG more recently that for safety and other reasons, the increased backcountry access it not so likely.

37. I believe that an LNG facility does not align the values of the community. Even if the benefits were much greater than they are stated, this still would not fit with the community culture. qualitative, but very important.

38. There are heritage artifacts and resources at Woodfibre -- from the pulp mill, power plant, and early logging operations. Within the site is an antique Pelton Wheel deserving a new home in Squamish. Behind the site are artifacts from a pioneering 1920s truck logging operation, including steam equipment and unique truck relics. At Henidetta lake is a diesel or gas donkey. All of these artifacts, as well Western Forest Products photo and document archives are of great interest to the Sea to Sky Forestry Centre Society -- which has the aim of opening an interpretive centre near the Squamish Adventure Centre that will tell the story of Woodfibre and the forest industry -- past, present and future.

39. Let the first nations speak for them selves .... all the concerns sound horrendous.

40. They can offer all they want to mitigate their activities. Not new behaviour, but just as insincere. Different place, same players.

41. Bullet point 2 and 5 should be combined - they are both effects of LNG tankers. Re 6th bullet, re noise and visual effects, add night safety lighting and flaring.

42. The proposed site is in direct conflict with the traditional values of the historical safe guarding of this land. Instead of attempting to convince Squamish First Nations to submit to pressures of capitalism, our community needs to work in unison and with respect upholding traditional values and embracing the culture and teachings of ancient wisdom as part of our innate and special community DNA.

43. Squamish was run on LNG through the 60s before BC hydro built their infrastructure. It is part the towns heritage, move on.

44. First nations have a right to their traditional ways of hunting and fishing- the impact of this facility through dirty water cooling system and the pipeline through the estuary and site will do nothing but harm to an already compromised area. Howe Sound has had a beautiful revival of marine life and hope is high to see this continue.
45. NO LNG

46. In addition to the above concerns, I value recreational access to Howe Sound.
   I regularly kiteboard/sea kayak/paddleboard, and I am very concerned that the exclusions zones
   around the proposed LNG facility and the LNG tankers will impact recreational access within the
   Howe Sound.

47. I am not as familiar with the impact on the First Nations but I imagine it will be the same as the
   impact on all of us - destruction of the natural habitat, whose value we cannot put a price on.

48. I don't believe that woodfibre will continue to support anything they propose. I truly believe this is a
   business which runs under it's own best interest, and once they have approval to go ahead they will
   have no reason to care what's important to the people of Squamish. And why should they propose to
   work with volunteer groups to remediate the site and monitor/mitigate potential impacts to elk
   herds? that should be their responsibility to organize, fund, and execute, not the responsibility of
   volunteers.

49. This is yet again another slap in the face to our native heritage. Giving them access to a place that they
   were the first to inhabit is ironic.

50. Some rich billionaire tycoon who made his billions by deforesting Sumatra through clear cutting and
   burning and murdering villages and indigenous villagers and also makes fake invoices to dodge
   appropriate taxes comes to my home and starts throwing his money around and buying people off to
   gets **** carbon fuel out of our ground... I say pardon! I don't think so! Wlng you're not welcome!

51. We have seen WLNG dole out huge amounts of bribes, oops, I mean cash to whomever is naive
   enough to accept their money. They appear to have no shortage of blood money to throw at the
   community to garner whatever support they can get in whatever sector they can get their dirty
   fingers into. This should not, in any way, construe these groups owe them any allegiance and many of
   us see gifts of baubles and beads for what they truly are - hollow bribes!

52. Woodfibre "proposes to work with" local First Nations.....Fact: Why hasn't this happened already?
   Fact "to provide training and Job ops..." In other words a bribe. "Woodfibre provides support and
   funding to local groups" Fact: another bribe. "Woodfibre proposes to work with local volunteer
   groups" Fact: Volunteers should not have to work for free to ensure an eco-system that Woodfibre
   will potentially ruin.

53. is the support and funding bribery? why do certain groups get it and has their opinion of the LNG
   changed since the arrival of donations?
   i have concern for the water environment, fish habitat, impact n traditonal hunting and also the effect
   of he pollution on these fish.

54. Noise and visual impacts from LNG tanker traffic and the glass sponge destruction and the waves
   created and the constant fear of an accident make it imperative that Squamish Council devote hours
   in consultation with Eoin Finn. His residence is on the tanker route and his studies are thorough
   regarding the destruction attempting to bring even one tanker into Howe Sound.
   This is one of those cheap buy of property, government lax in re-zoning the land to something other
   than industrial use, as stated in 2005 was to happen, things.
   A "thing" that will negatively impact the planet and already is with fracking at one end and spills at
   the other of all these projects.
55. Backcountry access via wood fibre us a load of garbage. That really upsets me. why would I want to pass thru noxious chemicals to start a hike.

56. There are many educational and cultural opportunities in our Howe Sound for teaching about First Nations practices and environmental resilience.

57. This question section has ignored the cultural value to non natives.

58. The return of the fish, Dolphins and whales shows us that industry that had destroyed access to the sea life to this area is now back. This has huge social implications such as the First Nations who can utilize the gains of the return of sea life here. Now that things are flourishing we can really aim at protecting instead of destroying it.

59. You keep mentioning backcountry access - I can't believe for a second that anyone from the public will be allowed anywhere near the site - the safety considerations just wouldn't allow it.

   The seawater cooling system has been banned in California due to its impacts on fisheries. How can BC consider allowing it?

60. I am more concerned with the negatives because the impact will be greater to Howe Sound than the potential few positives that WLNG is trying to entice people with.

61. It does not fit with our culture or heritage at all. We are finally recovering from past industrial activity in Howe Sound, it's a place that needs to be protected. It's iconic and should the UNESCO World Heritage Site instead.

62. Good that LNG are co-operating with First Nations and others.

63. Once through cooling system is banned in California as it damages marine life; juvenile salmon, herring, plankton the dolphins, orcas and humpbacks no longer have a food supply. First nations people are dependent on salmon as a food. If it is no longer available on of their food sources is gone.

64. Make the site as in obstructive as possible (bury everything) the flaring should be strictly monitored.

Heritage - Values |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Let's move as a community to support the research, development, and implementation of green sustainable energy...not outdated soon to be hated fossil fuel Planet damaging Projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I feel Squamish has come sonar in the last few years. It would be a shame to lose everything we have with this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Absolutely No! Not! Nodda!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I support greater local first nations involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I place a high value on Aboriginal people's ability to self-determination, and so I would hope that the District supports local First Nations, no matter what First Nations' opinions are of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I feel part of the land and the water and the sky in this place. It is my home. It is where I eat. It is where I pray and worship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>56 years of LNG tankers, no incident. And to those who say that means the odds are there will be, I say, is that how actuaries determine insurance rates? Since Fukushima, Japan has almost solely relied on LNG. Tokyo, a city of 13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Million people has an LNG tanker transit its harbours every 20 hours!!! Perfectly safe.

9. The past industrial operations in Howe Sound have had a negative impact on the heritage and culture as a whole. The cessation of such activities has resulted in the return of powerful FN symbols such as the Orcas, dolphins, salmon, herring and eagles. These are cultural icons which could be severely damaged as a result of WLNG. Much loss of traditional territory and way of life has been already experienced by FN, losing the recently returning and hope building icons of their heritage could deal a severe blow to these communities.

I am absolutely opposed to this "project"!

dumbasses

Is the cooling system proposed not being banned in parts of the USA (California) for it’s devastation to marine life? I feel we are being short sighted, grasping for tax base but not thinking through the consequences of our actions. I feel while it may take time we could do much better as a community, be leaders for positive change.

District of Squamish and Squamish First Nations need to meet to talk about this 'major' development and where we need a 'true' picture as to what needs to happen, 'working together'....'The Good, Bad and the very very Ugly'

First Nations with their land, culture, and treaties are to be defended against industrial development (exploitation).

LNG expansion will further the divide between industry and First Nations.

I have seen these projects work hard with stakeholder groups and develop progressive programs; find, document valuable heritage finds and become an asset to community groups - the private sector assisting with community needs!

Still I don't like this industry from the beginning till the end transport out. Thanks

Most of these people will sell their land for a buck only to demand more in the future. Don't we give these people enough money/ tax breaks only to have them throw it away/in our faces?

The proponent purchased a dirty environmental site. Their remediation plans will improve the area for future generations.

What about the culture of Squamish? We have here a young and vibrant community that enjoys our beautiful environment. We’re a very down-to-earth community for the most part. How does one reconcile working in dirty oil and living in a place like this? Oh yeah, you can have it all... except you can't. My bet is that they won't do it well so they'll either not stay or move to another sector... sort of like my "green" friends that were "paid enough to forget" about what nasty deeds their employers were doing in the oil patch while they tried to clean up. They let their souls get sucked dry.

I do not believe that Woodfibre LNG will act in the best interests of this community. Here is the crux of the issue. WLNG is owned by an Indonesian company with an appalling record of human rights and environmental rights abuses. WLNG’s Vice President, Byng Giraud, previously worked on the Mount Polley project and no doubt assured the local community there that the project was perfectly safe. I do not trust that our environment is safe in the hands of a company run by people with such a terrible track record.

We have too much to lose and not enough to gain.

Thw Government has proved, through actions, that historically it will violate agreements with First Natons, or anyone that opposes it’s views. There are many viable energy sources that we should be investing in right now. Kind of how there were electric cars being manufactured in Eastern Canada 10 years ago, by a small Canadian automotive company, who were not allowed to sell cars in Canada and sold their electric cars to California instead. Now that the Major World Car Manufacturers are making electric cars .its okay? Can you say "dirty politics".

If a major enery company switched to clean energy and paid the government thier kickback, we wuld be seeing breaking
twchnology, like clear solar glass energizing Howe Sound.

First Nations face enough challenges keeping their heritage and culture alive, they don’t need another. 

Just don’t let it happen!

Once again, a very tilted grouping of comments. Are Woodfibre’s offers to "mitigate" unlimited? Will they match any negative impact to any degree and fully remediate in a timely way? If so, why haven’t they made any legally enforceable assertions of this?

I can’t speak well to impacts on First Nations culture, but I think it’s worth considering Squamish’s culture as well. If you accept that the information collected by the branding committee is accurate, then environmental stewardship is important part of Squamish's broader culture. Does WLNG and a push into a fossil fuel industry with massive climate impacts and a massive increase in fracking align with that culture and its values?

Heritage and cultural values needs protection for the common benefit of ALL users and inhabitants of this part of the world.

I value a community that respects our First Nations peoples and works with them to support them as needed to maintain their culture and heritage.

Be proud of this inherent culture as one of our communities very special gifts that differentiates us not just in beauty but in historic values. Adopted at the core, First Nations teachings and knowledge should be valued highly and embraced as part of the master community planning process.

The best thing that Squamish Nation could do with WLNG is negotiate an Impact & Benefit Agreement. If Council could ever move beyond focusing on the negative impacts they might be able to negotiate a similar style agreement with WLNG to guarantee benefits.

Hello, My name is [Redacted]. I live [Redacted], Squamish, B.C.

I have lived in Squamish since the mid 1960’s. I have witnessed personally heavy industry here and seen the devastation both on land and in the air. I went to the elementary school down town and saw 2 of my class mates develop asthma and had to go to school in Brackendale due to the air pollution. There were warning siren towers placed around town and would go off periodically. The smog down town in June during a high pressure weather pattern with no clouds around was astounding. I have been windsurfing here in Howe sound for 30 years. We have held world cup windsurfing races and the Canadian Windsurfing national championships here. We have unique inflow wind thermals that also blow straight thru town from wood fiber. Our wind sport society operates off of the end of the spit just down wind and not far from the woodfiber site. We will be up to 800 members this year. When woodfibre was in operation our members were the first to get the smell of the air pollution. I am a director and past president of the society for 15 years. I also have been sitting on the Squamish Estuary Committee for the past 15 years where I have learned a lot about the Howe sound and the recovery it has been going through. I have witness whales, dolphins and orcas all returning right up to the river mouth. Never in the past have we seen this until the last 3 to 4 years. I had a Whale spray in my face when he or she was feeding off of the river mouth and I was down wind on my kiteboard. The Howe sound fiord is unique and due to the lack of activity at the old woodfiber site has allowed the large water mammals to return. If you look at the geography of the site of woodfiber it is like doorway as the mammals round the corner to come into the harbour and to the river. Those ships that LNG are proposing are huge. They will be assisted by 3 to 4 Tugs all the way up the sound. These tugs noise decibels will not be good for the retuning mammals. I am getting sick and tired of the LNG propaganda as they compare themselves to other places around the world and try to spin off the impact of the pollution and activity under water that this plant will create. We are not other places, we are a unique Howe Sound Fiord. It has been said that Howe Sound is the worst place to set up industry.

The other frustrating point about this plant going in is it is the only plant that Christy Clark and the Liberals can get up and running first to make good on their mandate to start delivering LNG before the other plants come on line that are not
near populated areas. We are being used as a political pawn here on this plant. These pipes are 24" diameter and will be able to double the shipping in the Howe Sound in the near future, of course they will deny this. I know you are supposed to make recommendations but that is what they want regardless of the risks because they are recommendations only.

I could mention the safety, the economy, and more on pollution but I will let the others write in on this.

I thank for your attention and hope you will do the right thing.

Best Regards

XXXXX

| 3   | LNG will do nothing for First Nations in the long run. The facility may promise short term gain, but the only way to truly help all inhabitants of Howe Sound is to find clean energy sources and continue to remediate the area from past dirty industry and look to the future for sustainable practices we can all be proud of. |
| 4   | NO LNG |
| 3   | Again the "positive" contributions to First Nations, is simply a smoke screen designed to make LNG look good. Our First Nations do not need LNG coming is and helping them with one hand while the other takes away. It's shameful and disgusting to me to see this kind of political showmanship happening in order to sway votes in the council room. |
| 6   | I hope that Woodfibre does not succeed in pacifying the First Nations here in Squamish into not battling for their land and their rights. I hope that First Nations all over North America continue to lead the way in their very visible way to try to protect the land and their heritage. That will help us all. |
| 7   | Going backwards is what I feel like we are doing here. |
| 8   | Do I need to say more? |
| 9   | I believe heritage and culture will be strengthened by opposing the LNG project. |
| 10  | Resource industries continuously promise to provide First Nations and government with economic rewards that appear as "pay-offs" at the expense of the greater community and environmental well being. Culturally significant sites and traditions that are potentially effected should be evaluated by the impact on preserving cultural integrity and not "up for sale" in order to skip over thorough environmental evaluation processes. |
| 11  | This just makes me want to puke. I can't bear it. how else can i describe this situation! its painful to read about. |
| 12  | my submission to EAO on WLNG |
| 3   | I will first draw on the expertise of others: |
Sound residents at risk

As LNG tankers transit Howe Sound, there is a high-danger zone for 1,600 metres (1-mile) on either side of the LNG tanker. If an accident happens, people within this zone risk death by asphyxiation, or death/injury by fire or explosion. Every time a tanker travels through Howe Sound (approximately 6-8 transits a month according to Woodfibre LNG) several Howe Sound communities will be in that high-danger zone, including: Bowen Island, Bowyer Island, Anvil Island, Passage Island, Porteau Cove, West Vancouver, and parts of the Sea to Sky highway. The Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) LNG Terminal Siting Standards states that LNG terminals should not be located in narrow, inland waterways with dense local populations and significant commercial, recreational, and ferry traffic. Why would that guideline not apply to Howe Sound? The proposed siting of the Woodfibre LNG terminal and associated transit of LNG tankers through Howe Sound poses an unacceptable risk to safety of people in communities along the shores of Howe Sound.

Sources: Sandia Report, 2004 and SIGTTO LNG Terminal Siting Standards

2. ENVIRONMENT: The once-through seawater cooling system proposed by Woodfibre LNG is outdated

Woodfibre LNG is proposing an outdated and damaging cooling method to help cool the LNG facility. They propose to extract 17,000 tonnes (= 3.7 million gallons, or 7 Olympic-sized 50-meter swimming pools) of seawater from Howe Sound, chlorinate it, heat it, and then spit it back out into the sound every hour of every day for the next 25 years. This method has been banned in California and several other places as it is very damaging to marine life such as juvenile salmon, herring, and plankton which are the building blocks for all other life in Howe Sound. If the herring are impacted, the dolphins, orcas, and humpbacks are also impacted as they no longer have a food supply. The impacts of increased water temperatures and the addition of chlorinated seawater will likely reverse the recent revival of marine life in Howe Sound, which is just now recovering from the toxic legacies of previous industries. This is unacceptable.

3. HEALTH: Social costs and health impacts of air pollution

Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG's environmental assessment application). Emissions of NOx and SO2 interact with other compounds to form fine particles, which can affect both the lungs and the heart. Exposure to these particles is linked to increased risk of respiratory symptoms, such as irritation of the airways, coughing, or difficulty breathing; decreased lung function; aggravated asthma; onset of chronic bronchitis; irregular heartbeat; nonfatal heart attacks; and premature death in people with heart or lung disease. A new study published in the scientific journal, Climatic Change, estimates the true social costs of air pollution that aren’t accounted for in the cost of fossil fuels and other pollutants. Social costs include the health impacts of air pollution as well as impacts from climate change. The study found that sulfur dioxide costs $42,000 per tonne, and nitrous oxides cost $67,000 per tonne. Sources:


4. SITE SUITABILITY: The Woodfibre site is not a safe location for a hazardous LNG facility

On February 15th, 2015, a 3.4 magnitude earthquake hit Vancouver’s coast that was felt throughout Howe Sound. The Woodfibre LNG proposal is located within this zone of moderate to high earthquake risk, on two known thrust faults. The Woodfibre site also has a history of slope failure. In 1955 a wharf and three warehouses collapsed into Howe Sound at the Woodfibre site, causing $500,000 – $750,000 in damages (Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4). A recent, but
unreleased, geotechnical study by Knight Piesold identifies that approximately 46% of the study area was mapped as having rapid mass movement. This means landslides and slope slumpage, including existing natural landslide hazards as well as terrain where construction activity may increase landslide initiation. Why hasn't the geotechnical study by Knight Piesold been released?

Sources:
Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4
B.C. Ministry of Energy and Mines

5. ECONOMY: The requested socio-economic study has not been provided

During construction, only 4.3% of jobs (=38.5 out of 895) will be for locals living in the Squamish/Whistler corridor (See Table 6.2-8 of the Labour Market section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Why are there so few jobs predicted to be filled by workers in the Squamish/SLRD area? The EA application is also very unclear about how many of the 100 full-time jobs will be filled by residents of Howe Sound once the LNG terminal is operational. What are the benefits to Squamish? What are the costs? There is still no clarity around how much in municipal taxes will be paid to the District of Squamish. How will this project impact existing small businesses and existing industries in Howe Sound?

6. CLIMATE CHANGE: 142 thousand tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions is unacceptable

Woodfibre LNG is now estimating greenhouse gas emissions to be 142 thousand tonnes of CO2 equivalent every year. These annual emissions of CO2 equivalent from Woodfibre LNG is equal to adding over 18,000 cars to the highway, driving to Vancouver and back, every day. This is more than six times greater than current highway traffic. It is irresponsible to approve this kind of polluting industry at a time when we need to transition away from fossil fuels to mitigate the risks associated with climate change, and to reduce the economic and health impacts of air pollution in general.

7. GOVERNMENT REGULATION: Inability of government to monitor, enforce, and respond to issues

There are no regulations adopted to regulate this LNG industry from a technical standpoint. Any of the current standards are not applicable to the LNG industry. Do the regulators have the knowledge and the expertise and the capacity to oversee this industry or will they be relying on the proponent to monitor themselves and report to the regulator? Self-monitoring industries have created several examples of accidents with resulting environmental destruction in recent years, including the Lac Megantic rail disaster and the Mt Polley tailing pond spill.

8. ENVIRONMENT: Removal of water from Mill Creek unsustainable for fish life

Woodfibre LNG has secured the water license to extract water from Mill Creek, which flows through the Woodfibre site. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans has objected to this because the amount of water that WLNG is proposing to remove will reduce water levels in Mill Creek to levels that will no longer support fish life, especially in the summer months. Woodfibre LNG needs to source water for this project from somewhere else to protect this important stream habitat which is home to several native fish species.
9. ENVIRONMENT: Missing baseline studies

The following baseline studies are either missing or are inadequate as they do not conform to any recognized scientific standards: fish, birds, marine mammals, air quality, shipping, water quality, marine sound, and atmospheric sound, marine life near the Woodfibre site, and the cumulative impact assessment. Proper studies need to be completed before any decisions can be made regarding this project.

10. VIEWSCAPES: BC Hydro clearcut of two 64 metre swaths of forest at the Woodfibre site will impact viewscapes from the Sea to Sky highway and the gondola

BC Hydro is proposing to clearcut two 64 metre swaths of forest at the Woodfibre site which will create visible scars in the Howe Sound viewscapes which will be very visible from the highway and the gondola. This information was only made available during the recent BC Hydro open house held on 19th March, near the end of the public comment period. This information is not included in the cumulative impact assessment of the Woodfibre application and it should be. This late release of information pertinent to this project and the timing of the BC Hydro open houses is unsatisfactory.

11. ENVIRONMENT: 9000 year old glass sponge reefs endangered by tanker traffic

LNG tankers do not have enough clearance to get over the 9000 year old reef if they go off course. These 9000 year old glass sponge reefs have been called "Living Fossils" by National Geographic as until recently this species was thought to have gone extinct over 60 million years ago. MLA Jordan Sturdy recently made a statement in the House about the importance of this discovery in Halkett Bay near Gambier Island, and to support the proposal to expand the Provincial Park Protected Area to ensure these reefs are protected.

Sources:
http://jordansturdymla.ca/bcltv_videos/mla‐sturdy‐halkett‐bays‐glass‐sponges/

12. ENVIRONMENT: Will there be smog? Will there be a smell?

Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2‐14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application).

Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2) is a reddish‐brown gas with a pungent, irritating odour. It absorbs light and leads to the yellow‐brown “smog” pollution haze seen hanging over cities. It is known to irritate the lungs and increase susceptibility to respiratory infections. In combination with either ozone (O3) or sulphur dioxide (SO2), nitrogen dioxide may cause injury at even lower concentration levels.

Sulphur Dioxide (SO2) is a toxic gas with a pungent, irritating, and rotten smell. Current scientific evidence links short‐term exposures to SO2, ranging from 5 minutes to 24 hours, with an array of adverse respiratory effects including bronchoconstriction and increased asthma symptoms. These effects are particularly important for asthmatics at elevated ventilation rates (e.g., while exercising or playing). Studies also show a connection between short‐term exposure and increased visits to emergency departments and hospital admissions for respiratory illnesses, particularly in at‐risk populations including children, the elderly, and asthmatics. The addition of these air pollutants in Howe Sound is of particular concern as recent research by MSc student Annie Seagram (studying under Professor Douw Steyn, Department of Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Sciences at the University of British Columbia) has shown that the Howe Sound airshed...
and Lower Fraser Valley airshed are connected. Emissions from Woodfibre LNG will add to the pollution in Howe Sound, exacerbating the existing air quality conditions, particularly in the Squamish-Brackendale corridor.

Note that Metro Vancouver annually issues several Air Quality Advisories due to high concentrations of ground-level ozone. This pollution also impacts the Howe Sound and Squamish, and exposure to these pollutants are of particular concern for infants, the elderly, and is directly linked to health issues such as lung or heart disease and asthma.

In addition: the BC government needs to ensure the protection of the 9000 year old glass sponge reef at Halkett Bay off Gambier Island.

About Glass Sponge Reefs: http://www.eao.gov.bc.ca/pcp/forms/Woodfibre_LNG_form.html

Glass Sponge Reefs in Halkett Bay off of Gambier Island

MLA Jordan Sturdy spoke in Legislature about the glass sponge reef at Halkett Bay off Gambier Island.
http://jordansturdymla.ca/bcltv_videos/mla-sturdy-halkett-bays-glass-sponges/

Tankers do not have enough clearance to get over the 9000 year old reef if any off course action happens.

Transport Canada Dangerous Goods Dept. is not at all ready for LNG. In fact they now have a task force for rail and road.

I have been a member of 2 Stakeholder Teams focused on the protection and restoration of salmon habitat. I include information and links for your convenience and ask that a similar project be implemented for the WLNG and Fortis BC applications.

2005 SALMON RECOVERY PLAN
Entire Salmon Life Cycle
$250,000 Pacific Salmon Foundation

$2 million
5 year plan
Cheakamus Salmon Recovery
Squamish Nation and Stakeholders

CERT C
Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Technical Committee

The Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Technical Committee (CERTC) website, provides information on Cheakamus ecosystem restoration activities.
CERTC was formed in August 2005 in response to a train derailment and subsequent spill of sodium hydroxide into the Cheakamus River. CERTC's mandate is to understand ecosystem-level impacts and develop restoration and monitoring strategies for affected species to accelerate the return of the Cheakamus ecosystem to a pre-spill state as quickly as reasonably possible. CERTC Terms of Reference (pdf).

CERTC recommends programs for implementation to the Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Steering Committee based on input from experienced professionals, external specialists, interested parties and the public.

Both committees include representatives of:

CN
District of Squamish
Fisheries and Oceans Canada
BC Ministry of Environment
Squamish Nation

Thank you for your interest in Cheakamus ecosystem restoration.

Comments can be made to CERTC at comments@certc.ca

Fish Assessment

Following the spill, B.C. Ministry of Environment (MoE) fisheries biologists, technicians and contracted staff documented fish survival and compared fish density information to available previous data.

Fish mortalities were collected from the Cheakamus River downstream of the spill, with activities including:

Recording mortalities by species and location;
Collecting length data to determine age classes of impacted fish;
Collecting scale samples to further supplement brood year identification; and,
freezing and storing of samples for further examination, if required.

Fish Impact Assessment (MoE and DFO) (pdf)

MoE Estimated Impacts on Salmon and Trout Populations:
Chinook
- 25% of juveniles from 2004 spawning population
- 50% of 2005 spawning population

Chum
- juveniles not affected
- 2005 spawning population not affected

Coho
- 50% of juveniles from 2004 spawners
- 2005 spawning population not affected

Pink
- juveniles not affected
- between 3 - 10% of 2005 spawning population

Steelhead
- 90% of mainstem juveniles from 2003 to 2005 spawners
- 2006 and 2007 steelhead spawning populations not affected

Estimated Impacts on Other Fish

Ninety percent of resident fish in the mainstem Cheakamus River may have been affected by the spill including:
Dolly Varden/Bull Trout
Rainbow Trout
Lamprey (2 species)
Sculpins (bullheads - 2 species)
Sticklebacks

Juveniles rearing in tributary streams at the time of the spill were not affected.

Benthos Recovery Presentation - Triton Environmental, 2008 (pdf). New!
Appendices (pdf) New!

Ecological Assessment

A screening level qualitative assessment of ecological effects has been conducted for CN to understand the potential effect the spill could have had on receptors other than fish in order to identify and target the need for ecosystem restoration activities.

Given the broad scope of the project and the limited amount of available data (i.e., exposure data, such as concentration of NaOH in environmental media, NaOH ecotoxicity toward specific species) it is not possible to conduct a comprehensive ecological risk assessment for each species present in the ecosystem. The screening level assessment focused on the functions of populations and communities within the ecosystem. This recognizes populations are less sensitive than their most sensitive individual member and some effects may be observed at the population level without impairing the functions of the ecosystem as a whole.

Qualitative methods using subjective ecological effects ranking categories, such as high, medium and low, were used to describe the likelihood of adverse effects rather than providing a numerical estimate of effects. To minimize subjective influence, the interpretation of ecological effects contain a clear explanation of the lines of evidence leading to the conclusions, including a description of the uncertainties and assumptions used. Additionally, matrices were used to provide a structured framework for the characterization of ecological effects. The assessment used existing information from baseline and monitoring reports and from previous scientific literature.

This screening level assessment of ecological effects consists of three main steps: problem formulation, analysis and characterization of the likelihood of adverse ecological effects. Results from the ecological effects assessment will be used to determine the direction of future recovery efforts for other components of the Cheakamus River ecosystem.

For more details, view the
Ecological Final Report (pdf) New!
Amphibian Assessment – October 2007 (pdf) New!
Study Design: Screening Level Assessment of Ecological Effects (pdf)
Water Quality

River Sampling

Water quality professionals tested and monitored the following:
Water quality in the Cheakamus and Squamish Rivers, August 5 - 8, 2005
Water quality in the Cheakamus during site remediation activities, August 10 - 26, 2005
Water quality in the Cheakamus after rainfall events, August 17 - October 28, 2005
Monitoring was conducted over a variety of meteorological conditions and river levels. The parameters monitored included: pH and conductivity, sodium, total dissolved and total suspended solids, total and dissolved organic carbon.

Results

The Cheakamus River was cleared for recreation after 24 hours by Vancouver Coastal Health on August 6, 2005. Water quality downstream of the derailment site was determined to be similar to that upstream.

Well Sampling

Forty-eight wells within 100 metres of the Cheakamus River were sampled on August 6 and 7, 2005. The parameters monitored included pH and conductivity, sodium, total dissolved and total suspended solids.
The sampling was coordinated by Environment Canada, Vancouver Coastal Health Authority, Triton Environmental Consultants Ltd., and Quantum Environmental Services.
Drinking water from wells was cleared for drinking by the Vancouver Coastal Health Authority after 48 hours on August 8, 2005.
No additional detailed water quality sampling is required.

Water Quality Report – September 2007 (pdf)
Water Quality Report Appendices – September 2007 (pdf)
http://certc.ca/recovery_fund.shtml

CERT C Stakeholder Team

The Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Stakeholder Team (Stakeholder Team), established by CERTC, is a public advisory group comprised of representatives from interested organizations and individuals with local knowledge of and experience with the Cheakamus River.
Meeting Notes

September 30, 2010 (pdf) New!
June 24, 2010 (pdf)
March 25, 2010 (pdf)
October 29, 2009 (pdf)
June 17, 2009 (pdf)
March 5, 2009 (pdf)
November 27, 2008 (pdf)
September 25, 2008 (pdf)
May 27, 2008 (pdf)
March 27, 2008 (pdf)
January 24, 2008 (pdf)
December 6th, 2007 (pdf)
September 27, 2007 (pdf)
June 21st, 2007 (pdf)
April 25th, 2007 (pdf)
February 28th, 2007 (pdf)
December 6th, 2006 (pdf)
July 6th, 2006 (pdf)
May 25th, 2006 (pdf)
April 27, 2006 (pdf)
March 25, 2006 (pdf)

Presentations

Overview of the Cheakamus River Large Woody Debris Stream bank Protection and fish habitat development project, June 2011 (pdf) New!
Update on Cheakamus River recovery strategies and monitoring programs, March 2009 (pdf) New!
Update on Cheakamus River recovery strategies and monitoring programs, January 2012 (pdf) New!
Cheakamus River Sculpin Recovery Presentation to CERST - Fall 2010 (pdf)
Adult Wild-and Hatchery-Origin Steelhead Returns to the Cheakamus River in 2009(pdf)
Cheakamus River Bull Trout Radiotelemetry and Enumeration Program, 2007-2009(pdf)
Cheakamus River Side Channel Re-watering Projects, March 2010 (pdf)

Role

The Stakeholder Team provides input into the development and implementation of monitoring and restoration programs
for the Cheakamus ecosystem.

The Team helps coordinate and communicate comments and recommendations from interested parties to CERTC, and also receives updates on CERTC activities, as the information becomes available. All input from the Stakeholder Team is considered advisory in nature and final decisions regarding monitoring and restoration programs rests with CERTC and the Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Steering Committee. Stakeholder Team Terms of Reference

CERTC Communication to the Stakeholder Team

CERTC Responses to Dec 6 2006 Stakeholder Team Questions (pdf)
http://certc.ca/public_events.shtml Events and Brochures.
http://certc.ca/monitoring_programs.shtml
http://certc.ca/recovery_plan.shtml to 2012

SQUAMISH ESTUARY MANAGEMENT PLAN

[PDF] Skwelwil’em Squamish Estuary Wildlife Management Plan


PDF] View the 1999 Squamish Estuary Management Plan


REPORT OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE ON THE PROPOSED SQUAMISH ESTUARY MANAGEMENT PLAN

Volume One and TWO THE PLAN  September 1982

Volume TWO Pages 211 to 233 re: PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT WORK GROUP REVIEWS OF SEMP DRAFT 1982


PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT WORK GROUP MEMBERS
Squamish Estuary Nature Centre ad hoc Committee
Squamish Council
1999
SEMP
https://squamish.civicweb.net/document/10318/February%202,%201999

Page 19 Signatures to 1999 SEMP


1982 TO 1992
SEMP!

Howe Sound has also been improved because the Fraser Basin Council has successfully restored the waters at Britannia Beach on Howe Sound BC.
http://www.fraserbasin.bc.ca/about_britannia.html

Clean up after industry pollutes is never complete and restoration actually takes centuries.

The economy here in Howe Sound no longer depends on big polluting industry. What is evolving is self-employment in businesses that depend on "the scenery". Like the film industry. Also tourist activities because HOWE SOUND NOW HAS WHALES! DOLPHINS! HERRING!

Eagles and salmon have always drawn the public to the wilds of Howe Sound. People stay to live in a healthy environment and to co-exist with nature. There are economic benefits to all aspects from the sea, keeping the wild fishing industry to the sky where Whistler/Blackcomb are world class ski resorts with a growing population in what was once a village. Our proximity to Vancouver BC, also a source of employment, allows those who live in the Howe Sound area to park the car and enjoy recreating without it when not commuting to work elsewhere.

The LNG Project needs to be assessed as a having a negative impact on a recovering Howe Sound.

Many have written who have been able to study and report on the negative impact of the WLNG project, the Fortis BC pipeline and the gigantic tankers.

For me this is a forced endeavor. I feel quite intimidated by the fact that the WLNG company can afford $250 million dollar fines for environmental atrocities elsewhere.

It brings to mind that Woodfibre had 600 pollution violations that could have been charged against the owners and the
government would not allow that to happen in 1983.

When in 2005 Woodfibre was closed, there was a statement from the government that the Woodfibre site would never again be used for industry. The re-zoning never took place and now this is a legal application with deadly consequences. Global warming could have been avoided had alternative energies been used these last 40 plus years.

I have lived here since 1977 and I have enjoyed the transition to a Howe Sound that is recovering. Those moving to Squamish now, afford to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars to buy a small accommodation here. This isn’t so as to return to dirty industry and the putrid polluted smell of money when industry has an "accident".

Sincerely

XXXXX

4. Council needs to lobby that this project is developed as a best-in-class facility.

4. We believe LNG is grasping at air to convince intellectual people of its bogus benefits. No to LNG.

6. We should be focusing on Howe Sound as a global example of environmental remediation. One commenter said the following on a forum: He works at a summer camp on Gambier Island. Howe Sound is in a precarious state ecologically. Having suffered from decades of pollution, it is just now beginning to rebound, thanks to a great deal of grassroots initiatives, and careful monitoring and enforcement of regulations by DFO. We are seeing herring, salmon, and porpoises return in numbers we haven’t seen in 30 years. I have used this to teach students about ecological resilience - that natural systems will rebound if allowed, and given the right conditions. Woodfibre LNG threatens to reverse this progress. This would be a very sad story to have to teach.

7. For security purposes I certainly hope there is not a path thru the WLNG site to allow people access to the backcountry...

8. Any use of Squamish Nation land must be dealt with going through the Squamish First Nation.

9. Increasing site access for First Nations and backcountry access is a poor excuse for an LNG project.

5. There is a lot more heritage than just the First Nations. Our culture and its heritage is here now also...

1. As stated lets not take anything more away from the sea than we already have
   It is not ours to destroy. Why not keep some aspects still alive an flourish

2. How can an LNG plant add to Squamish’s culture? Is this not an oxymoron? The carrots they dangle (money) are not worth the impact.

3. Their pitiful bribes to local groups and organizations is distasteful.

4. Good jobs and co-operation with the District is important

5. It seems as though once again first nations people will lose their rights due to industry.
5. I am not in favour of this project. The visual values of this actual site will not be improved by WLNG
6. Nothing is more important than clean air, water and land.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The short term uncertain economic gain is not worth the potential catastrophic environmental risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>There is an opportunity in this process to seek Provincial leadership on improving the health of Howe Sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Self sufficient in regard to safety? What plan? Why no information? We would still be responsible for any damages and most damage would be irreversible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I believe it is safe and health concerns are minimal at best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Not worried about lng tanker safety or explosions on site. I am not confident Canadian regulations are worlds best standard. Please ask for comparative analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Research shows, and I strongly believe that there are long term health side effects from living near LNG pumping stations and other facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>When one googles LNG plant accidents they are extremely common. It's not a matter of if, but when. How can we invite such a disaster into our home?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Accidents along the pipeline as well as fracking also a concern beyond our towns basic needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>It's Your air too! ... Let us breathe please!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I've seen some pretty sketchy freighters in our harbour... the LNG tankers would be in much better condition. I do not see much if any risk with the tankers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>The federal governments ability to monitor/report on accidents/malfunctions due to the operation of industry canada wide is a joke!!! I have no confidence in the reports arising from industrial accidents /impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>rapid reaction response teams need to be in place locally before construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I would imagine that the most important health and safety issue is the air pollution that will come from the ships and the facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Mistakes are inevitable. There is no protection that could be put in place to protect from mistakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>The fact is there are risks and there is a potential for accidents or malfunctions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Since part of the pipeline goes so close (or even through) our community, we should be concerned about the safety or about what happens if there is a leak or an issue with the pipeline- we've all seen several accidents depicted on the news. Imagine the massive impact it would have on our community- where people live, where we recreate, where the wildlife</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lives and flourishes.

Industrializing the Howe Sound will undo everything that has happened over the past few years to rehabilitate it to its beautiful, healthy, thriving state at the moment. I would be concerned about the quality of the air we breathe with the plant being so close to the community. Will there be smog? We all love to be outside, and imagine if we had to breathe nasty, polluted air every time we were on a hike, bike ride or climbing? And having those conditions for longer term could be detrimental to our health.

There is always a risk of an accident for the tankers or at facility. It has happened before and it will happen again. My biggest concern is for the leaks, spills, explosions and how it would affect our air, the water and the surrounding ocean and forests.

20. Proposed compressor station too close to community!

   [Link to document]
   As well they should read the concerns and comments of the working group:
   [Link to document]

22. there is an inherent risk in just about anything we do. risks are mitigated through planning.

23. I am extremely concerned that the pipeline does through a populated area of Squamish and that the pumping station is located within a populated area. Even though statistically LNG facilities and pipelines have a fairly good safety record accidents can and do happen. I have asked several ties at different events what would the evacuation radius be in the event of an emergency. Fortis has never answered the question. Going by accidents and evacuations from similar facilities my guess is that it would be 800 to 1,000 metres. This would put a significant number of people at risk, not to mention our ambulance, police station, and search and rescue command centre. I have asked Fortis exactly how many and where shutoff valves for the pipeline would be located. In the event of a rupture any gas in the pipeline in both directions would escape up to the shutoff valve. This could cause a significant risk to the population. Fortis should provide where any shutoff valves are located.

24. Fact: pipelines leak! Accidents happen and here I feel the risk is too high concerning both the pipeline and the tankers.

25. Just because there has never been a catastrophic explosion at an LNG plant, or an exploding LNG tanker, doesn't mean there could be one, here or elsewhere. In a fiord, the dynamics of leaks or explosions are more pronounced. Site emissions are also subject to wind conditions, potentially compromising air quality and health

26. There has only been one incident, and it was by sabotage, with a Fortis pipeline. Fortis has an exemplary record. We have gas coming into our homes in plastic pipes for petes sake. Howe Sound has been recovering for almost twenty years not from industrial activity but from the cessation of over-fishing by Americans in Hecate Strait and the work done by the Stream Keepers in supporting the herring.

27. The current safety standards and guidelines specific to LNG are largely missing from provincial and federal legislation and frameworks. There has also been repeated demonstrations of the responsible agencies lacking resources to meaningfully monitor, oversee and enforce what policies and rules are in place for safety. The siting of WLNG does not meet the international SIGGTO standards. While the potential for LNG carrier accidents is low, this potential must be related to the severity of impact on Squamish and Sea to Sky communities.
Until the plant is operational we cannot ascertain the impact of flaring on air quality and health, given emissions, light pollution and noise. WLNg is estimating the addition of 295.7 tonnes of NO2 and 43.8 tonnes of SO2 every year. This impacts our air quality and has been linked to a number of respiratory health impacts. These costs need to be considered as factor's in this decision.

There have been numerous accidents involving gas lines and compressor stations and the ones proposed by Fortis are very close to populated areas and this poses an unacceptable risk.

There has been very little conversation around forest fire hazard from WLNG. With expected rising temperatures and drier weather this could pose a major health and safety issue for Squamish and Howe Sound region. The proponent manages the fire hazards on site but since it's located in a difficult to access mountain side any fire spread could be disastrous and exceedingly difficult to manage, as stated in the WLNG proposal.

No matter how safe Woodfibre, Fortis BC or other experts iterate, LNG is a dangerous substance. Every day in North America there are pipeline leaks and/or tanker mishaps. Every day. All it would take is one incident to threaten the health of the people, marine and land life of Squamish.

Accidents do happen. End of story.

I am very concerned about the health risks of this project for Squamish residents. The exhaust from liquifying the gas as well as flaring in emergencies will contaminate our air space. During the liquefaction process all the impurities in the gas will be released into our atmosphere. BC has no provincial standards on cancer causing agents such as volatile organic compounds. The VOCs combine with also emitted NOx to form ground level ozone. This industrial project will slowly make all of us residents sick.

Having visited the Tilbury LNG plant, I feel reassured that there are robust regulations in place. That said, the proposed LNG facility is a first of its kind (floating storage tank and transfer station) in Canada and internationally. To say it will meet all levels of standards and guidelines is somewhat misleading.

Pipelines leak frequently and this pipeline will be in areas that are very difficult to access especially in poor weather. We are also located in a very active seismic zone and the risk of earthquake and tremors to the pipeline is significant. Large LNG freighters are both unsightly and very large and will be challenged navigating our narrow Sound. There is great risk of colliding with the BC Ferries departing and arriving in Horseshoe Bay. Howe Sound also has many small islands that are very difficult to see in poor weather conditions and no man-made navigation equipment is perfect. The risk of a spill in our confined Howe Sound is too high. A spill would be catastrophic and take decades if not longer to clean up killing all sea life for years and years. We may not come back from a spill both in the ocean and on land. Back country access being made available to those that can get to the area is for such a small percentage of the population that it should not be considered as a benefit.

don't even do your homework? accidents? really? *** you are stupid.

While the proposed LNG facility may meet all standards in theory, the provincial and federal governments have demonstrated that they set standards that are a bare minimum and that they are unable at this time to effectively monitor the situation. I would rather see them have to not only meet, but clearly exceed, the standards.

every industry carries risks with it. This industry has risks as it is reasonable to expect. Overall this industry is well regulated. The money is in running a system continuously without major breakdowns or loss of assets. The proponents would not invest their money in something that they thought would be lost in an emergency generating event.

Does a natural gas pipeline through an environmentally and geologically active area make sense?

Squamish and British Columbia have no guidelines in place to regulate emission of of VOCs (volatile organic
compounds) such Benzene. These VOCs will be emitted from LNG Woodfibre with no regulations to police outflow. This has potentially catastrophic consequences for our public health.

The Safety guidelines for this project are the most up to date and comprehensive in the world. We have had a high pressure gas line running through the town plus the whole of the district is served by under ground gas lines.

Burnaby pipeline rupture. Kalamazoo pipeline rupture. LNG explosion in Washington State. BP oil spill in Gulf of Mexico. I could go on and on. This industry does not care about us. It cares about raping our land and stealing our resources. Our "laws" and "rules" don't apply to them and they look at the potential misery that their industry causes as mere blips on an insurance claim.

An LNG project site that is self-sufficient is worrisome in many ways. As we have seen over and over with oil spills (BP in the Gulf of Mexico comes to mind) and pipeline bursts elsewhere in the world, a promise is only a hope for the best. When accidents happen, environments are impacted. Significantly. For the long term. Whether the response is quick or not. More worrisome is the potential cumulative health impact on the sound that will occur, regardless of the incident of accident. We are all part of this very same ecosystem, and I know of no one who would knowingly pollute and poison their own food and air system, for economic benefit or otherwise.

The Squamish Estuary has mercury contamination from previous industrial use at the nearby Nexen site... concentrations of mercury have been revealed on the east side of the WMA and within Site A... 4 locations in east marsh and the one sample taken on the boundary of Site A show mercury levels higher than the Sediment Quality Criteria for a typical contaminated site (SedQCtcs)1. An Ecological Risk Assessment completed by Nexen Inc. found no unacceptable risks to the environment and human health in the conservation area (now the WMA) if left in an undisturbed condition. The Ecological Risk Assessment was completed using the Ministry of Environment's protocols and was approved by the Ministry's Contaminated Sites Program.

Emissions from the combustion of natural gas contribute to acid rain and ground-level ozone, both of which can damage forests and agricultural crops and are dangerous to health. In fact, 77 per cent of particulates from natural gas plants are dangerously small. These fine particulates have the greatest impact on human health because they by-pass the bodies' natural respiratory filters and end up deep in the lungs. Many studies have found no safe limit for exposure to these substances that are not only carcinogenic but are linked to a range of respiratory illnesses such as childhood asthma.

Accidents do happen.
We recently experienced an earthquake of a magnitude of 3.5. It was like an explosion.
We are in an area vulnerable to earthquakes and fracking is said to be provoking earthquake activity.

LNG plants should not be built in a long narrow heavily-used waterway
LNG tankers are the size of 3 football fields and takes 8 kilometres to stop. The captain can’t see anything 1.2 km ahead.
LNG tankers are class A marine safety hazards; one tanker has the explosive power of 70 Hiroshima A-bombs
If LNG spills onto the ocean, once it warms, it becomes flammable. The natural gas won’t just rise and disappear. Especially if there is wind, the flammable portion could drift in a cold fog to somewhere there is an ignition source – a cigarette in Lions Bay, a car on the Sea-to-Sky, a stove in Whytecliffe. The 1000-degree fire from the contents of an LNG tanker would fill Howe Sound.
Woodfibre LNG is being built with minimum safety spacing between LNG liquefaction, storage, and loading facilities. You can’t put out a large LNG fire with water. If a fire starts one place, it can easily spread to other places in the facility.

Missing from this list and singularly the most significant public health and safety element is the fact that this activity is built upon the expectation of 50,000 fracked shale gas wells in northern BC. All of the concerns listed above pale by comparison and they are in fact of no consequence since fracking leaks methane (no seals last forever), contaminates aquifers, possibly even changes the geography so significantly that earthquakes are more frequent and seem directly
There are grave public health and safety concerns all the way down the line from transport through pipelines or on rail, refining and compressing and shipping. Who benefits by all these risks?

According to the WHO, "Ambient (outdoor air pollution) in both cities and rural areas was estimated to cause 3.7 million premature deaths worldwide in 2012." Find study at http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs313/en/. Besides the fact that polluting the common good air should not be free, a company that is making money from polluting our air, should at least have to pay for every ton of CO2 they put up there. E.g. Carbon Offsetting / Compensation through programs like offsets Canada. Or help Squamish build wind turbines and solar panels to reduce the CO2 levels in the corridor that way.

Our local food industry is growing, our potential for aqua-culture is flourishing---finally after Howe Sound has started to recover from prior industry---We do not want to introduce such danger into our ecosystem and bodies!

LNG is one of the safest industries in the world... much safer than the huge propane tank sitting outside downtown ... that could blow up with a crash. Public health is an interesting topic. Natural Gas is a provider of heat, energy and without those how would our hospitals run? I watched this documentary once where one scene showed this African medical centre... all they had was one solar panel and they had to choose: have the lights on? Or have the fridge plugged in to keep the medicine cooled? So we are pretty blessed with our resources... why not spread the ability to power a community with a fossil fuel that is much cleaner than oil or coal and much more affordable then solar panels and wind turbines. As well, there have been studies that show that the de-industrialization of a town can show massive health effects on people's mental health (confidence, depression, anxiety, etc.) and adverse affects on physical health.

The applicable codes are written mostly by industry, and do not hold industry accountable at a level that actually compensates for full potential losses. These "codes, guidelines, and policies" are merely limitation clauses that forgive industry for the full price of their mistakes. Oil and gas industries have repeatedly refused to disclose their actual emergency plans (on premise of proprietary secrets), making it impossible to determine if they are actually prepared for an emergency. Cumulative health impacts are of a special concern, as we have NO IDEA how the development will impact the environment in the wake of a changing climate. Given that over 98% of all scientists accept global climate change as a real and pressing problem, and given that Squamish is in the midst of a record-shattering warm winter, and is facing a summer with severe limits of water, we cannot possibly understand how the impacts of LNG will affect us. Far more study is required, and industry needs to open their doors to proper independent studies, and not just studies fettered by the control of industry itself.

Public Safety is of utmost concern. We have heard of a vapour cloud during an explosion, that perhaps may not burn, but given the winds that blow up the sound every day in Summer, could asphyxiate our whole population.

Also here the geographic location in relationship to the potential of an earth quake is very real and dangerous.

What is the likelihood and severity of the health and safety issues that you are concerned with.

SAFETY. In the event of a chemical fire like the recent event in Vancouver, an LNG fire or leak, what is the emergency response plan and time? There isn't one right now because it's a very difficult situation with the terminal off shore. Since the wind from Woodfibre usually blows into Squamish, we need to be concerned.

We've all heard about the story of Erin Brokovich. LNG needs to stop pretending there isn't a very real risk of poisoning our land water and air. It is also a fact that having a track record of "zero incidents since..." does not mean that it won't happen. This risk is real. This risk is a fact in itself.

Does gas not have to be purified before it becomes lng. where does all these impurities go??

What do experts(other than LNG, Fortis or Gov't) say the health/environmental effects would be from an LNG facility.
Maybe contact Sierra Club and ask their opinion.

Methane as a gas can displace oxygen in the atmosphere and cause asphyxiation, or when exposed to an ignition source become explosive. In the Squamish Valleys limited air refreshment any leaks and become compounded.

From the information presented by the proponent, it appears that public health and safety is a priority.

Proposal does not cover risks of adverse effects from the natural environment or intentional sabotage. Seismic risks are well known and acts of intentional damage have occurred in Canada along with additional foiled plots.

Internationally, there are 19 major or great earthquakes annually - the risk is real and being realized around the world. OAG, 2014, p. 35,36 Retrieved from: http://www.bcauditor.com/pubs/2014/report15/catastrophic-earthquake-preparedness

Apologies for selecting 4 above, but they are all very real concerns.

Sandia National Labs, who investigated for the US government what would happen if there was a large LNG spill on water, showed that there could be a catastrophe in Howe Sound if a BC Ferry ran into an LNG tanker.

WF is not being laid out well in terms of safety spacing. Normally there is a big space between the liquefaction plant and the storage area, incase of fires - so if a fire starts one place it can’t spread to the storage. Not so here - it’s only 300m. And normally there is a lot of space between storage and loading LNG tanker. Not so here - they will be next to each other. Very strange.

We need to consider the health and safety of more than just humans in this endeavour. We share this water way and land with other living creatures and it’s our responsibility to not harm this web of life we share with them.

There are so many potential impacts to health and safety that it is difficult to just pin this down to one item. Spills, explosions, human error (yes, that most sublime of occurrences that is the root of so many of our biggest catastrophes, let us not forget the CN derailment in 2005) are all aspects that cannot be factored in as part of a simple risk/benefit analysis. The bottom line is there will be impacts and I guess the question Council has to ask is do they want their name in years to come to be associated with these incidences!

Really do not feel safe in the town anymore if there should be a LEAK or MALFUNCTION at the plant. It is so hard to listen to their promises of how safe this all will be. WE KNOW Byng Gerard was in charge of the Mount Polley mines before the disaster struck and ruined Quesnel Lake. The people heard all the same safety promises and look what happened. Talk is cheap and now we have BYNG in charge of Woodfibre/LNG. I have No faith in one word that comes out of his mouth!!! How can there be after obvious fault with such a great disaster to the people of the Quesnel Lake area.

Potential for accidents or malfunctions and how they are responded to is a real concern. Industry does not have a great track record for cleaning up their messes. This project will support fracking in another location. I am concerned for the health of those communities and concerned for the health of our own community.

There were 169 earthquakes off the BC coast in December 2014. I am very concerned about the safety of this plant and the Fortis pipeline in an area with so much seismic activity. I also have concern about potential accidents with the giant LNG tankers floating down the Howe Sound which is busy, busy with ferries, recreational boaters and other smaller tankers. With the closure of the Vancouver Coast Guard base, there is potentially a lack of emergency response should an accident occur.

Whether we know all the facts or not it is not possible to guarantee there will never be an accident along the natural gas pipeline or at the wood fibre site. Accidents happen all the time. Mount Polly, Chernobyl, BP Deep Horizon, Exxon Valdez,
train derailments, fuel laden train explosions...the list goes on and on. The question is what are we willing to risk?

Even though the potential for a tanker accident is low, it is a real potential. Pressure in the 25 year old pipeline will be increased significantly. How well will the pipe withstand this pressure without rupturing? What guarantees do we have? And when it happens it will be too late because the damage is done. And who wants 142,000 tons of climate warming GHG's annually? Not to mention 150 million tones of chlorinated water damaging marine life expelled into the sound annually, nitrogen oxides (smog) and sulphur dioxides too.

It was very hard to pick only 3 concerns. There are so many concerns with this. First of all, standards and safety guidelines evolve constantly. So just because they adhere to current guidelines does not mean they are satisfactory. There's so much that can go wrong and so little benefit to the community. Why would you support this?

There is no reason we should be putting our environment or community at risk.

Human beings are now the sickest species on the planet. We need to seriously start looking at our environment and how to clean it up air, water, food in order for man kind to reverse all of these chronic illness’ that are occurring due to the environmental impact on us. Epigenetics has already proven our health status is in direct correlation with the health of the environment.

Although WLNG may be far enough away from Squamish that we would not be directly impacted by a fire or explosion, it is closely surrounded by forest that connect to Squamish. The WLNG plant does involve explosive gases beyond just natural gas. And although LNG is not explosive, it can be in its gaseous state. It will be in both a liquid and gaseous state at the plant. LNG will burn big and hot even though it won’t explode. So what? What will happen if even a small accident triggers a fire? As I read the risk assessment in the WLNG EA document, it seems like there are a number of scenarios where the surrounding forest would be exposed to fire. Is Squamish or the province equipped to handle an off-site forest fire caused by an event on the site? With reduced snowpacks and increasing droughts predicted for our future, how fast and far would a fire spread? What would be the impact on our forestry industry. What would happen to the gondola if the whole forest in its viewscape burned down? Could a large forest fire spread to Squamish and/or the estuary, and what would the impacts be?

Council said no test hole. Company goes to court. What laws will they follow? Look at what this company actually does is other counties.

could this be target? Threat of major earthquake is very real. This project would be supplied by fracking for gas...the impacts of fracking, flaring and GHG at well sites should be included in assessment.

a) Negative long-term health impacts of operating LNG are evident and documented worldwide.
   b) Risk of accidents in mountainous terrain in the ACTIVE seismic zone
   (http://www.squamishchief.com/news/earthquake-rumbles-squamish-1.1763509) is real and dangerous.

We have a short time left to make a difference to future generations. All the people that want this here do not all live here so they do not care of the fall out. Like the death zone when it is malfunctioned and the money is not eatable or cover the cost of lives that will be lost because we today made the wrong choice. To just say NO LNG. We have been used enough to industry that do not live in the kill zone.

The compressor station location is also of concern regarding public health and safety.

As we all know from countless industrial accidents ranging from BP to Valdez, governmental regulations are only as good as their enforcement.

Potential for any accidents associated with any aspect of the Site or Pipeline would be devastating, to our communities health through environmental degradation.
Huge risk. No gain for me or anyone long term.

There are pipeline leaks and explosions well documented. There are major issues with fracking on northern communities as well as other communities that over the next 30 years will be impacted as the beast must be fed.

Public health will be affected greatly.

The last 2 bullet points should be combined - there is concern re safety in a lot of areas. Why risk side effects if they can be prevented simply by eliminating the potential root cause?

The health and safety risks from commuting to jobs that pay a living wage in The Lower Mainland will have an exponentially greater impact that any accident at WLNG.

I think your survey does a disservice by suggesting that there are benefits to the health of our community (We have compiled the main issues (both concerns and benefits) by having LNG at the Woodfiber site.

Woodfibre LNG will emit pollution emissions of nitrous and sulfur dioxide. Emissions of these gases interact with other compounds to form fine particles, which can affect both the lungs and the heart. Exposure to these particles is linked to increased risk of respiratory and cardiac symptoms.

Accidents in mining, pipeline disasters and environmental tragedies fill the headlines, and as we live in an earthquake zone it is not a safe site for this facility. Our area is know for weather changes that can create landslides, mudslides and other havoc that would cause disastrous consequences at the site.

Do these statements REALLY require further comment? I have no doubt the proponents would follow all existing government guidelines to get set up; it's what happens when accidents occur, and they will, that concerns me. I grew up seeing Squamish as "that place you buy coffee and groceries en route to Whistler", but having moved here 14 years ago, I've become increasingly proud of our success at re-introducing marine life, highlighting the natural beauty of the place, caring for our environment deeply. An LNG plant is diametrically opposed to our burgeoning Squamish image/mindset/economy.

BC Oil & Gas commission (BCOGC) have no setback requirements, nor does BC Safety Authority - both stated so in writing and both appeared before working LNG committee. The Jan 14 meeting minutes lists pipeline setbacks as an outstanding issue.

Design, construction and testing can only mitigate risks from pipeline explosions but only an adequate setback can ensure the safety our residents deserve.

The (USA) Gas Research Institute defines a 200m hazard zone from centre of pipeline - We could be about 50m from the pipeline.

Saskatchewan Energy is one provincial agency that has setback requirements: 185m

The history of Natural Gas Pipeline explosions in USA 2001 - 2010 $3.6 Billion in property damage and 145 fatalities

Approx. 100 Natural gas line explosions in the USA 2000 - 2012. And there were some in Canada as well - the deadliest one killed 28 in Quebec.

We are talking worse case scenario. I have young kids. Do I want them to be at risk? No way.

they threaten to poison ourselves and our ecosystem NO LNG
Effects of fracking on fresh water is devastating. We should save all of our fresh water sources. Negative impact on marine life should be more important than exporting goods like LNG to countries that have not learned to be energy efficient.

My understanding is the green house gases from this project are equivalent to adding 10,000 additional cars to the highway each year. I am also concerned with having a compressor station so close to so many residents and businesses in the industrial park.

This business is dependent on fracking in BC which is already banned in numerous places because of health risks.

An LNG tanker is a potential easy terrorist target. This risk may be small but why even allow it. The results would be disastrous.

The owner of Woodfibre LNG has a completely untrustworthy background and there is no reason to want to do business with him.

This potential for accidents or malfunctions of LNG tankers in transit or at the plant is also a very large concern, but not so much for Squamish residents. This is a bigger concern for other Howe Sound communities.

To date, LNG tankers have been relatively safe, but that is because there are stringent international guidelines to prevent accidents. The problem is that Woodfibre LNG and the BC Liberals aren't following these guidelines. Here are some of the key issues below:

1) Tanker traffic puts Howe Sound residents at risk

As LNG tankers transit Howe Sound, there is a high-danger zone for 1,600 metres on either side of the LNG tanker (see Zone 2 boundary on the map). People within this zone risk death by asphyxiation, or death/injury by fire or explosion if an accident happens. Every time a tanker travels through Howe Sound (approximately 6-8 transits a month according to Woodfibre LNG) the following communities are in that high-danger zone: Bowen Island, Bowyer Island, Anvil Island, Passage Island, Porteau Cove, West Vancouver, and parts of the Sea to Sky highway.

Source: Sandia Report, 2004
http://www.energy.ca.gov/lng/documents/2004-12_SANDIA-DOE_RISK_ANALYSIS.PDF

2) Siting an LNG facility in Howe Sound violates international safety standards and practices

According to the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) LNG Terminal Siting Standards:

LNG ports must be located where they do not conflict with other waterway uses, including fishing, recreational boating, and ferries.

Long, narrow inland waterways are to be avoided, due to greater navigation risk. Fjords (such as Howe Sound) are by definition "long, narrow inlets characterized by steep sides, created in a valley carved by glacial activity."

LNG ports must not be located on the outside curve in the waterway, since other transiting vessels would at some time
during their transits be headed directly at the berthed LNG ship.

Human error potential always exists, so it must be taken into consideration when selecting and designing an LNG port.

Source: SIGTTO LNG Terminal Siting Standards
http://www.witherbyseamanship.com/site-selection-design-ip-no-14-for-lng-ports-jetties.html

Another key concern for Squamish residents is the impacts to our health:

3) Increased air pollution can affect the lungs and heart

Even though Woodfibre LNG is using hydro as the main power source, there will still be significant air pollution during operation. Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrous oxides (NOx) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application).

Emissions of NOx and SO2 interact with other compounds to form fine particles, which can affect both the lungs and the heart. Exposure to these particles is linked to increased risk of respiratory symptoms, such as irritation of the airways, coughing, or difficulty breathing; decreased lung function; aggravated asthma; onset of chronic bronchitis; irregular heartbeat; nonfatal heart attacks; and premature death in people with heart or lung disease.

http://www.nature.com/nrcardio/journal/v6/n1/full/ncpcardio1399.html

4) Air pollution from Woodfibre LNG has a social cost of over $20 million per year

A new study published in the scientific journal, Climatic Change, estimates the true social costs of air pollution that aren’t accounted for in the cost of fossil fuels and other pollutants. Social costs include the health impacts of air pollution as well as impacts from climate change. The study found that sulfur dioxide costs $42,000 per tonne, and nitrous oxides cost $67,000 per tonne.

Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrous oxides (NOx) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Combined, that is a social cost of over $20 million every year.

“This research shows that we need to transition away from fossil fuels not just to mitigate the risks associated with climate change, but to reduce the economic and health impacts of air pollution in general.”

For more information, check out this easy-to-understand article in The Guardian about the study.
http://www.theguardian.com/environment/climate-consensus-97-per-cent/2015/mar/18/fossil-fuels-are-way-more-
The only way to have a true zero impact, is to have NO LNG plant. Not just in Squamish, not anywhere.

Time and again we are told about the safety of the pipelines, the tankers, the plants, and time and again we hear of the pipeline breakdowns, the tanker hitting land, the oil and gas explosions. Please don’t give me any more lies about the safety of this process.

This project is not a good fit for here. As demand increases the impact over time will only become greater.

Accidents cannot be entirely prevented. The impacts of these accidents could be quite bad. I am primarily concerned with the environmental side of this.

Fossil fuels pose a potential health risk to the surrounding area. There is always a risk for leaks. It has taken a long time to clean up after Britannia Mines, why risk it and bring in potentially harmful materials into the area.

LNG is an explosive gas. Squamish is in a narrow valley. There are many natural risks (earthquakes) and man made risks (accidents/terrorism) which are difficult or impossible to mitigate. We seem to be concerned with risks such as the Cheekye fan which is a 1 in 10,000 year event yet we're willingly inviting another large risk into town for very small benefit.

So what if the site will meet provincial, national and international safety guideline (which some of their proposed practices have actually been banned in other countries, by the way), all through history of the industrial revolution best practices have been established and then banned for not being good enough. First a catastrophe has to happen, and then we change things. I don’t want that catastrophe to happen anywhere, let alone my home. I want to see life in Howe sound again, not watch it dwindle to nothing.

The potential for health risks to our youth and there delicate lungs. Not to mention the elderly.

One interesting point here is that Woodfibre LNG has said its chlorine release back into Howe Sound will be 1/100th of that of drinking water. But they are releasing 6 olympic pools of water/HOUR. Its about volume not percentage. How many litres of chlorine a day will be spilled into Howe Sound? Funny how they don't tell it this way.

We are not going to find another planet to live on... We only have one earth. Jehovah or Allah or whatever you may believe in is not going to come save your ass... and if we continue to add carbon fuel to the atmosphere we are doomed. The Pacific Ocean genocide is no joke and the acidification caused by these carbon fuels and methane releases is only going to quicken the end of life on earth so maybe we should say no and choose a new path... Please for the sake of humanity and our children’s future say no to Wlng!

I do not believe that LNG will pose any more safety issues that we already have. However I do believe We need to have a body in place to do oversight of this operation just like they need to be for all industry. Council should be putting their efforts in the oversight and not fighting against the development.

While I have been told that the proposed Woodfibre LNG will be state of the art, and I don’t doubt that it will be, the fact remains that accidents do happen and it only takes one accident to destroy habitat and a community. One has only to google the history of accidents in the LNG industry to discover several accidents that have taken place around the world between 1944 and 2005. According to the Timor-Leste Institute for Development Monitoring and Analysis, some of these incidents include a leak into the sewer systems of Cleveland, Ohio in 1944 resulting in the deaths of 128 people. In 1964, during loading operations lightning struck the forward vent riser of the Methane Progress and ignited vapor which was being routinely vented through the ship’s venting system. A similar incident occurred in 1965 while a vessel was at sea.
In both those cases, the flames were quickly extinguished. In 2004 a pipeline transporting natural gas from Belgium to France exploded resulting in 23 known fatalities. Another incident occurred in Algeria in 2004 when a steam boiler that was part of an LNG production plant exploded, triggering a second, more massive vapor-cloud explosion and fire. The explosion and fire destroyed a portion of the LNG plant and caused 27 deaths, 74 injuries and material damage outside the plant. In 2005, a 28 inch LNG underground pipeline exploded in Nigeria and the resulting fire engulfed an estimated 27 square kilometers.

While I understand that Woodfibre LNG will likely be one of the most advanced plants of its’ kind and the risk of an accident occurring is low, it is not entirely preventable. The fact remains that people make mistakes and unforeseen mechanical failure, extreme climate and geological events can occur.

3. How will the first responders be funded to respond to a disaster should there be an event at the wlng site, fortis compressor station or pipe failure within the comunity?

4. Humans make mistakes. Earthquakes happen here. We are named for the strong winds here. Ships run aground. Why are we allowing this many potential accidents to happen so close to our homes?

5. When I first moved to Squamish in the early 1990s we had a very high incidence of breast cancer. With the closing of the FMC chlor-alkali plant and the most recent closure of Woodfibre we have seen huge improvements to our air quality (as can be verified through the Ministry of Environment air quality studies) and improvements to our water. I don’t know what our current rate of breast or other cancers are but this is definitely something that needs to be better understood before we embark on a potentially lethal industry that could impact human health

6. Re-industrialization of Howe Sound! Potential accidents/malfunctions and the results on the environment.

7. The facts council should consider is the safety record of the company that will own the plant. Money in the pockets of the owners is always more important than safety to the owners. No matter what they owners tell you about how they will prevent accidents, accidents will still always happen. Council should look back over time at this company’s safety record and how they have reacted to accidents in the past.

8. Focusing on this method will delay the necessary development of safe sustainable renewable energy sources.

- LNG is primarily methane. According to the United States Environmental Protection Agency - methane is a major contributor to the greenhouse effect, second only to carbon dioxide, and is about 21 times more powerful at warming the atmosphere than carbon dioxide. SO why go down this path..?? again, delaying what could be...better.

- The specific emissions from a gas-fired power plant will be higher than average global CO2 intensity in electricity generation by 2025, raising questions around the long-term viability of some gas infrastructure investment if climate change objectives are to be met. And liquefying natural gas is an energy intensive and leaky process. When you factor in shipping overseas, you get an energy penalty of 20% or more. The extra greenhouse gas emissions can equal 30% or more of combustion emissions, according to a 2009 Reference Report by the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission, Liquefied Natural Gas for Europe – Some Important Issues for Consideration.

9. Just the fear of an accident and the ugly polluted industry in site is too much for public health and safety. The government was to re-zone this area for non-industrial uses.

There is no clean up in a remote area or on the Squamish waterfront as witnessed at Squamish Terminals.

There will be an intake of marine water which will include anything living in it... It is imperative Squamish Council Stop this project before marine life is eliminated by daily operations or accident.

No one is able to cope with an accident at WLN, or on the Fortis BC pipeline or with the Tankers!
There is no safety!

11 Council needs to ensure that the facts are considered, and to avoid undue influence through fear mongering.

11 Its not IF an accident will happen...its when and how often? And will LNG plant try to cover it up?

11 Social costs and health impacts of air pollution Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrous oxides (NOx) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Emissions of NOx and SO2 interact with other compounds to form fine particles, which can affect both the lungs and the heart. Exposure to these particles is linked to increased risk of respiratory symptoms, such as irritation of the airways, coughing, or difficulty breathing; decreased lung function; aggravated asthma; onset of chronic bronchitis; irregular heartbeat; nonfatal heart attacks; and premature death in people with heart or lung disease. A new study published in the scientific journal, Climatic Change, estimates the true social costs of air pollution that aren’t accounted for in the cost of fossil fuels and other pollutants. Social costs include the health impacts of air pollution as well as impacts from climate change.

Siting an LNG facility in Howe Sound violates international safety standards and practices, putting Howe Sound residents at risk. As LNG tankers transit Howe Sound, there is a high-danger zone for 1,600 metres (1-mile) on either side of the LNG tanker. If an accident happens, people within this zone risk death by asphyxiation, or death/injury by fire or explosion. Every time a tanker travels through Howe Sound (approximately 6-8 transits a month according to Woodfibre LNG) several Howe Sound communities will be in that high-danger zone, including: Bowen Island, Bowyer Island, Anvil Island, Passage Island, Porteau Cove, West Vancouver, and parts of the Sea to Sky highway. The Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) LNG Terminal Siting Standards states that LNG terminals should not be located in narrow, inland waterways with dense local populations and significant commercial, recreational, and ferry traffic.

Federal and provincial government regulations re LNG and pipelines is as non existent as regulations in DoS bylaws.

also a concern is Potential for accidents or malfunctions of LNG tankers in transit or at the plant.

Feels like a ticking time bomb- accidents and regrets are bound to happen if this goes through

It is not about whether an accident will happen, it is about when. It is simply not worth the risk. Having the best safety record in an industry rife with accidents isn't enough.

Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Emissions of NOx and SO2 interact with other compounds to form fine particles, which can affect both the lungs and the heart. Exposure to these particles is linked to increased risk of respiratory symptoms, such as irritation of the airways, coughing, or difficulty breathing; decreased lung function; aggravated asthma; onset of chronic bronchitis; irregular heartbeat; nonfatal heart attacks; and premature death in people with heart or lung disease.

The Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) LNG Terminal Siting Standards states that LNG terminals should not be located in narrow, inland waterways with dense local populations and significant commercial, recreational, and ferry traffic. Why would that guideline not apply to Howe Sound? The proposed siting of the Woodfibre LNG terminal and associated transit of LNG tankers through Howe Sound poses an unacceptable risk to safety of people in communities along the shores of Howe Sound.
LNG is a new industry in Canada - what regulations are in place to guide construction and operation of the facility? Who will provide oversight? I'm definitely concerned about emergency response and the potential effects of an accident or malfunction. Incidents can happen, despite best safety records; automatic shut-offs etc...

TANKERS = IT IS A REALLY BIG BOMB

"LNG tankers have the best safety record in the industry", in the same way the Titanic was the safest ship ever built...How did that work out?

I am confident in risk management and the stringent regulations in place. Fear mongering and hyperbole on everything that could go wrong is irresponsible when the project has green thoroughly planned and researched...

As LNG tankers transit Howe Sound, there is a high-danger zone for 1,600 metres (1-mile) on either side of the LNG tanker. If an accident happens, people within this zone risk death by asphyxiation, or death/injury by fire or explosion. Every time a tanker travels through Howe Sound (approximately 6-8 transits a month according to Woodfibre LNG) several Howe Sound communities will be in that high-danger zone, including: Bowen Island, Bowyer Island, Anvil Island, Passage Island, Porteau Cove, West Vancouver, and parts of the Sea to Sky highway. The Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) LNG Terminal Siting Standards states that LNG terminals should not be located in narrow, inland waterways with dense local populations and significant commercial, recreational, and ferry traffic. Why would that guideline not apply to Howe Sound? The proposed siting of the Woodfibre LNG terminal and associated transit of LNG tankers through Howe Sound poses an unacceptable risk to safety of people in communities along the shores of Howe Sound.

Sources: Sandia Report, 2004 and SIGTTO LNG Terminal Siting Standards

Saying that "The proposed LNG project site will meet all provincial, national and international safety standards, guidelines and codes of practice." is simply not true!

On February 15th, 2015, a 3.4 magnitude earthquake hit Vancouver's coast that was felt throughout Howe Sound. The Woodfibre LNG proposal is located within this zone of moderate to high earthquake risk, on two known thrust faults. The Woodfibre site also has a history of slope failure. In 1955 a wharf and three warehouses collapsed into Howe Sound at the Woodfibre site, causing $500,000 – $750,000 in damages (Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4). A recent, but unreleased, geotechnical study by Knight Piesold identifies that approximately 46% of the study area was mapped as having rapid mass movement. This means landslides and slope slumpage... including existing natural landslide hazards as well as terrain where construction activity may increase landslide initiation. Why hasn't the geotechnical study by Knight Piesold been released?

Sources:


Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4

B.C. Ministry of Energy and Mines

Potential for accidents or malfunctions of LNG tankers in transit or at the plant.

The proposed LNG project site will meet all provincial, national and international safety standards, guidelines and codes of practice.
are also important!

4. LNG tankers will be painted with a paint that leaches and the storage tanker will sit on the water for a long time. This will pollute the water further.

   The tankers will have an impact on our beaches and destroy them.

   What will happen in the event of a fire? Say a tanker leaks and sets on fires, who is responsible and who will monitor?

5. This type of floating facility is the first of its kind - that's usually not a great sign as there is no safety record for this yet!

   You say that the project site will meeting all safety standards, but the tankers cannot meet international standards due to the widths of Howe Sound - in several locations they will be too close to populated areas and the S2S highway.

6. There will be significant health risks with this plant. Contamination of air and water are obvious. What if the pipeline under the estuary has a small leak. I have been told by someone in the industry who has built pipelines said that it is too far underground to fix and if the leak is small enough they will likely ignore it. If there is an earthquake the pipeline will most certainly rupture. What will be the effects to the land and water? Could there be an explosion? The pipeline runs through residential areas and will be larger than the current pipeline. Could residents be in danger with an earthquake?

7. Howe Sound is not the right location for an LNG facility, it's too narrow of a fjord with recreational boating and fishing activities. Those do not mix with LNG facilities or carriers. Although the chance of an accident is low, the impacts would be big for the residents and the environment from both the pipeline and WLNG.

8. The gas line is planned too close to residential areas. If there was a leak it could have a devastating effect. Canada does not have any safe distance guidelines, as they are still "researching" this but in the USA there would be absolutely no way a pipeline of that size would be allowed to be put that close to residential areas!

9. Siting an LNG facility in Howe Sound violates international safety standards and practices, putting Howe Sound residents at risk.

   As LNG tankers transit Howe Sound, there is a high-danger zone for 1,600 metres (1-mile) on either side of the LNG tanker. If an accident happens, people within this zone risk death by asphyxiation, or death/injury by fire or explosion. Every time a tanker travels through Howe Sound (approximately 6-8 transits a month according to Woodfibre LNG) several Howe Sound communities will be in that high-danger zone, including: Bowen Island, Bowyer Island, Anvil Island, Passage Island, Porteau Cove, West Vancouver, and parts of the Sea to Sky highway. The Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) LNG Terminal Siting Standards states that LNG terminals should not be located in narrow, inland waterways with dense local populations and significant commercial, recreational, and ferry traffic. Why would that guideline not apply to Howe Sound? The proposed siting of the Woodfibre LNG terminal and associated transit of LNG tankers through Howe Sound poses an unacceptable risk to safety of people in communities along the shores of Howe Sound.

Social costs and health impacts of air pollution

Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Emissions of NOx and SO2 interact with other compounds to form fine particles, which can affect both the lungs and the heart. Exposure to these particles is linked to increased risk of respiratory symptoms, such as irritation of the airways, coughing, or difficulty breathing; decreased lung function; aggravated asthma; onset of chronic bronchitis; irregular heartbeat; nonfatal heart attacks; and premature death in people with heart or lung disease. A new study
Published in the scientific journal, Climatic Change, estimates the true social costs of air pollution that aren't accounted for in the cost of fossil fuels and other pollutants. Social costs include the health impacts of air pollution as well as impacts from climate change. The study found that sulfur dioxide costs $42,000 per tonne, and nitrous oxides cost $67,000 per tonne.

Will there be smog? Will there be a smell?

Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application).

Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2) is a reddish-brown gas with a pungent, irritating odour. It absorbs light and leads to the yellow-brown “smog” pollution haze seen hanging over cities. It is known to irritate the lungs and increase susceptibility to respiratory infections. In combination with either ozone (O3) or sulphur dioxide (SO2), nitrogen dioxide may cause injury at even lower concentration levels.

Sulphur Dioxide (SO2) is a toxic gas with a pungent, irritating, and rotten smell. Current scientific evidence links short-term exposures to SO2, ranging from 5 minutes to 24 hours, with an array of adverse respiratory effects including bronchoconstriction and increased asthma symptoms. These effects are particularly important for asthmatics at elevated ventilation rates (e.g., while exercising or playing). Studies also show a connection between short-term exposure and increased visits to emergency departments and hospital admissions for respiratory illnesses, particularly in at-risk populations including children, the elderly, and asthmatics. The addition of these air pollutants in Howe Sound is of particular concern as recent research by MSc student Annie Seagram (studying under Professor Douw Steyn, Department of Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Sciences at the University of British Columbia) has shown that the Howe Sound airshed and Lower Fraser Valley airshed are connected. Emissions from Woodfibre LNG will add to the pollution in Howe Sound, exacerbating the existing air quality conditions, particularly in the Squamish-Brackendale corridor.

Siting an LNG facility in Howe Sound violates international safety standards and practices, putting Howe Sound residents at risk.

As LNG tankers transit Howe Sound, there is a high-danger zone for 1,600 metres (1-mile) on either side of the LNG tanker. If an accident happens, people within this zone risk death by asphyxiation, or death/injury by fire or explosion. Every time a tanker travels through Howe Sound (approximately 6-8 transits a month according to Woodfibre LNG) several Howe Sound communities will be in that high-danger zone, including: Bowen Island, Bowyer Island, Anvil Island, Passage Island, Porteau Cove, West Vancouver, and parts of the Sea to Sky highway. The Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) LNG Terminal Siting Standards states that LNG terminals should not be located in narrow, inland waterways with dense local populations and significant commercial, recreational, and ferry traffic. Why would that guideline not apply to Howe Sound? The proposed siting of the Woodfibre LNG terminal and associated transit of LNG tankers through Howe Sound poses an unacceptable risk to safety of people in communities along the shores of Howe Sound.

Social costs and health impacts of air pollution

Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Emissions of NOx and SO2 interact with other compounds to form fine particles, which can affect both the lungs and the heart. Exposure to these particles is linked to increased risk of respiratory symptoms, such as irritation of the airways, coughing, or difficulty breathing; decreased lung function; aggravated asthma; onset of chronic bronchitis; irregular heartbeat; nonfatal heart attacks; and premature death in people with heart or lung disease. A new study
published in the scientific journal, Climatic Change, estimates the true social costs of air pollution that aren't accounted for in the cost of fossil fuels and other pollutants. Social costs include the health impacts of air pollution as well as impacts from climate change. The study found that sulfur dioxide costs $42,000 per tonne, and nitrous oxides cost $67,000 per tonne.

Will there be smog? Will there be a smell?

Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application).

Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2) is a reddish-brown gas with a pungent, irritating odour. It absorbs light and leads to the yellow-brown “smog” pollution haze seen hanging over cities. It is known to irritate the lungs and increase susceptibility to respiratory infections. In combination with either ozone (O3) or sulphur dioxide (SO2), nitrogen dioxide may cause injury at even lower concentration levels.

Sulphur Dioxide (SO2) is a toxic gas with a pungent, irritating, and rotten smell. Current scientific evidence links short-term exposures to SO2, ranging from 5 minutes to 24 hours, with an array of adverse respiratory effects including bronchoconstriction and increased asthma symptoms. These effects are particularly important for asthmatics at elevated ventilation rates (e.g., while exercising or playing). Studies also show a connection between short-term exposure and increased visits to emergency departments and hospital admissions for respiratory illnesses, particularly in at-risk populations including children, the elderly, and asthmatics. The addition of these air pollutants in Howe Sound is of particular concern as recent research by MSc student Annie Seagram (studying under Professor Douw Steyn, Department of Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Sciences at the University of British Columbia) has shown that the Howe Sound airshed and Lower Fraser Valley airshed are connected. Emissions from Woodfibre LNG will add to the pollution in Howe Sound, exacerbating the existing air quality conditions, particularly in the Squamish-Brackendale corridor.

Note that Metro Vancouver annually issues several Air Quality Advisories due to high concentrations of ground-level ozone. This pollution also impacts the Howe Sound and Squamish, and exposure to these pollutants are of particular concern for infants, the elderly, and is directly linked to health issues such as lung or heart disease and asthma.

1. having a 24” pipelines going through the middle of town is very dangerous. Pipeline accidents happen all the time. How will WLNG address any accidents at the facility that could lead to forest fires over there? BC got rid of all of its fire bombers. who will pay for it? The health of Howe Sound is at risk if WLNG gets the green light.

2. The LNG tankers will be escorted down Howe Sound by three (3) major tugboats

3. Never forget that Murphy is always waiting in the wings. If something can go wrong, it will - and usually at the most inopportune time! Also: flaring is bad. It seems to go with natural gas

4. Health impacts; will there be smog, will there be a smell - are we going backwards to the stench of Woodfibre? Self monitoring industries do not have the capacity to regulate themselves and government has proven inadequate as per the Mr. Folley trailing pond spill

5. Safe, Clean, Industry

6. LNG leak from pipe - explosion - harm. It happens often. Compressor blast - major harm. It happens.

7. Pipelines have leaks all the time - of course there are extreme concerns with possible accidents - Any leaks or explosions could be devastating.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>We currently have a gas line. I don't see any more potential for danger than we currently have. We already have vessel traffic. I don't see substantial more potential danger by adding a few ships a year more than currently navigate these waters. Self sufficiency is necessary as we don't want to dry up our own emergency services. That being said, a good neighbour doesn't stand by to watch another man's house burn down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>We do not want it period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>If the air, water and land is compromised by this project, we will leave Squamish. Squamish will no longer be the community we chose to live and raise our children in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The health effects are huge...world CO2 levels are at the tipping point. this is an unnecessary addition of Greenhouse gasses to the earth's atmosphere...as a community we will be irresponsible to future generations if we support this assault.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Again, who will enforce the standards, review guidelines and best practices? It's one thing to say they will meet them, but are the current standards stringent enough? What are the long-term impacts on Howe Sound of re-industrializing. Is this the direction we want to go in? After all the clean-up efforts at Britannia, do we want to reverse our progress?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I moved to Squamish with my family to raise my kids in the natural surroundings. If I ended them to grow up next to heavy industry I'd move to Fort Mac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I'm very concerned and scared about this plant and I will strongly consider moving away from Squamish if this project goes through (I own two homes here, but work in the city... I would be inclined to cash out and move away).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>One word ... Dread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I feel that LNG will be responsible in the process of moving our resources for market. Sometimes bad things do happen though and it's important that we make sure their checks and balances are in place. What are there emergency response procedures? are they sufficient? What are we/they doing to ensure their efficiency?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I DON'T WANT LNG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I see no health issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I wouldn't trust existing government standards, guidelines, policies, or even laws to provide citizens with adequate protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>This project is too high a risk to public health, safety and long-term quality of life in the region, it should not go forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I do not trust the LNG project site to be self-sufficient when dealing with emergencies during operation. Where is the operational over site? This does not make me feel safe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>We need to consider and look at past pipeline projects. Where are the pipeline projects where there have been no accidents or malfunctions? Are there any?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I feel that it would only be a matter of time until there was some kind of accident along the pipeline, the facility or with the tankers and I don't think that is a risk that should be taken. I came here for the clean air, the healthy forests and waters and that would all be compromised just by having the facility functioning on a day where there is no accidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>You only allow us to choose three, but I would also like to include the potential for accidents or malfunctions at the LNG project site as a concern. I feel that the cumulative impacts and potential for environmental health disasters from the wood fibre plant and pipeline do not outweigh any benefit they might have for this community. I am terrified for the health and safety of my children should these projects become approved. I will be devastated should they be approved and would consider moving as a result.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Some members of council should quit acting like they know everything and speaking with that authoritative voice women of elementary school age children use, or when that is not working, like a ranting child having a temper tantrum.

19. Risk to Squamish on this venture is minimal unlike the waterfront development plan downtown.

20. I believe that location of the pumping station in the Industrial Park is purely for financial reasons. Fortis is willing to risk the possibility of an accident for reduced cost of property, construction, and power supply. I am not willing to accept the risk of a major industrial accident near my family. The pipeline and particularly the pumping station should be at a minimum 5 kilometres from any populated area.

21. It is easy to say all safety standards will be followed and nothing will go wrong when it's not in your back yard.

22. The council should consider the potential extent of the impacts and scale of damage from this facility and relate back to whether there is a net benefit to the community.

23. The LNG project site being the site for dealing with malfunction and accidents is situated close to where an accident can occur. Was are the chances that the site itself would be harmed in the accident? What then?

   Do research online and you'll find that the Singapore company that owns Woodfibre has a weak track record of dealing with accidents in an efficient, environmentally caring way. They have been highlighted in several median articles in the last few years not for their safety rating but for the accidents their terminals have incurred. Why would this be different in Squamish? Why would they care about our town?

24. They tell us of how safe this is and how safe that is. But between human error, technical failure and the potential for natural hazards, particularly seismic, the proponents cannot guarantee that either the LNG plant or pipeline will be accident free.

25. I truly hope council will do all it can to make sure this project does not go ahead. The detrimental health impacts of this project are considerable, and must be given greater weight to any short term economic benefit - of which there is very little.

26. The people in Squamish that I've met all live healthy lives, and so a healthy environment is important to them. This project would risk all of our health through the air we breathe and the local food we eat.

27. Accidents happen and nothing is perfect but the accidents that can occur from pipeline leaks, or freighter accidents are devastating for years to come to human and animal health. Our geographic area is so small, the risks of this project are just too high for us to accept this project in our area.

28. I am absolutely opposed to this "project"!

29. Stupid dumbasses.

30. Some of the phrases above were worded as benefits, but are concerns for me... in that W LNG is saying, for example, that they will be self-sufficient. That would be great, but I have questions about this.

31. Do we want to risk our environment for this? It only takes one accident.

32. All of this is a terrible idea. Stand up for the community and tell Christy Clark to frack off and go somewhere else.

33. I have worked in the marine industry for over 35 years. The proposed marine traffic associate with this project in Howe Sound does not create a safety concern for a mariner who knows anything about safe navigation.

34. That this will be a bonus in good paying jobs plus during the construction our hotels and eating restaurants will be full as they were during the previous construction of the gas line to the Vancouver Island and Whistler.

35. Gibsons just voted to consider environmental assets, as just that, assets. If you owned a home, would you allow water damage, mold and other pollutants to devalue your investment? No. Considering Howe Sound as a home, not just to marine life, but to human life as well, there is no valid reason to endanger public health, and no reason that the community should willingly accept it. Safe or not, no thank you, is the phrase that comes to mind.
36. We need to consider the public health and safety issues not only in the Squamish area but all along the line ... in everything to do with the extraction, transport and use of Natural Gas.

37. Industry often does not actually meet Provincial, National, and International Safety Standards, Guidelines, and Codes of Practice. The Provincial and Federal Governments do not currently provide adequate oversight and enforcement of Environmental and Health Regulations with respect to Industry. There are many examples of this. (Mt. Pooley, CN caustic soda spill into Cheakamus River, Lac-Mégantique rail disaster, Alberta Tar Sands, numerous pipeline breaks & Spills, etc.)

38. see above

39. I am also very concerned about the last point regarding cumulative health impacts, but can only choose 3 options.

   I am also concerned about the false framing of “industrial development versus no money or energy”. As I said there are better energy options in terms of investment and safety, but more importantly, if there ever was a place that did NOT need industry to save it economically, it is Squamish---beautiful, voted best place to visit---Squamish---Not Squamish the doormat of LNG---the fake 'clean' energy.

40. Devastated that this project would be considered.

41. I have worked in heavy industry and they are one of the safest areas in the world. How much focus is on safety is incredible... I have gained so much knowledge that I use in my everyday life that I gained by working in heavy industry. And public health, I think I would breathe in more air pollution by biking through Stanley Park during busy traffic then I ever would be affected by this plant. It is really not a concern for me... the plant is 7km down the channel and there is not a lot of GHG being emitted ... I just feel like so much of this is blown out of proportion.

42. the potential for a gas pipeline explosion is frightening. Increasingly we hear of these happening near residential areas where lives are lost and property decimated, not to mention the potential for a devastating forest fire that could wipe our town off the map. Some have happened even after inspections deeming the pipeline safe. And Fortis may not always own and operate this pipeline. They have an alternative route away from populated areas through Britannia Beach, why not use that route? And this larger pipeline proposal is to install it just a few metres away along an already existing pipeline. What could they be thinking?! Two potential pipeline explosions occurring at the same time. If this goes ahead as planned we may seriously have to consider moving away.

43. Why would you chose to place this so close to a fault line. We do know they exist.

44. Easy to fear monger but what does a risk matrix look like for the various outstanding items the community is concerned with?

45. It is scary that this is even being considered. Have we forgotten about the future of our children. With Squamish having one of the largest per capita of children, this is disgusting that we are doing this. Let’s take a hard look at the facts and what the negative affects are. We have enough just in everyday life where harm, illness and destruction of our earth. Let’s not just hand our souls to the corporation. As council you need to do what we have asked you to do. Don’t sell out!

46. Please please please don’t trade nature for money. We do not need this to have a healthy economy in squamish. Instead we can make a stand and be an example for the rest of the world. Squamish is sacred. Let’s keep it that way.

47. In an industry where leaks and defective valves are accepted as part of the operations it is hard to believe that gov't allows such operations to co exist with the public.

48. Council needs to recognize that there are many professionals working to make this site healthy and safe. Trust them.

49. And what about the implications to our public health care system? Do foreign workers get cheap access to medicine? Should they?

50. I feel Howe Sound will be less safe for everyone if WF is built. For people all along the tanker route, and people in Squamish. I wrote earlier in this survey what Alex Bridgon said at the small group meeting at Furry Creek, June 17, 2014, (pg 11 of 16, top paragraph) re passive fire protection: "We also have other passive elements, like fire protection on steel columns, which prevents the steel from becoming soft that protects the integrity of the structural steel and prevents collapse." So they have to build this to withstand a calamity that they won’t admit might happen to Squamish.
How would Squamish fare given such a massive fire at WF?

I value safety. I value honesty.

And I value the real estate values not dropping in Howe Sound.

51. I am deeply concerned that WLNG cannot be trusted with regards to our health and safety. As I mentioned before, one of its senior managerial staff previously held a responsible position at the ill-fated Mount Polley project.

52. See above..

53. New ideas require risk to be sure. But this project isn't a new idea, it's the same old business as usual.

   Burn fossil fuels regardless. I don't think many solutions are going to come from the powers that be. They will fight to the bitter end to maintain the status quo. Change will never come from the top. People and communities and municipalities will have to take the lead. At some point we are all going to have to take a stand about how our remaining fossil fuels should be used. Would we not rather use what surplus we have left to try and move away from dirty energy and develop more resilient options for the challenging times to come?

54. Call me a NIMBY, but why should we (Squamish) shoulder all the risks in the event of an accident and the longer term risks to health? Proponent not providing alternatives to pipeline/compressor locations because too costly for them!

55. Our province has the most lax, third world regulations imaginable when it comes to resource extraction. Our health is directly linked to the health of our natural world and frankly our Provincial government has been working overtime to remove as many barriers as possible to health and safety of both us, and our environment.

56. No thanks and no way!!!!

57. I don't have the confidence that if there were a pipeline or tanker accident that it would be dealt with with minimal environmental impact, and it is not a risk we should be imposing on our community/environment.

58. The possible negative effects of a major incident far out way any small positives, do not allow this to go through.

59. Heavy industry development in BC makes me feel sick and depressed. Is nothing sacred???

60. Is this relatively highly populated part of the Southern coast, including the route through islands to Georgia Straight, honestly an appropriate area for re-establishment of dangerous cargo heavy industrial operations? Perhaps up on the Northern Coast where there is very light pleasure craft use or habitation, if LNG is to occur anywhere. But certainly not appropriate or necessary to be located in the Howe Sound!

61. I own an integrated health clinic in Squamish and we are absolutely slammed with thousands of Squamish residents appointments every year helping people recover their health. In a town full of active health conscious people, the majority of our business is NOT sports enhancement rather recovering people from disease. I have been in the industry for over 20 years and the numbers of every disease are on the rise. This is no longer a luxury for people to pay privately to utilize our services at the clinic rather a necessity to keep people at jobs, to pay bills and raise their kids who are also sicker than ever. An increase to fossil fuel usage, oil, gas, fracking have proven to pollute our environment which will have a DIRECT affect on our patients health. I am writing this on behalf of my family, friends, neighbours and patients. WE ARE SICK AND IT’S GETTING WORSE. I have a very successful business to prove it.

62. LNG project brings health and safety related problems only. There are no benefits.

63. The people that live here like you and I and our family and friends that want to ave a healthy safe Zone not wondering if we have tomorrow with our families. I love Squamish as s. we are capital recreation of BC. Les keep it that way.

64. As mentioned above, I think that we have neither the laws in place nor the funding/manpower to enforce what regulations we do have. We would not be able to keep in check a company owned and controlled by Sukanto Tanoto’s empire, well known for doing tremendous harm on many fronts.
65. To me, there is no compromise for clean air, clean water, a healthy environment and healthy people. A practice that promises an increase in greenhouse gas emissions, air pollution, acid rain production, habitat destruction and poses a risk for explosion and spills is not an acceptable practice.

66. I value a community that understands Public Health, that looks at all the determinants of health, including culture, environment, working environments, childhood development. So many of which could be negatively influences by the proposed Site and Pipeline.

67. Howe Sound is my environment. It is important to me. I will protect it. I am against this LNG project.

68. If we end up with a glut of natural gas as we have with crude, who will be held responsible? Where will it be stored?

69. History shows that pipelines break, chemicals spill, wind blows chemicals for great distances. Human error happens and we need to do all we can to minimize it.

70. Accidents can happen but preventative measures can be taken to minimize impact. Therefore yes, please consider industry and jobs for our town with a long-term vision that incorporates not violates.

71. Hello, My name is Jamie Martin, I live on 1109 Plateau Crescent, Squamish, B.C.

I have lived in Squamish since the mid 1960’s. I have witnessed personally heavy industry here and seen the devastation both on land and in the air. I went to the elementary school down town and saw 2 of my class mates develop asthma and had to go to school in Brackendale due to the air pollution. There were warning siren towers placed around town and would go off periodically. The smog down town in June during a high pressure weather pattern with no clouds around was astounding. I have been windsurfing here in Howe sound for 30 years. We have held world cup windsurfing races and the Canadian Windsurfing national championships here. We have unique inflow wind thermals that also blow straight thru town from wood fiber. Our wind sport society operates off of the end of the spit just down wind and not far from the woodfiber site. We will be up to 800 members this year. When woodfirber was in operation our members were the first to get the smell of the air pollution. I am a director and past president of the society for 15 years. I also have been sitting on the Squamish Estuary Committee for the past 15 years where I have learned a lot about the Howe sound and the recovery it has been going through. I have witness wales, dolphins and orcas all returning right up to the river mouth. Never in the past have we seen this until the last 3 to 4 years. I had a Whale spray in my face when he or she was feeding off of the river mouth and I was down wind on my kiteboard. The Howe sound fiord is unique and due to the lack of activity at the old woodfiber site has allowed the large water mammals to return. If you look at the geography of the site of woodfiber it is like doorway as the mammal’s round the corner to come into the harbour and to the river. Those ships that LNG are proposing are huge. They will be assisted by 3 to 4 Tugs all the way up the sound. These tugs noise decibels will not be good for the retuning mammals. I am getting sick and tired of the LNG propaganda as they compare themselves to other places around the world and try to spin off the impact of the pollution and activity under water that this plant will create. We are not other places, we are a unique Howe Sound Fiord. It has been said that Howe Sound is the worst place to set up industry.

The other frustrating point about this plant going in is it is the only plant that Christy Clark and the Liberals can get up and running first to make good on their mandate to start delivering LNG before the other plants come on line that are not near populated areas. We are being used as a political pawn here on this plant.

These pipes are 24” diameter and will be able to double the shipping in the Howe Sound in the near future, of course they will deny this. I know you are supposed to make recommendations but that is what they want regardless of the risks because they are recommendations only.

I could mention the safety, the economy, and more on pollution but I will let the others write in on this.

I thank for your attention and hope you will do the right thing.

Best Regards

XXXX
72. Do we really need tanker traffic here. I'm not afraid of a catastrophic accident but again am disturbed by the overall damage that will be inflicted on our environment and thus our community

73. I fear for my family's safety, and their health - not just by being on the water and close to the site and in tanker transit zones (with associated risks of accidents), but from changes in air quality. As a nurse who works with patients who suffer from chronic disease and also as a person who lives with asthma - I do not take air quality for granted. Since the pulp mill has gone, we have enjoyed the fresh air and freedom from unpleasant odours that we previously endured.

74. An alternate route should be considered away from the residential area of Ravens Plateau for pipe size they are considering. Residents that purchased properties on the utility corridor should not have to worry about the possible endangerment to themselves and others living there with the volume of gas they are proposing only meters away. An alternate route through non residential north of the current pipeline would have my support.

75. Just because past Council allowed a new subdivision to be established adjacent to a 10 inch high pressure natural gas pipeline in upper Valleycliffe does not justify making another mistake of passing a 24 inch pipeline (About six times the gas volume, depending on the location of the automatic shut-off valves) within 50 feet of homes. Lives are lost in Gas Pipeline explosions all the time. We have no guarantee on the quality of future testing and maintenance of any pipeline. The 10” line changed ownership twice already since it was built in the 90’s.

76. As mentioned, the threat of a big event twoe drive me out of town. I chose squamish to raise my family, & I’d be forced to choose somewhere else.

77. we are in a deep sound behind a huge island, LNG plants should be on open ocean! NO LNG

78. I value clean air.

79. There WILL be accidents, and not just in Howe Sound with the tankers, the pipelines, emissions from the plant. But look at the entire picture - the BC interior is being polluted by fracking - it's air pollution and water pollution. Please do not support this project.

80. As time passes we will all adapt to having this here, but people who have never been here before will no doubt notice it. This will affect the brand negatively, as the industry of fracking and the owner of this LNG plant are both quite controversial.

81. There is no way site safety can be self reliant for every eventuality, that is PR spin.

82. It concerns me that the proponent seems to be complying with the minimal level of standards rather than best practices. Let's contrast that with the old pulp mill, chemical plant and mine. They were also compliant with the accepted minimum standards at the time and look at the mess they have left behind in Howe Sound.

83. Again I feel this survey is benefiting one of the sides in how the questions are worded. Who paid for this survey?

84. Canada needs to step up and become a great leader for the environment and protecting the earth we blessed to live here can we start showing the rest of the world we care...

85. Stop putting road block up to stop or impede this project and start working with it to ensure best practices and adherence to rules and regulations.

86. we are surrounded by precious stunning miraculous beauty. i feel a sense of responsibility to protect, appreciate, and enjoy the precious stunning miraculous beauty we are surrounded by. i believe all aspects of health are improved by opposing LNG. it allows us to invite and embrace future projects that promote health (e.g. international swimming events for people to swim across howe sound, self propelled boat tours up howe sound or from Squamish).

87. My feeling is the whole wlng and lng industry is just being pushed through the system without consideration for long term effect in favor of short term gains.

88. Humans are human. We make mistakes, no matter how many precautions we take. Can we evacuate 17,000 people in an emergency? Are we willing to put our community in this position where we have to even think about potential
explosions from naturally occurring earthquakes or from human error?

89. Howe sound is not an easy place to navigate a tanker. The last thing we need is increased tanker traffic. An LNG facility recently had a large explosion in Washington, is that the type of risk we need in our fragile ecosystem?

90. I have great fear of any negative impacts ...potential for great environmental damage that may be permanent.

91. No matter what safety precautions are in place, accidents still happen. The potential impacts from an accident are big. To me, it is not worth the risk.

92. I have faith in the regulators to monitor this project to ensure WLNG is operating within and beyond the required guidelines.

93. again, its just not ok. it just isn’t. I raise my daughter in squamish. i live there. i want to live there because its squamish. its gorgeous, beautiful, alive. lets keep it like that. lets move forward. not backward.

94. my EAO submission on WLNG

   I will first draw on the expertise of others:

1. SAFETY: Siting an LNG facility in Howe Sound violates international safety standards and practices, putting Howe Sound residents at risk.

   As LNG tankers transit Howe Sound, there is a high-danger zone for 1,600 metres (1-mile) on either side of the LNG tanker. If an accident happens, people within this zone risk death by asphyxiation, or death/injury by fire or explosion. Every time a tanker travels through Howe Sound (approximately 6-8 transits a month according to Woodfibre LNG) several Howe Sound communities will be in that high-danger zone, including: Bowen Island, Bowyer Island, Anvil Island, Passage Island, Porteau Cove, West Vancouver, and parts of the Sea to Sky highway. The Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) LNG Terminal Siting Standards states that LNG terminals should not be located in narrow, inland waterways with dense local populations and significant commercial, recreational, and ferry traffic. Why would that guideline not apply to Howe Sound? The proposed siting of the Woodfibre LNG terminal and associated transit of LNG tankers through Howe Sound poses an unacceptable risk to safety of people in communities along the shores of Howe Sound.

   Sources: Sandia Report, 2004 and SIGTTO LNG Terminal Siting Standards

2.ENVIRONMENT: The once-through seawater cooling system proposed by Woodfibre LNG is outdated.

   Woodfibre LNG is proposing an outdated and damaging cooling method to help cool the LNG facility. They propose to extract 17,000 tonnes (= 3.7 million gallons, or 7 Olympic-sized 50-meter swimming pools) of seawater from Howe Sound, chlorinate it, heat it, and then spit it back out into the sound every hour of every day for the next 25 years. This method has been banned in California and several other places as it is very damaging to marine life such as juvenile salmon, herring, and plankton which are the building blocks for all other life in Howe Sound. If the herring are impacted, the dolphins, orcas, and humpbacks are also impacted as they no longer have a food supply. The impacts of increased water temperatures and the addition of chlorinated seawater will likely reverse the recent revival of marine life in Howe Sound, which is just now recovering from the toxic legacies of previous industries. This is unacceptable.

3. HEALTH: Social costs and health impacts of air pollution.

   Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Emissions of NOx and SO2 interact with other compounds to form fine particles, which can affect both the lungs and the heart. Exposure to these particles is linked to increased risk of respiratory symptoms, such as irritation of
the airways, coughing, or difficulty breathing; decreased lung function; aggravated asthma; onset of chronic bronchitis; irregular heartbeat; nonfatal heart attacks; and premature death in people with heart or lung disease. A new study published in the scientific journal, Climatic Change, estimates the true social costs of air pollution that aren't accounted for in the cost of fossil fuels and other pollutants. Social costs include the health impacts of air pollution as well as impacts from climate change. The study found that sulfur dioxide costs $42,000 per tonne, and nitrous oxides cost $67,000 per tonne. Sources:


4. SITE SUITABILITY: The Woodfibre site is not a safe location for a hazardous LNG facility

On February 15th, 2015, a 3.4 magnitude earthquake hit Vancouver’s coast that was felt throughout Howe Sound. The Woodfibre LNG proposal is located within this zone of moderate to high earthquake risk, on two known thrust faults. The Woodfibre site also has a history of slope failure. In 1955 a wharf and three warehouses collapsed into Howe Sound at the Woodfibre site, causing $500,000 – $750,000 in damages (Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4). A recent, but unreleased, geotechnical study by Knight Piesold identifies that approximately 46% of the study area was mapped as having rapid mass movement. This means landslides and slope slumpage… including existing natural landslide hazards as well as terrain where construction activity may increase landslide initiation. Why hasn’t the geotechnical study by Knight Piesold been released?

Sources:


Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4

B.C. Ministry of Energy and Mines

5. ECONOMY: The requested socio-economic study has not been provided

During construction, only 4.3% of jobs (=38.5 out of 895) will be for locals living in the Squamish/Whistler corridor (See Table 6.2-8 of the Labour Market section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Why are there so few jobs predicted to be filled by workers in the Squamish/SLRD area? The EA application is also very unclear about how many of the 100 full-time jobs will be filled by residents of Howe Sound once the LNG terminal is operational. What are the benefits to Squamish? What are the costs? There is still no clarity around how much in municipal taxes will be paid to the District of Squamish. How will this project impact existing small businesses and existing industries in Howe Sound?

6. CLIMATE CHANGE: 142 thousand tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions is unacceptable

Woodfibre LNG is now estimating greenhouse gas emissions to be 142 thousand tonnes of CO2 equivalent every year. These annual emissions of CO2 equivalent from Woodfibre LNG is equal to adding over 18,000 cars to the highway, driving to Vancouver and back, every day. This is more than six times greater than current highway traffic. It is irresponsible to approve this kind of polluting industry at a time when we need to transition away from fossil fuels to mitigate the risks associated with climate change, and to reduce the economic and health impacts of air pollution in general.
7. GOVERNMENT REGULATION: Inability of government to monitor, enforce, and respond to issues

There are no regulations adopted to regulate this LNG industry from a technical standpoint. Any of the current standards are not applicable to the LNG industry. Do the regulators have the knowledge and the expertise and the capacity to oversee this industry or will they be relying on the proponent to monitor themselves and report to the regulator? Self-monitoring industries have created several examples of accidents with resulting environmental destruction in recent years, including the Lac Megantic rail disaster and the Mt Polley tailing pond spill.

8. ENVIRONMENT: Removal of water from Mill Creek unsustainable for fish life

Woodfibre LNG has secured the water license to extract water from Mill Creek, which flows through the Woodfibre site. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans has objected to this because the amount of water that WLNG is proposing to remove will reduce water levels in Mill Creek to levels that will no longer support fish life, especially in the summer months. Woodfibre LNG needs to source water for this project from somewhere else to protect this important stream habitat which is home to several native fish species.

9. ENVIRONMENT: Missing baseline studies

The following baseline studies are either missing or are inadequate as they do not conform to any recognized scientific standards: fish, birds, marine mammals, air quality, shipping, water quality, marine sound, and atmospheric sound, marine life near the Woodfibre site, and the cumulative impact assessment. Proper studies need to be completed before any decisions can be made regarding this project.

10. VIEWSCAPES: BC Hydro clearcut of two 64 metre swaths of forest at the Woodfibre site will impact viewscapes from the Sea to Sky highway and the gondola

BC Hydro is proposing to clearcut two 64 metre swaths of forest at the Woodfibre site which will create visible scars in the Howe Sound viewscape which will be very visible from the highway and the gondola. This information was only made available during the recent BC Hydro open house held on 19th March, near the end of the public comment period. This information is not included in the cumulative impact assessment of the Woodfibre application and it should be. This late release of information pertinent to this project and the timing of the BC Hydro open houses is unsatisfactory.

11. ENVIRONMENT: 9000 year old glass sponge reefs endangered by tanker traffic

LNG tankers do not have enough clearance to get over the 9000 year old reef if they go off course. These 9000 year old glass sponge reefs have been called "Living Fossils" by National Geographic as until recently this species was thought to have gone extinct over 60 million years ago. MLA Jordan Sturdy recently made a statement in the House about the importance of this discovery in Halkett Bay near Gambier Island, and to support the proposal to expand the Provincial Park Protected Area to ensure these reefs are protected.

Sources:
http://jordansturdymla.ca/bcltv_videos/mla-sturdy-halkett-bays-glass-sponges/
12. ENVIRONMENT: Will there be smog? Will there be a smell?

Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application).

Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2) is a reddish-brown gas with a pungent, irritating odour. It absorbs light and leads to the yellow-brown “smog” pollution haze seen hanging over cities. It is known to irritate the lungs and increase susceptibility to respiratory infections. In combination with either ozone (O3) or sulphur dioxide (SO2), nitrogen dioxide may cause injury at even lower concentration levels.

Sulphur Dioxide (SO2) is a toxic gas with a pungent, irritating, and rotten smell. Current scientific evidence links short-term exposures to SO2, ranging from 5 minutes to 24 hours, with an array of adverse respiratory effects including bronchoconstriction and increased asthma symptoms. These effects are particularly important for asthmatics at elevated ventilation rates (e.g., while exercising or playing). Studies also show a connection between short-term exposure and increased visits to emergency departments and hospital admissions for respiratory illnesses, particularly in at-risk populations including children, the elderly, and asthmatics. The addition of these air pollutants in Howe Sound is of particular concern as recent research by MSc student Annie Seagram (studying under Professor Douw Steyn, Department of Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Sciences at the University of British Columbia) has shown that the Howe Sound airshed and Lower Fraser Valley airshed are connected. Emissions from Woodfibre LNG will add to the pollution in Howe Sound, exacerbating the existing air quality conditions, particularly in the Squamish-Brackendale corridor.

Note that Metro Vancouver annually issues several Air Quality Advisories due to high concentrations of ground-level ozone. This pollution also impacts the Howe Sound and Squamish, and exposure to these pollutants are of particular concern for infants, the elderly, and is directly linked to health issues such as lung or heart disease and asthma.

In addition: the BC government needs to ensure the protection of the 9000 year old glass sponge reef at Halkett Bay off Gambier Island.

About Glass Sponge Reefs: http://www.eao.gov.bc.ca/pcp/forms/Woodfibre_LNG_form.html

Glass Sponge Reefs in Halkett Bay off of Gambier Island

MLA Jordan Sturdy spoke in Legislature about the glass sponge reef at Halkett Bay off Gambier Island.
http://jordansturdymla.ca/bcltv_videos/mla‐sturdy‐halkett‐bays‐glass‐sponges/

Tankers do not have enough clearance to get over the 9000 year old reef if any off course action happens.

Transport Canada Dangerous Goods Dept. is not at all ready for LNG. In fact they now have a task force for rail and road.

I have been a member of 2 Stakeholder Teams focused on the protection and restoration of salmon habitat. I include information and links for your convenience and ask that a similar project be implemented for the WLNG and Fortis BC applications.
2005 SALMON RECOVERY PLAN

Entire Salmon Life Cycle

$250,000 Pacific Salmon Foundation

$2 million
5 year plan
Cheakamus Salmon Recovery
Squamish Nation and Stakeholders

CERT C
Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Technical Committee

The Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Technical Committee (CERTC) website, provides information on Cheakamus ecosystem restoration activities.

CERTC was formed in August 2005 in response to a train derailment and subsequent spill of sodium hydroxide into the Cheakamus River. CERTC’s mandate is to understand ecosystem-level impacts and develop restoration and monitoring strategies for affected species to accelerate the return of the Cheakamus ecosystem to a pre-spill state as quickly as reasonably possible. CERTC Terms of Reference (pdf).

CERTC recommends programs for implementation to the Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Steering Committee based on input from experienced professionals, external specialists, interested parties and the public.

Both committees include representatives of:
CN
District of Squamish
Fisheries and Oceans Canada
BC Ministry of Environment
Squamish Nation

Thank you for your interest in Cheakamus ecosystem restoration.
Comments can be made to CERTC at comments@certc.ca

Fish Assessment

Following the spill, B.C. Ministry of Environment (MoE) fisheries biologists, technicians and contracted staff documented fish survival and compared fish density information to available previous data.

Fish mortalities were collected from the Cheakamus River downstream of the spill, with activities including:
Recording mortalities by species and location;
Collecting length data to determine age classes of impacted fish;
Collecting scale samples to further supplement brood year identification; and,
freezing and storing of samples for further examination, if required.

Fish Impact Assessment (MoE and DFO) (pdf)

MoE Estimated Impacts on Salmon and Trout Populations:

Chinook
- 25% of juveniles from 2004 spawning population
- 50% of 2005 spawning population

Chum
- juveniles not affected
- 2005 spawning population not affected

Coho
- 50% of juveniles from 2004 spawners
- 2005 spawning population not affected

Pink
- juveniles not affected
- between 3 - 10% of 2005 spawning population
Steelhead
- 90% of mainstem juveniles from 2003 to 2005 spawners
- 2006 and 2007 steelhead spawning populations not affected

Estimated Impacts on Other Fish

Ninety percent of resident fish in the mainstem Cheakamus River may have been affected by the spill including:
- Dolly Varden/Bull Trout
- Rainbow Trout
- Lamprey (2 species)
- Sculpins (bullheads - 2 species)
- Sticklebacks

Juveniles rearing in tributary streams at the time of the spill were not affected.

Benthos Recovery Presentation - Triton Environmental, 2008 (pdf). New!
Appendices (pdf) New!

Ecological Assessment

A screening level qualitative assessment of ecological effects has been conducted for CN to understand the potential effect the spill could have had on receptors other than fish in order to identify and target the need for ecosystem restoration activities.

Given the broad scope of the project and the limited amount of available data (i.e., exposure data, such as concentration of NaOH in environmental media, NaOH ecotoxicity toward specific species) it is not possible to conduct a comprehensive ecological risk assessment for each species present in the ecosystem. The screening level assessment focused on the functions of populations and communities within the ecosystem. This recognizes populations are less sensitive than their most sensitive individual member and some effects may be observed at the population level without impairing the functions of the ecosystem as a whole.
Qualitative methods using subjective ecological effects ranking categories, such as high, medium and low, were used to describe the likelihood of adverse effects rather than providing a numerical estimate of effects. To minimize subjective influence, the interpretation of ecological effects contain a clear explanation of the lines of evidence leading to the conclusions, including a description of the uncertainties and assumptions used. Additionally, matrices were used to provide a structured framework for the characterization of ecological effects. The assessment used existing information from baseline and monitoring reports and from previous scientific literature.

This screening level assessment of ecological effects consists of three main steps: problem formulation, analysis and characterization of the likelihood of adverse ecological effects. Results from the ecological effects assessment will be used to determine the direction of future recovery efforts for other components of the Cheakamus River ecosystem.

For more details, view the
Ecological Final Report (pdf) New!
Amphibian Assessment – October 2007 (pdf) New!
Study Design: Screening Level Assessment of Ecological Effects (pdf)

Water Quality

River Sampling

Water quality professionals tested and monitored the following:
Water quality in the Cheakamus and Squamish Rivers, August 5 - 8, 2005
Water quality in the Cheakamus during site remediation activities, August 10 - 26, 2005
Water quality in the Cheakamus after rainfall events, August 17 - October 28, 2005
Monitoring was conducted over a variety of meteorological conditions and river levels. The parameters monitored included: pH and conductivity, sodium, total dissolved and total suspended solids, total and dissolved organic carbon.

Results

The Cheakamus River was cleared for recreation after 24 hours by Vancouver Coastal Health on August 6, 2005. Water quality downstream of the derailment site was determined to be similar to that upstream.

Well Sampling

Forty-eight wells within 100 metres of the Cheakamus River were sampled on August 6 and 7, 2005. The parameters monitored included pH and conductivity, sodium, total dissolved and total suspended solids.
The sampling was coordinated by Environment Canada, Vancouver Coastal Health Authority, Triton Environmental Consultants Ltd., and Quantum Environmental Services.

Drinking water from wells was cleared for drinking by the Vancouver Coastal Health Authority after 48 hours on August 8, 2005.

No additional detailed water quality sampling is required.

Water Quality Report – September 2007 (pdf)
Water Quality Report Appendices – September 2007 (pdf)
http://certc.ca/recovery_fund.shtml

CERT C Stakeholder Team

The Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Stakeholder Team (Stakeholder Team), established by CERTC, is a public advisory group comprised of representatives from interested organizations and individuals with local knowledge of and experience with the Cheakamus River.

Meeting Notes

September 30, 2010 (pdf) New!
June 24, 2010 (pdf)
March 25, 2010 (pdf)
October 29, 2009 (pdf)
June 17, 2009 (pdf)
March 5, 2009 (pdf)
November 27, 2008 (pdf)
September 25, 2008 (pdf)
May 27, 2008 (pdf)
March 27, 2008 (pdf)
January 24, 2008 (pdf)
December 6th, 2007 (pdf)
September 27, 2007 (pdf)
June 21st, 2007 (pdf)
April 25th, 2007 (pdf)
February 28th, 2007 (pdf)
December 6th, 2006 (pdf)
July 6th, 2006 (pdf)
May 25th, 2006 (pdf)
April 27, 2006 (pdf)
March 25, 2006 (pdf)
Presentations

Overview of the Cheakamus River Large Woody Debris Stream bank Protection and fish habitat development project, June 2011 (pdf) New!
Update on Cheakamus River recovery strategies and monitoring programs, March 2009 (pdf) New!
Update on Cheakamus River recovery strategies and monitoring programs, January 2012 (pdf) New!
Cheakamus River Sculpin Recovery Presentation to CERST - Fall 2010 (pdf)
Adult Wild-and Hatchery-Origin Steelhead Returns to the Cheakamus River in 2009(pdf)
Cheakamus River Bull Trout Radiotelemetry and Enumeration Program, 2007-2009(pdf)
Cheakamus River Side Channel Re-watering Projects, March 2010 (pdf)

Role

The Stakeholder Team provides input into the development and implementation of monitoring and restoration programs for the Cheakamus ecosystem.

The Team helps coordinate and communicate comments and recommendations from interested parties to CERTC, and also receives updates on CERTC activities, as the information becomes available. All input from the Stakeholder Team is considered advisory in nature and final decisions regarding monitoring and restoration programs rests with CERTC and the Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Steering Committee.

CERTC Communication to the Stakeholder Team

CERTC Responses to Dec 6 2006 Stakeholder Team Questions (pdf)
http://certc.ca/public_events.shtml Events and Brochures.
http://certc.ca/monitoring_programs.shtml
http://certc.ca/recovery_plan.shtml to 2012

SQUAMISH ESTUARY MANAGEMENT PLAN

[PDF]Skwelwil'em Squamish Estuary Wildlife Management Plan


PDF]View the 1999 Squamish Estuary Management Plan

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT WORK GROUP MEMBERS
Squamish Estuary Nature Centre ad hoc Committee
Squamish Council
1999
SEMP
https://squamish.civicweb.net/document/10318/Feb%202,%201999

Page 19 Signatures to 1999 SEMP


1982 TO 1992
SEMP!

Howe Sound has also been improved because the Fraser Basin Council has successfully restored the waters at Britannia Beach on Howe Sound BC.
http://www.fraserbasin.bc.ca/about_britannia.html

Clean up after industry pollutes is never complete and restoration actually takes centuries.
The economy here in Howe Sound no longer depends on big polluting industry. What is evolving is self-employment in businesses that depend on "the scenery". Like the film industry. Also tourist activities because HOWE SOUND NOW HAS WHALES! DOLPHINS! HERRING!

Eagles and salmon have always drawn the public to the wilds of Howe Sound. People stay to live in a healthy environment and to co-exist with nature. There are economic benefits to all aspects from the sea, keeping the wild fishing industry to the sky where Whistler/Blackcomb are world class ski resorts with a growing population in what was once a village. Our proximity to Vancouver BC, also a source of employment, allows those who live in the Howe Sound area to park the car and enjoy recreating without it when not commuting to work elsewhere.

The LNG Project needs to be assessed as a having a negative impact on a recovering Howe Sound.

Many have written who have been able to study and report on the negative impact of the WLNG project, the Fortis BC pipeline and the gigantic tankers.

For me this is a forced endeavor. I feel quite intimidated by the fact that the WLNG company can afford $250 million dollar fines for environmental atrocities elsewhere.

It brings to mind that Woodfibre had 600 pollution violations that could have been charged against the owners and the government would not allow that to happen in 1983.

When in 2005 Woodfibre was closed, there was a statement from the government that the Woodfibre site would never again be used for industry. The re-zoning never took place and now this is a legal application with deadly consequences. Global warming could have been avoided had alternative energies been used these last 40 plus years.

I have lived here since 1977 and I have enjoyed the transition to a Howe Sound that is recovering. Those moving to Squamish now, afford to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars to buy a small accommodation here. This isn't so as to return to dirty industry and the putrid polluted smell of money when industry has an "accident".

Sincerely

XXXXX

| 95. | Council needs to lobby that this project is developed as a best-in-class facility. |
| 96. | No to LNG. The health of the land and sea is most important. |
| 97. | I was surprised to read what I just posted above about the facts. This is really scary! I was more concerned about the additional greenhouse gases from the LNG and also to the contribution of burning that LNG wherever it ends up in the world-contributing to climate change...but reading about the local impacts it may have just makes this even more appaling. |
| 98. | I wish I could add #2 and 5, I think it's very dangerous that lng will be responsible for itself. How much will be hidden and swept under the rug with the what we don't know won't hurt us. Also regardless of their clean up procedures and emergency response programs once an accident happens the sound is screwed. Just ask Alaska, they are still cleaning up after the Econ Valdez |
| 99. | You only have to read the Transport Canada working group comments in the EA application ti see how concerned TC is about the LNG facility. This is all a big experiment with Squamish and Howe Sound as guinea pigs. |
| 10. | How is this project helping us care for our most vulnerable community members such as those with existing respiratory issues, the elderly and infants? |
1. I value clean air and water.

2. I grew up on Vancouver Island and in Chile. After travelling the world I realized that WE, the Global North are the problem. So many communities and people around the world have so much less, yet so much more. After much deliberation I have been settled in the Sea to Sky region for 6 years now because I was truly proud to be Canadian and of our BC coast. I realized that problems globally had to be solved at home. I truly do not know where my heart will stand as a Canadian if Squamish follows our Provincial Liberal Government.

3. Just because there have been no incidents with LNG tankers doesn't mean we couldn't have the first one here in Howe Sound!

4. I am very concerned about leaks of toxins and gas
   Also worried about a fire and it’s impact on humans and the trees

5. We hear on the news about pipeline spills. Rust, earthquakes, fractures are some reasons but they all do damage. Again to go back to the beginning as to why are we allowing this project in the first place and is it necessary are important to me when considering approval.

6. I have no concerns around Public Safety and or Health if this project goes ahead.

7. What could be more important than a healthy area, a place where we breath clean air? how could we allow anyone to change this?

8. Safety and pollution control should be priority

9. Woodfibre site isn't a safe location for hazardous LNG facility siting an LNG facility in Howe Sound violates international safety standards and practices, putting Howe Sound residents at risk. Society of International gas tankers and terminal operators LNG terminal siting standards states that LNG terminals should not be located in narrow inland waterways with dense local populations and significant marine traffic - Sight to LNG terminal siting standards.

10. There is not Health and Safety concern to Squamish

11. I am not in favour of this project. It does not add any value whatever to me, in the contrary it takes value from me (property value, safety, general happiness to live in Squamish)

12. I don't believe the claim the "world class safety standards" will keep us all safe.

### CONCERNS | Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Squamish doesn't want or need this. The same number of jobs could be created in other industries. This is a bad idea all around.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I am concerned about the pipeline construction, the siting of the pump station in a populated area, the disturbance to the mercury lying dormant in the estuary and the safety of the tankers transiting in the sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Council has the opportunity to be progressive and imaginative when deciding how to invest in the future of Squamish. This project is a mistake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I do have two concerns, the pipeline going through the estuary and the hot water being pumped into Howe Sound. I hope in some way the impacts of these two factors can be mitigated. LNG is clean burning fuel and the world needs to start moving away from coal and toward the cleaner burning fuel. My hope is that fracking can be made cleaner and better for the environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. The proponent of the project has a terrible reputation as far as environmental concerns. In the current world economic climate is it wise to invest in LNG, which other countries are already producing more cost-effectively. We would seem to have missed the boat.

6. My main concern it extracting truth from all the rhetoric and hype. Whatever happened to compromise on significant issues. The council has the tough decision and responsibility of representing all the citizens. Council may have personal passions but need to practice the ultimate ethics in separating themselves from partisan beliefs and supporters. People are elected to represent and in my opinion don't get to choose in making proper decisions between appearing popular or not.

I have witnessed in the Squamish Chief Newspaper of late a subtle form of bullying in some of the replies towards opposing views. What an inappropriate behaviour this is. And what a opposite example of problem solving. In this debate there are no "good" or "bad" people only people. Those who use put downs or attempt belittle others are not part of the solution.

And I believe in the old saying that no only must the just thing be done, it must be seen to have been done. I am paraphrasing.

7. I think this is an awful idea for the community and the environment. I am firmly opposed.

8. The cumulative effect on Howe Sound is discussed as part of this process but really needs to be looked at prior to future projects, whether industrial or tourist related. There is an opportunity here to show leadership in protecting this magnificent fiord from too much development.

9. Don't want this project anywhere near me, my family, my home, or the community/environment which I spend all my time. I live in Squamish because it is natural and beautiful. Please don't take that away. All we see in media is disasters in regard to fossil fuels...

10. We cannot allow developers with such bad track records or any heavy industry of this nature back...we've come too far to go back now.

11. My concern isn't so much with LNG as it is with the owner. With an international reputation for environmental destruction, how can we be certain this company will take due care with Howe Sound.

12. I'm looking forward to having Woodfibre LNG on the site

13. For utilizing an industrial site, this is the best proposal to come along. The resources are currently in place (the power grid and the pipeline). The plan that I have heard thus far is well thought out.

14. It is luddite in this day and age

15. There are much more long-term viable options for energy creation than natural gas. If we funded and developed these instead, we would be truly setting our community up for long term success.

16. I am more concerned how council deals with developers and companies trying to apply to work or co exist in Squamish. I think LNG is an amazing company and we would be fortunate to have them.

17. Everything about this project is wrong - Those who run the company, how the product is extracted, what it emits, how it will be moved around, where it will be processed and so on.

That it was even proposed is unbelievable to me in this day and age. It is not right and you must know that in your heart. Please leave behind a legacy that we can be proud of. Please don’t let this happen to us.

18. Our town is amazing, the natural beauty of Squamish and all the recreational opportunities it offers is what makes it so special. An LNG processing plant will detract from this and will not bring enough jobs and taxes to make it worth while. WLNG is the wrong direction for Squamish!

19. I have had it up to here with the push from the proponents...please ask them to go away.
20. I'm concerned about the natural impact. Spills that could happen and the clear cutting and destruction of the area near the site.
   I'm concerned people won't want to live here.

21. There are many concerns; impact on the environment, a deterrent to clean, eco-friendly industry, a deterrent to film products, a deterrent to tourism and a negative impact on Squamish residents.

22. Generally I think the owner of this company is not known to be a leader in corporate practice. My feeling is that if there is an incident he is likely to find some way to avoid accountability by transferring ownership.
   I am also concerned how the people that are opposed threaten, bully and intimidate people on line. I have lost respect for many people in this community to the degree it makes me want to move. I recognize that they are frustrated and want change but this is not the way to go about it. I think it discredits the social and environmental movement.

23. This isn't the right project for Squamish at this time. Our future and our direction lies in sustainable eco-tourism and its surrounding infrastructure. And this infrastructure includes spas, gyms, doctors, massage therapists, physiotherapists, and other great economic additions to the community that continue to expand. Yes, we need jobs and increased tax revenue, but the environmental, social and health costs of this project are too great for it to be approved. Let's keep Squamish a great place to live.

24. LNG might be yesterday's news by the time a plant is constructed. Let's find a renewable energy source, eg. windpower.

25. Please do everything you can to fight this.

26. Please do not let this LNG project happen. I am also super concerned about the compression station location being allowed in the city limits.
   I am 100% against this project.

27. Well covered
   Please do not allow this to happen

28. Please be very concerned about the fact they will kill our very soul!

29. The Fortis pipeline under the estuary scares me. Pipes deep under ground are hard to monitor for leaks and damage. The ecosystem in the estuary is invaluable. This is a place worth protecting. Inevitable earthquakes and seismic activity could damage fortis pipes and go undetected. This is unacceptable. There is a tipping point when industry goes too far - comes too close to residential communities and comes too close to natural habitat that is fragile and worth preserving. I do not support the Fortis pipe route that is proposed. It is dangerous and short sighted.

30. My biggest concern is the negativity that's surrounding this project. I'm scared that some radical will try and cause a problem where there wouldn't have been one. I think our council needs to help shift this into a more positive light for our community. We have needed some kind of industry here for a long time, I for one do not want my child leaving this community as there is so few gainful jobs. I myself do not want to join the ranks of the commuters to the city for work when I resume my career. We stand to gain a lot from LNG over the long term.

31. basing harbour tugs in squamish will require shore power connections to reduce air pollution

32. I feel that this project has the potential to provide some benefits, but also numerous costs, for our community. I don't know enough to have come to conclusion about whether it is a net positive or negative balance. I am of the opinion, though, that when the global impacts are considered, especially climate change, that this project is net negative. I of course would love it if the District helped communicate the message that our community is interested in hosting progressive, clean industrial development, and that fossil fuel transmission this is not. thank you

33. Long-term negative impacts on health, safety, tourism and quality of life for residents, visitors and the regional environment. We cannot let short-term greed saddle our community with long-term risk.
34. I am concerned that if this project goes ahead I will no longer want to live in Squamish.

35. I would like Council to help the Woodfibre LNG project to go forward and to provide the scrutiny over the impacts to the environment and the neighbours of Fortis and Woodfibre. That means Council needs to keep the project moving even while listening to the voices of the electorate. Rely on the experts who have knowledge and experience in the matters at hand. Communicate the experts findings and move forward with a decision.

36. I'm concerned that adding LNG will change Howe Sound forever. What is returning to a state of healthy marine life and an environment that is proving healthy for marine animals we will surely kill by doing this. I'm not sure how that can't be considered or realized as a greater threat and issue than adding some jobs and boosting an economy that is already starting to boost on it's own.

We have an opportunity to be an incredible town that become a sought after destination for not only tourism but for residents. I believe adding these projects will negatively impact both the tourism and residential growth.

37. The demographic in Squamish has changed. People here are very much aware of the need to keep fossil fuels in the ground to mitigate uncontrollable climate change effects. They are educated, passionate about the environment and community. It's inspiring.

The type of community we want to live in is one that is progressively planning for a future that is environmentally responsible. We want to see long term vision not short term solutions as fossil fuels are a temporary economic fix.

We DO NOT support the proposed Woodfibre LNG project sited on the old Woodfibre industrial lands, nor anywhere in Howe Sound. My heart hurts when our community has to fight for our beautiful environment.

We are learning that it is becoming clear that there are too few benefits (a handful of jobs and minimal revenue in Municipal taxes) that are outweighed by far too many costs to our environment, our health, and the future economic stability of Squamish.

Plus the proposed compressor plant would be a couple blocks away from our home which will only house one job at the end. We also don't want to see the estuary disturbed, it's so precious. We already see the negative effects of development on wildlife. We care about their future too!

We need to think innovative and green! That is where our hard earned tax money should be invested.

Say NO to Woodfibre LNG!

38. I am concerned that there is nothing we can do to stop it from becoming a reality in this community. I am terrified for our future should we be forced to allow this project to move forward.

39. High regards to Council and the committee. They will learn more from reviewing the comments which are online at the EAO site. Especially if they go to Federal Comments and Submissions and Local Government Comments and Submissions. Which have recently been posted this month.

http://a100.gov.bc.ca/appsdata/epic/html/deploy/epic_project_doc_index_408.html

Have any of council considered that filling out this survey has taken 4 hours away from completing EAO comments which must be submitted soon. I hope the work here stands for 4 hours of my time and that Council submits relative
comments to the EAO. Thank you.

40. concern #1 - council should do what is best for Squamish and support this initiative!!

41. A disaster strategy is important.

42. This project has too many negatives, environmentally and economically. Howe Sound and the Squamish estuary have made a remarkable comeback from previous industrial pollution. I do not want to see this come back turned into a set back. Economically there will not be very jobs for the existing people of Squamish. Additionally the petrochemical industry is subject to boom and bust cycles. When the bust happens who will get the bill to decommission the site and the pipeline?

43. It is a bad sign when we base our economies on a non renewable resource. It seems that we are willing to take whatever we can get now in a "safe and sensitive manner". When you look around this area I don't see where heavy industry fits in. We have just recently witnessed the return of large predators to these waters which is a good sign but apparently we aren't listening. I do firmly believe that there is NO way to guarantee this will not pose a health or safety risk. It would be ignorant to imply that environmental impact would be "minimal". This is easily illustrated by the absence of heavy industry and the recent recovery of the area.

44. My biggest concern is actually that Squamish will be negatively impacted by saying that we don't want it. The site is zoned industrial and our approval is not required for the project to go ahead. If council decides to go ahead with making some kind of statement that we don't want this project then this sends a message to every other major industry out there that we are closed for business to you unless you happen to be the flavour of the day.

I know some councillors have a personal agenda when it comes to this project and I worry that their ability to be unbiased is limited. Council needs to look beyond the rhetoric and personal beliefs and look for the opportunities that this project can bring.

I realize global warming and GHG emissions are a concern, but reducing supply of energy does not reduce demand for energy. CO2 and its contribution to GHG emissions is only one part of global pollution problem. The development of clean energy sources is continuing to develop and it is up to the rich first world countries to continue this push forward, and bring the cost of implementing these technologies to the world. In the meantime we need to provide the cleanest cheapest energy sources to the developing countries so that they can advance their economies and improve the lives of their people while minimizing the health impacts of using dirty energy sources.

45. I am against WLNG. I am for clean tourism business and a brand that reflects clean air, clean water, and forward thinking, ie not expanding fossil fuel consumption.

46. I have none.

47. The only concern I have is that the project won't go through. This is a project that would have minimal air pollution, no water pollution provide direct jobs, indirect jobs and property taxes which we badly need.

48. Politicians support this due to payouts they have and continue to receive. It's sickening. I'm so tired of having the same conversation, seeing so much push ha I and we still have to talk about it. We, the public, don't want lng - but the rich keep pushing and it's still an issue. Stop the madness

49. I am concerned that the local government does not have the knowledge / experience to provide meaningful input to the EA process. For the district of Squamish to properly realize the opportunities that come with such a project and to protect the interests of the local environment, they need to spend less time listening to agenda driven ngo's whom are not presenting truthful information in the community and spend more time digging into the real project issues. I believe the proponents ( fortis and wlng) want to make meaningful investments into the communities. The more these companies are alienated, the less discretionary investments they will contribute to the community. This rests clearly with the recently elected inexperienced local government officials.

50. If Council stops this plant from going through, it will send a message to other industries that they are not welcome in
Squamish.

51. Everything about this proposed project concerns me. Please DO NOT allow this to happen. This will ruin our town, and threaten the health, safety, environment and economy of all of the Howe Sound.

52. Tankers would limit free access to Howe Sound

53. This is just the wrong direction. We have an opportunity to be at the forefront of new green technologies - wind power, solar power. This reliance on fossil fuels has to stop.

54. Everyone already knows that this project is hugely unpopular, otherwise questionnaires such as this one wouldn't exist. Is council just going to keep asking until they get the only answer they will accept? Or at least until they can put out the appropriate media about due process and community consultation and how the concerns are going to be addressed? The majority of people in Squamish don't want it so there is your questionnaire, asked and answered. The rest is just details.

55. Will take away from the re-branding and all the hype Squamish has received for being a beautiful place to visit. Tourism and Heavy industry don't mix, and it is proven that Tourism has been more beneficial for Squamish.

56. The economic viability of this project is questionable at best. Squamish may experience significant negative impacts and to large extent has already experienced significant conflict and polarization in the community due to this project all the while none of the positive economic returns have been demonstrated in fact. Very little analysis or understanding of the hidden costs have been undertaken, which is a big concern. As a community with an increasing profile for livability, beauty and lifestyle it is critical we understand how this profile may be damaged with real economic and jobs impacts on many people here. And this wouldn't even begin to ascertain what our lost opportunity costs are.

With our health, environment, wealth, safety, lifestyle, culture and work in the future at stake the risks are exceedingly high with very little economic opportunity. It makes no sense.

57. Please stand courageously and stop the Woodfibre LNG terminal from coming to Squamish. Thanks for listening.

58. Biggest concern is around the placement of the Compressor Station. Concerned about safety for the surrounding community.

59. I am absolutely opposed to this project

60. Protect Howe Sound

61. Who is this person/company we are considering doing business with? From my readings he and his company has a terrible track record both in paying taxes and following good environmental practices. Why would be willing to risk beautiful Howe Sound by going into business with this man?

62. This project also has risks for home owners. All the negative impacts of this proposal will make Squamish a less desirable to live and will result in a drastic drop on home prices.

63. I feel that this project has been green lighted by the Federal Government and despite all of our protests and all of the facts that have been presented regarding the risks of LNG, pipelines and fracking this project will go ahead. It's impact would just be too great on our small community which has so much potential to be something more than just a heavy industrial town. I beg Mayor and Council to see that the economic benefits proposed by WLG are minimal but that the environmental, social and health risks are enormous and potentially devastating to our very special community. I understand we have our challenges managing growth and providing services to our community with low industrial tax base but this can change if we can continue to court Rectech, green technologies, more forestry, entrepreneurship, tourism and other forms of commercial activity. We should be the next silicon valley where you get to leave your desk and step out to either white water kayak, ocean kayak, climb, hike, back country hike, camp, hunt, fish, road bike, mountain bike, kite board, paddle board, swim, trail run or just sit with a cup of coffee while admiring the views of the ocean, rivers, mountains and sky untouched by flaring, emissions, and unsightly buildings and freighters. Squamish is a very special and wonderous place to live. We are so lucky to be here and it is our responsibility to be the Stewards of this special place and all of the natural benefits it has to offer no matter how much it offends our Provincial and Federal Governments.
64. take your hippie wannabe asses and **** leave town. no industry means no money for the town, more taxes for the people and less for the needy give me's.

65. I am from Southern Ontario originally. It is heavily industrialized in some areas, like Hamilton. It is ugly. I moved here 7 years ago to get away from that. If I wanted to look at that (industrialization) I would move back there, for it is significantly cheaper. I have always been able to reconcile the expensive cost of living with the pristine esthetics of my surroundings out here. I feel we should set a different precedent, shift our values look long term into our future.

66. I don’t see how this project makes any sense. The potential health and environmental risk far outweigh the few jobs and reduced tax dollars the community may actually see.

67. I do not have any significant concerns with this project. The Council should rightfully expect that the project proponents follow through with their commitments to minimise and mitigate any impacts (such as making such proposals conditions of their project approvals).

I do have a concern about how Council and the District of Squamish will be perceived by current and potential new industry and businesses if they are to take a negative stance that is not supported by the facts.

68. Please review all documents that WLNG and all the 'other' information gather against and/or for this Project, talk to Squamish First Nations Leaders (The whole Council, not just 2 people - all of Council)

69. I don’t have kids. I don’t intend to have children. By the time fracking and LNG and use of fossil fuels have killed our environment and have raised sea levels I will be long gone. YOUR children are going to have to deal with massive instability, raised sea levels, food shortages, water shortages. For me this is entirely selfish. I love my town and I don’t want LNG to ruin it. Go ahead and murder the planet some other place if you want where it doesn’t affect me. I’ll be dead by the time people start panicking.

70. The largest concern about this project is the amount of time, and the methods used for public feedback. This questionnaire itself just took me all morning to complete - and I haven’t given official comments on the Environmental Assessment, yet. Devoted citizens may give a voice of concern for others, but the process is much to labour-intensive for the average citizen. Woodfibre employees are being paid to draft these assessments, how can regular citizens even attempt to compete? Once again, the onus is on council to understand, acknowledge and do their best to mitigate this situation for its citizens.

71. Already WFLNG is looking to buy more land for their project. Even your own District group has shown how much is still outstanding. The site is WRONG. Canada needs an energy plan. By rushing to force LNG industry we are compromising our potential energy source for the future. We should get the regulations in place. New technologies for fracking need to be adopted. The Air cooling system should be the ONLY option.

72. I want to know that we are doing all that is required to keep the water, air and land in Squamish and Howe Sound clean now and for the future. We are not dumping anything into the water that could harm the recovery of Howe Sound. We are not polluting the air or land with toxic chemicals.

73. We who live in Squamish, British Columbia are blessed to live in what could be classified one day as a world heritage site. It is rare to find anything in the world equivalent in natural beauty and thee 360 degree views. Take for example, the water front with; the presence of the Chief to the east, Shannon falls to the south east, Howe Sound to the south, eagles or wind surfers soaring to the west, and Diamond Head to the north. It is awesomely beautiful but extremely vulnerable.

This is what we in Squamish, we as British Colombians and we as Canadians are entrusted. It is unique in all the world and we are responsible to be stewards of it and conserving it for the future. Our clean air and emerald seas are a precious and increasingly rare resources.

74. Reject this proposal. There is no sustainable future in fossil fuels. There is no lack of natural gas and fracking is a failed strategy of extracting it. Our government was played by the oil tycoons in Alberta with promises of prosperity for all when this is clearly not true. To allow the Woodfibre proposal to go ahead is a mistake. It will be a travesty and too late
to change at any stage but in the beginning to simply say NO. This will determine the future of Squamish and the region. Just say NO.

75. Increased cost of living, environmental concerns, impact on tourism, health concerns.

76. Do not buy into the smoke and mirrors tactics of the proponents or the industry-controlled political shills. Besides, we already know that the leader of Petronas believes that business related social and environmental impacts are merely externalities that do not enhance profits for the few.

77. There are too many risks involved to not be considered for the environment.

78. I think I have expressed them throughout the survey. My biggest concern is there really is nothing we can do to stop this...and then, it happens but the promises cannot be lived up to or that the culture of this naturally beautiful community disappears. We live in the best place on earth. It could all be gone in the shake of the next frack.

79. Please see my earlier comments. Thank you for asking the residents of Squamish about their opinion, cause those will be the ones affected by this mega project.

80. too many to list

81. This project not only meets and exceeds the provincial and municipal guidelines it is giving hope to a quickly growing out of control town. We need something like this to bring everyone back to reality. Not everyone can afford a $700k home on a minimum wage tourism job. Squamish was built on industry and we need to stop allowing groups to come into Squamish and make the ones who still survive on industry feel as though they should be ashamed of how they make a living. Industry has put the food on our table for years, we come from a family of loggers. Loggers used to be the wealthy ones in Squamish, now they are lucky if they can afford a dilapidated townhouse. Something has gone terribly wrong in this town and this isn't right, enough is enough. Council needs to clean up this mess that it has allowed to happen.

82. This project will effect generations of human, animal and plant life in the corridor. LNG woodfibre cannot be trusted to monitor their impacts while the focus is on the money. Local govt needs to listen to their constitutes and not rely on provincial govt to provide economical support to push this project through. Squamish has grown and changed for the better it will never be the heavy industry based town it once was and the attraction of squamish is small locally owned business with the focus on sustainable tourism and recreation opportunities. The gondola is a prime example along with SVMF on local success that employ locals and provide millions to the local econony. This focus is why families are moving here. Not LNG Woodfibre

83. Just the wrong direction entirely, we will be stuck with this dinosaur infrastructure which adds to the very challenges of climate change which our coastal community is sensitive to such as rising ocean levels and acidification.

The noise pollution is worse than Wind Power.

It is an affront that we will be paying more money in hydro costs to subsidize the LNG electric-turbines, which are being touted as a green energy when Geothermal options are so much greener, more productive, sustainable, employing, and better for the community.

For all we know this project could trigger a breach in that huge water being held in the mountain above Squamish---remember the '200 times the force of Hiroshima' lake that could wipe out Squamish?

84. 1) We can not turn a blind eye to the source of the natural gas. Fracking is dirty business with horrible implications upon the environment.

2) Our community foundation is our natural environment. We already have our greatest asset. Don't put it at risk.

3) The price of non-renewables is far too unstable for the community to support this initiative.

4) We live in a region that has regular earthquakes. Most are not felt, but they take place. Larger earthquakes are imminent. Are they prepared for that with their pipelines?
85. If LNG happens, the concern is that Squamish residents won't be hired

86. My real concern is with the public representation. It has been such a disappointment to listen to the mayor speak at public events and within her talks she makes slight at this project. There is show of consideration, or even the respect to the people in this community that value in this project. We all know that she run on an anti platform (yes... along with other issues that are important to the town) so why do we always have to be reminded every time she speaks? It divides the town more and more when its leader is showing disrespect in such a passive manner. My concerns about this project have to do with how our politicians are conducting themselves, how adults in the community bully each other on Facebook (all on show for the youth in this community), how there is a real disassociation from the way we live, how there is a disillusion of what a perfect town makes.

87. Social impacts are not addressed adequately, and there is ZERO understanding of how the population change associated with the boom-bust of construction will be managed, and how the negative impacts of this shift will be mitigated.

88. The proposed Fortis pipeline is our biggest concern and fear, with the installation route at the rear of homes along Cherry Drive, proposed to run alongside an already existing gas line. Mainly a potential explosion causing a forest fire and fanned by the winds that blow up from Howe Sound and down from Mamquam every day is of great concern.

89. Fracking.

90. Don't think I've missed any.

91. My concerns are many but I could go on forever. I have attending council meetings and heard the speakers on both sides. I went to the information meetings for Fortis and LNG. I cannot accept that this project is right for this town or this area of the province. We have come so far as a community, our neighbours have said a big, resounding NO to this project what is wrong with us? Consider what the scientific experts have said but also consider what those passionate speakers have said about our beautiful, natural surroundings. I love this town and I do not want us to go down the LNG road which is filled with many "potholes". I think that "clean LNG" is an oxymoron in the truest meaning of the word.

92. This is an uneconomic, environmentally unfriendly if not disastrous, unhealthy, socially divisive, and backward project (as separate components or joint/collective components) for Squamish and the whole of Howe Sound. It should be rejected by this Council, just as every other community council along Howe Sound and the Sunshine Coast have done.

93. None I support the project, it can be done safely

94. Don't put the community at risk of litigation due to positional community members and councilors. Let the process take its course and leverage the opportunity to get as much as you can for the benefit of current and future generations.

95. Having just moved to Squamish and if this goes through we are going to be in the red zone if something happened. This will destroy our investment as well as a potential death trap.

96. Not enough local jobs

97. That we are adding to greenhouse gas emissions world wide and putting our environment in danger in the process

98. My concern is that we lose our democratic process to the capitalistic big wigs. They have spent more money telling us how great this would be for us, (How do they know what is good for us or what we need or do they just dictate.) than they will pay into the community in taxes.

99. I am concerned about the amount of "fear of the unknown" that is being expressed in this process. There is an inordinate amount of written information about this project yet it seems to not satisfy the opposed. There are thousands of laws and regulations dealing with all facets of the proposal and if they are met and obeyed the proponent should be allowed to proceed without unnecessary obstacles being put in their way.

I am also concerned about the amount of the proponents money that Council is spending making fancy websites and hiring outside companies to help waste more of their money. It seems that it's better to hide behind community committees and expensive surveys rather than stand up and be counted for their own thinking and opinions.

100. I feel that employment opportunities should be prioritized to locals and possibly also have training be given to those locals wanting it. Just because there may not be locals trained to operate this facility now, doesn't mean there won't ever
1. Why would we destroy the Howe Sound and its beauty by re-introducing Industry back onto the Woodfibre sight. Are we that shortsighted that we cannot see the benefit of Tourism like the Sea to Sky Gondola. Who is going to want to look down upon the Woodfibre site with Industry again?

2. No LNG

3. We must diversify and offer alternative local employment with good paying jobs. There are so many areas in Tourism, Film, IT to name a few that will have little impact on the environment. Unconventional fracking must not be permitted. I have heard a council member talk about the poor children in China. We have no control over China’s policies. We do have control over ours. What about the poor little First Nations children downstream living along the Athabasca River? First Nations have been living on traditional territory for thousands of years. They are the people who will be most affected by poisoning the water, land, air and animals.

4. Please do not support the WLNG and do not allow FortisBC to build a compressor station anywhere within the residential or commercial areas in Squamish

5. Really feel insecure and exposed to a facility that I have no faith in being safe! We all will lose here .... Byng Gerard has a lousy record of safety. His words about safety means nothing and is an insult to our intelligence.

6. Howesound is coming back alive, reindustrializing will not help this trend. I worry that our federal and provincial governments are exporting our resources for short term gain and robbing future Canadians. Letting foreign companies control access to our resources is flawed. It’s needs to be reexamined. Keep the LNG here for generations to come. It doesn’t all need to be converted to cash today!

7. None

8. Squamish has rebranded itself as a community which stands for sustainable, environmentally responsible human activities. As a community we’ve said that keeping our forests, water and land clean are important to us, and that we believe in industries which take that ethos as their starting point. While no human activity is without impact, we have recognized that some activities are much worse than others and ought to be curtailed or stopped entirely. Woodfibre LNG is one such industry. The thought of tearing through the estuary to install pipes, of building a compressor in the middle of town, of using our only-recently-saved Howe Sound water for industrial purposes and returning it in a polluted and heated state to the Sound are all horrifying, but they all pale in comparison to the potential damage of a shipping accident, and the very real damage caused by fracking to extract natural gas. This is not what Squamish is about; it stands is absolute contrast to our rebranding as tourism and outdoor activities capital, and it must not be allowed to happen.

9. I have been in Squamish for 12 years. I consider myself a new resident like many others, i didn't grow up here. I moved here not for a job or career but for the lifestyle. climbing, montainbiking, snowboarding. Its all at my door steep. thats what makes squamish great, thats why people are moving here. squamish has the largest growing population percentage of people between the ages of 20 and 34 and under 5. Most of these people are hear for the same reason iam, lifestyle. I feel by adding lng that life style becomes seriously effected. the risks are too much. the job aspect is pretty small. I feel that this project is a eye sore and another environmental disaster waiting to happen.

10. I am concerned about the environmental impacts and health of our community and marine life. I am concerned about potential safety risks of pipes or tanker explosions. I do not think it is wise to have Fortis pipelines running past Brennan Park/RCMP as if there was an explosion, there is the potential to harm our children at Brennan Park and wipe out our essential services of the RCMP. The beauty of Howe Sound will be ruined with LNG tankers.

11. Fracking is problem and this project supports fracking. Injecting a toxic chemical cocktail underground under high pressure to fracture the rock and release the gas. A lot of that
fluid comes back up the well as waste. Do you know that toxic wastewater from fracking will be disposed of in a way that ensures it won't contaminate aquifers ten, twenty, or thirty years from now?

ProPublica investigation has identified more than 1,000 cases of water contamination near drilling sites. The risks don't end when the drilling does. The question isn't whether abandoned wells and fracking-waste storage sites can leak, but how many will fail, and how soon it will happen. Fracking enjoys exemptions from parts of at least seven major national environmental statutes, including the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Safe Drinking Water Act. The rush to frack for natural gas has occurred with maximum greed and minimum oversight.

Once-through Cooling Systems:

A single plant with a once-through cooling system can take in several billion gallons of water per day, and in the process, devour eggs, larvae and young hatched fish as they are sucked into the intake pipes. Larger fish and other aquatic species are injured or killed when they are trapped by screens intended to keep them out of the cooling systems.

Tankers anchored and noise pollution:

Residents of Cowichan Bay are hoping their peace and quiet will be restored soon, after years of having as many as eight freighters at a time anchored nearby because of backlogs at Port Metro Vancouver. "Residents have ended up having to put curtains up in the windows, put pillows over their heads, put covers over the eyes, moved to other rooms — the noise from the generators and the lights coming in have just been excessive."

Resource Works? Really!?

Where is Squamish council getting their information from?

Resource Works is funded in part by Fortis. Who's interests will they speak for?

Tourism:

I was pretty excited about Squamish's increased recognition globally and our recent listing as one of the top 52 places to visit in the world in the New York Times was certainly flattering ~ I sure felt proud to call Squamish my home. Not for long if this project goes through.

In short, more industry and more shipping of potentially environmentally damaging products in Howe Sound increases the probability of environmental damage. This is an irrefutable statistical fact and beyond argument.

Who wants that risk? And for very little economic reward in comparison to the risk

I could keep going but who has time. I guess that is what Woodfibre and Fortis is hoping for.

I cannot fathom why we should allow a man like Sukanto Tanoto start up a business like this anywhere in Canada and especially here in this natural jewel. The man has been found guilty of tax evasion and embezzlement; charged with environmental crimes. He lives in Singapore, a haven for money laundering and dodging taxes. His company APRIL is one of the leaders of mass destruction of rainforests in Indonesia. He has hired paramilitary forces to shut Indonesian villagers up about pollution and land grabbing. They have actually killed people. His companies have destroyed land
and poisoned communities.

Does anyone really expect him to treat this land and people any better than the people of his own country? Even if I supported the idea of a LNG storage facility, which I don't, I would absolutely be against his company being the one to own it.

He will destroy for greed. Please do not allow him to do it here.

1. The tax income benefits to the district and province are not worth nearly enough to compensate for the negative impacts and potential detrimental effects of the Woodfibre LNG project/facility.

The cooling required for the facility will have a significant negative effect by heating a considerable quantity of marine habitat nearby.

The flaring will not only be visually discordant to visitors and residents, but the fumes and unburned gas downwind of the facility will have a negative effect on our environment.

The financial benefits accrued locally will not have a proportionately significant benefit compared to the accrual of exported wealth.

Asian-Pacific economies are now making significant strides in their own gas production having a long term effect on keeping gas/energy pricing low thereby reducing the long-term viability of the project.

Greenhouse gasses are becoming increasingly dangerous to humans by ruining the planetary atmosphere. We value our species' future success.

4. This is the worst possible project for our community and it is deeply at odds with the OCP. The OCP is why I chose to invest well over $1 million dollars into Squamish. There is such a huge conflict here and I am shocked and saddened that even a few people around here support this.

5. Weighed against huge safety risks with liquefying, storing and shipping LNG, lowered property values, reduced air quality, destruction of marine life, disruption of recreational users to the sound, and loss of tourism potential to the region, I believe the risks far outweigh the benefits and the cons far outweigh the pros. There is just too much risk and too much inherent risk.

6. I am not in favour of LNG.

7. Sukanto Tanoto’s can not be trusted

8. There are enough governments in the world against fracking that we would be stupid to bw bullied into a LNG operaton by a government that is only looking to the personal perks yhey will receive fom LNG.

9. There are so many concerns. Please do not let this happen. Fight it tooth and nail. This will be disastrous for squamish. And in the years to come when a disused (that we have to pay to disassemble) LNG plant sits in ruins because some idiot thought that now was a good time to build a plant.. Despite economic experts saying we’re behind the curve, that there’s surplus supplies from other regions globally that are ready to sell now... and indeed even the stock market is favouring 'non fossil fuel' stocks... It will be utterly futile for the loud majority to say 'I told you so'. But we are telling you so now. Most people don’t want it. Stop it. Invest in attracting other types of businesses. Keep Squamish on track to be the real recreational capital of the world.

10. I do have some environmental concerns but feel that many of them are being addressed by the proponent.

11. It's a ticking time bomb. Don't do it.

12. I am concerned for humanity. Are the economic benefits to the already rich and getting richer more important than living in healthy environment with clean air, water and biodiversity? We need a wake up call: who cares we have fossil fuels to burn if we can't breathe?
Mostly environmental concerns of which were addressed in the survey.

LNG is most certainly against the evolving culture of our community in this region, and antagonistic to the recently accelerating lifestyle community (young families) and eco-tourism economy. This survey avoids the question of fracking, however the proposed facility certainly facilitates increased fracking, which most of the community is clearly against.

Please do the right thing and protect what is left of our environment and be brave to implement new successful proven ideas for alternate energy. There are a lot of us that will support and defend this idea. In 20 years I don't want to look into the eyes of even more sick patients and say "****, sorry. We knew what was happening and did not say or do a damn thing about it."

In part because of the Gondola, Squamish is on the world stage at the moment. We are home to a growing number of highly-educated, highly-motivated people that want to make Squamish their place to live and work. They are entrepreneurs looking to do leading-edge and innovative things. Do we want our next announcement to the world to be, "LNG"! Or, can we come up with something much better to say?

Do we want to be, "that LNG place on the way to Whistler"? Or, can we demonstrate that small Canadian towns can thrive without new fossil-fuel projects?

I believe this project is much better aligned with the Squamish of 20 years ago. The Squamish of today is focused on the future. Let's make sure the world is aware that Squamish is serious and confident about who it is today ... even if that means saying, "no", to things that would have been appealing in the past.

I just read an article recently in the globe about all of the incredible developments in renewable electricity generation, and batteries. There are so many technologies advancing so quickly, it's really exciting. The one discouraging part of the article is that all of development was being done in Europe or the US. Canada was completely absent. I worry that as a community and a Country, we're missing a really important opportunities as we stubbornly stick to fossil fuels.

Too many to note, but the global energy market makes me more wary of this kind of provincial tax investment. We could lose big time because of market volatility and it already looks like it's not going to bring anywhere near the kind of tax revenue promised during Clark's campaign.

Our government being run by a company rather than its people.

I do NOT want this to go through for many reasons!

how many concerns are needed in order to say no? I think there is enough concerns already.

LNG / Fortis alliance has no regards for our common goods. They look after their own interest only, hence the latest decision to take District Council decision about their application to the court.

Fortis in their brochure stats that: "Understanding, respect, open communication and trust continue to be our aim when working with First Nations groups throughout the province." How come they do not exercise the same values when it comes to relationship with the local government?
The council has my mandate to say NO to LNG proposal of this scope at this time!

1. Stop it
2. Politics and there leaders of the day is all about the money when it is not their front yard or back yard or their neighbourhood and Province also not their country. We have been minimized for to long as humans, time to vote for US. We live here..thank you for you faith.

3. Woodfibre LNG’s public relations person on duty in their office, in response to my concern about its parent company, reassured me that he used to have an Indonesian girl friend and she had said that Sukanto Tanoto is not much worse than any of the others, that they are all corrupt, are always suing each other, don’t care about the environment, just want to make lots of money, that’s how you do business. He was not able to answer my other questions, but I did appreciate that he gave me a memory stick containing all those volumes and pages.

4. LNG promotes fracking which promotes dirty water aquifers, wasted good water for fracking, pipelines that fragment animal populations, and the list goes on. I vote for renewable energy solutions. No environment, nothing else matters.

5. There are far more cons to this project going through than any potential benefit. The government has it's eye on profit and job creation, not the environmental impact. We should be investing in clean energy, solar, WIND power in one of the most wind- rich corridors there is. Squamish is named for "Mother of Wind" is it not???

6. I understand the workings of big business and the temptation of the all mighty dollar (loonie). I dont believe for a minute that a billionaire would invest such a huge amount to not gain an even larger figure. I also understand that woodfibre is only going to pay tax on profits? How can we know what is profit? How can we know the real dollar amount for generated municipal tax? Squamish and the howe sound community appears to be flowering quite well without the need of this industry. We will all be fine in twenty years without ever experiencing lng/woodfibre.

7. As human beings it is imperative that we coexist with our environment sustainably, and to the mutual benefit of either, and to cease past exploitive practices that were negligible when the world population was 1 Billion but unsustainable with a growing population of 7 Billion.

8. I do not think it fits at all with what Squamish stands for now, "The outdoor capital of Canada'!!! and I think it will hurt the economy long term for people will think twice of moving to Squamish if there is such a plant across the "street"...

9. I am concerned that the process of evaluating an industrial project proposal on the part of the District should be high quality -- objective and based on science, orderly and efficient, and able to accommodate genuine and ample opportunity for public involvement and input. The WLNG project not likely to be the last large industrial project to be considered at Squamish and northern Howe Sound. New shipping terminals, a new sawmill or other processing plant might be proposed in future. Squamish is and always will be an essential British Columbia seaport -- a tidewater portal for regional and Interior B.C. industries, in addition to being a gateway to a recreational waterfront and mountain landscape. Concerns regarding a "re-industrialization of Howe Sound" often appear to be poorly informed and can be damaging.

10. I moved to Squamish for health and lifestyle reasons. I feel strongly about protecting the environment in order to protect a healthy future for our children. Please reconsider moving forward with this project and investing in sustainable energy practices that foster environmental stewardship and improved public health.

Thank you for reviewing my concerns.

Feedback: I really would have liked to have been able to select more than 3 priority for any given category.

11. I am against the SITE and PIPELINE. Please listen to the voices of our community, use upstream thinking to navigate this potentially devastating proposal, and lets move forward progressively to "greener" pastures. Our community has so much potential, lets recognize it.

12. This project is totally unsuitable to the Sea to Sky corridor and Howe Sound which are finally recovering from the effects of past industrialization. There is not enough economic benefit to the impacted communities to justify the potential hazards associated with the plant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>This project is a &quot;No Go&quot; in my books. I am saying No. My opinion is a resounding NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>It is too late in the global game of fossil fuels for BC to jump in. The tax and royalties are too little and if something goes wrong, will it be the people of BC that will be left footing that bill. Do the right thing, be innovative and visionary. We are approaching a tipping point and now is the time to create the jobs of the future. Stop living in a decaying past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I have nothing to add.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Very concerned about the affects on our health if this goes forward. We would directly be promoting climate change on the planet and causing a negative impact to the ocean and marine life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Many concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Proper monitoring is essential to ensure compliance with all our standards, regulations, and laws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The fact that the provincial government is giving away our resources for next to nothing. If we received millions in tax revenue immediately it would be ok. Squamish will end up paying these foreign companies to be here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I am concerned about investing in energy resources that do not consider the need for new green technologies in the face of global warming. Why as a community can we not look at wind or solar technologies? Today when I read that in France all commercial properties must now be built with a green roof or a solar roof, I was ashamed of our governments lack of caring for our environment and global warming. I am very worried about the impacts of warming the waters around Howe sound and the effect that will have on water safety (plankton blooms, Bacteria overgrowth). I worry about the person who purchased Woodfiber LNG after the recent article on him regarding his shady business practices and disregard for the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I am against the LNG site and speak on behalf of my family (husband and two sons) to stop this project from moving forward. Instead, let’s get started on industry cluster projects to attract the right type of economic prosperity to our community. Otherwise I fear the developing popularity of Squamish locally and internationally may well be short lived and our family will be forced to find a new place to call home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The proponent of Woodfibre LNG needs to provide a comprehensive insurance plan open to assessment by peer groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Long will do terrible things to our community. The negative impact to the environment we saw from Britannia mine and wood fibre will be redone by LNG. All of the negatives that this project brings with it drastically outweighs the small amount of local jobs and tax revenue we will get from it. There is also the concern of the owners of this plan, who globally have a terrible track record for environmentally friendly industry, and in the past have had events where pollutants were spilled and nothing was done by them to mitigate or remove these spilled pollutants. BC should be aiming to find environmentally friendly means of producing power, jobs and economic growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 15.  | Hello, My name is Jamie Martin, I live on 1109 Plateau Crescent, Squamish, B.C. I have lived in Squamish since the mid 1960's. I have witnessed personally heavy industry here and seen the devastation both on land and in the air. I went to the elementary school down town and saw 2 of my classmates develop asthma and had to go to school in Brackendale due to the air pollution. There were warning siren towers placed around town and would go off periodically. The smog down town in June during a high pressure weather pattern with no clouds around was astounding. I have been windsurfing here in Howe sound for 30 years. We have held world cup windsurfing races and the Canadian Windsurfing national championships here. We have unique inflow wind thermals that also blow straight thru town from wood fiber. Our wind sport society operates off of the end of the spit just down wind and not far from the woodfiber site. We will be up to 800 members this year. When woodfiber was in operation our members were the first to get the smell of the air pollution. I am a director and past president of the society for 15 years. I also have been sitting on the Squamish Estuary Committee for the past 15 years where I have learned a lot about the Howe sound.
and the recovery it has been going through. I have witnessed whales, dolphins, and orcas all returning right up to the river mouth. Never in the past have we seen this until the last 3 to 4 years. I had a Whale spray in my face when he or she was feeding off of the river mouth and I was down wind on my kiteboard. The Howe Sound fjord is unique and due to the lack of activity at the old woodfiber site has allowed the large water mammals to return. If you look at the geography of the site of woodfiber it is like doorway as the mammal's round the corner to come into the harbour and to the river. Those ships that LNG are proposing are huge. They will be assisted by 3 to 4 Tugs all the way up the sound. These tugs noise decibels will not be good for the retuning mammals. I am getting sick and tired of the LNG propaganda as they compare themselves to other places around the world and try to spin off the impact of the pollution and activity under water that this plant will create. We are not other places, we are a unique Howe Sound Fiord. It has been said that Howe Sound is the worst place to set up industry.

The other frustrating point about this plant going in is it is the only plant that Christy Clark and the Liberals can get up and running first to make good on their mandate to start delivering LNG before the other plants come on line that are not near populated areas. We are being used as a political pawn here on this plant.

These pipes are 24” diameter and will be able to double the shipping in the Howe Sound in the near future, of course they will deny this. I know you are supposed to make recommendations but that is what they want regardless of the risks because they are recommendations only.

I could mention the safety, the economy, and more on pollution but I will let the others write in on this.

I thank for your attention and hope you will do the right thing.

Best Regards

XXXX

Squamish is great because it’s beautiful. Let’s keep it that way!

I feel the site itself could be remediated into a world class recreational destination, that could include research into clean energy initiatives, marine life research and study (partnerships with the Universities?) and opportunities for exploration and development of first nations heritage and culture. There could be development of hiking and other recreational pursuits. The location could also be a marine park and a boating mecca. Let us think of all the ways this site could bring LONG term gain and prosperity to all of Howe Sound.

I am concerned that the negative aspects of industrializing Howe Sound will not be off-set by the tax revenues and multiplier effect in Squamish and province as a whole. I have done over 100 business trips to Asia over 20 years and I can say with certainty that people want to come to Canada for the one thing we have that they don’t; Nature!

Selling of LNG at low profits simply makes no sense especially when we are compromising our greatest asset right on the doorstep of the gateway city to our country.

More concerns about the governance in Squamish than about the project:

Listen to the voices of the many not the few who yell the loudest - many of whom do not even live here. Do not believe this is a big issue for most of us.

Disagree strongly with the rules for speaking at Council meetings being changed for a few who yell loudly and will continue to do so on this issue - the rules should be the same for all of us. People need to follow procedures and demonstrate responsible behaviour to have input!

Annoyed about Fortis - those who voted against Fortis should pay for the lawsuit not the taxpayer. Our taxes are too
You cannot change or ignore contracts. Would you like it if the bank took back your mortgage? Agreements need to be honored and council members need to know what is going on so they do not abstain from voting because of ignorance of the issues.

Bringing LNG to Squamish has no benefits for this community. Tourism and housing sales will diminish - which are to me the main earners of our community. LNG won’t bring that kind of revenue and growth to Squamish. We have the potential to be the Outdoor Rec Capitol -- lets act like it and promote growth in more sustainable areas. Squamish has a hot real estate market--- these new residents will bring more business and therefore more wealth to our community. LNG will stop that. Not only killing our environment but killing our growth as a town. More jobs will come from more residents and a growing community--- Not from LNG-- it will have the opposite effect.

Proposed route of pipeline through Ravens plateau. The corridor is already used as a motocross track, illegal camping area, and garbage dump by many. Its access should be blocked to all non district vehicles with a gate on the east end of the utility corridor so these abuses are limited. A wider corridor will only increase these problems. I have witnessed people lighting campfires directly above buried gas lines, on more than one occasion. But hey it's only Valleycliffe right.

There really aren't enough benefits to the community to allow this monstrosity here. The owner of Petronas seems about as trustworthy as a sleazy used car salesman selling a 1971 Ford Pinto.

The Working Committee's work should have been expended to allow for technical input on the aspects of safety of the pipeline and compressor station. It is not too late to avoid all impact on Squamish town and the estuary by having the EAO require the proponent to re-visit the alternative routing via Furry Creek or Britannia which was only given a short consideration by the proponent.

I am concerned that Woodfibre LNG will not get the go ahead and I feel that this will be a great loss for our community. This questionnaire is a great idea because it allows for everyone to share there thoughts.

squamish is at a fork in the road, we can continue to improve and receive accolades like being named the #1 place to visit in North America by CNN last summer or we can revert to being an industrial ****hole please use your power to make the right decision NO LNG

Overall I think the issue of shipping and ship related accidents is important and has not been addressed in the survey. There are parts of Howesound further south of Woodfiber which are only 30 feet deep in the middle of sound. And as we have seen countless times in the past accidents do and will happen eventually. I do not think we need the site for Squamish to prosper there are other alternatives, and as our location is showing it is the most desirable place in Canada (North America according to NY Times). If done cleverly this place can turn into a jewel of soft industries and small hard industries over the next 20 years. LNG will have a negative effect on that potential in my view.

Say no to exporting fracked goods. Say no to warming howe sounds waters and chlorinating them.

I am concerned that council is working with blinders on when it come to doing the right thing for the community.

I think that any concerns that have been brought forward have been well addressed by Woodfibre LNG and Fortis. I am concerned about the stalling in granting permits to Fortis for geotechnical drilling. Geotech drilling is a low impact activity. I am also concerned about the lack of fact, science and evidence behind the hysteria opposing this project.

I appreciate that we need jobs/tax revenue in town and some will think that not accepting this project with open arms will give others the impression that we are not open for business. However, I don't believe that the oil & gas sector is the industry that represents our community values or our most recent branding of being hard wired for adventure. The Sea to Sky Gondola was a huge success last summer. Squamish is ripe for more such success. Placing an LNG plant in the sight line of the gondola is not showing support for that business.
Is there something greener that we could attract to that site?

1. We need WLNG

2. Special interest groups are using this assessment to protest fracking, but the two should be treated separately as this project’s rejection will not change the outcome of fracking. We need to decide this project based on local issues only.

3. For a full list of concerns about Woodfibre LNG and its associated pipelines, compressor stations, and tankers, please visit www.myseatosky.org/issues

   - I am continually adding to this list of key issues and concerns as more information about this project comes to light.
   - This project simply does not fit our values. It does not fit our vision of ourselves, Howe Sound, or any of the communities on its shores.

4. The anti LNG are very media savvy and intimidating. All their arguments are not based on hard science.

5. Other concerns? Aside from the fact that the beauty and strength that is Squamish will be permanently ruined for a few years of very ugly, very polluting and health damaging, but money making LNG process that will negatively impact both this province and in the long run, the planet.

   - Can you really be that short sighted?

6. My concerns would be the environment, but I do think they will do what they have to to protect it, they are not liers wanting to ruin our nature.

7. Please focus on Tourism and outdoor industries as Squamish main economy and assess all projects on that basis.

8. Negative conflict? say NO!

9. I really hope that the voices of locals can be strong enough to actually make a significant impact on the outcome of this controversial investment.

10. I am against it philosophically.

11. I’m really concerned about the amount of sea water that will be taken in, heated, chlorinated and dumped back into Howe Sound!!!!!

12. Without council members thinking outside the box and looking at every decision they make in terms of long term outcomes Squamish is in trouble. They must think and act and look at the long term outcomes of the very short term decisions that they are making today. Look at Squamish in 15 years and commence having vision and not short rem eyesight.

13. My primary concern is that the economic benefits do not outweigh the potential environmental concerns. Squamish is a community that I thought was moving away from heavy industry into a greener economy. My values are not reflected in the economic path represented by LNG. With the growing corporate presence and the revitalization of industrial activity in the area Squamish is quickly transforming into a town that I can’t see myself or my family occupying in the long term.

14. This project in its entirety is against the best interests of this town, this province, its people, their health, and the environment.

15. I think my discussion in the other sections encompassed most of my concerns. I think that the questionnaire options were somewhat biased and restricting. I hope the council takes the time to read all of the responses.

16. I think this is a bad idea at this time when global warming is a issue.

   - That great sums of money are being spent by government to send gas that we will need in years for a profit now.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I do not support the Woodfibre LNG project. I do support Mother Nature and the protection of the environment. As a recent resident to Squamish from Eastern Canada, where there are also environmental issues, I was surprised that BC would endorse such a project for Howe Sound. We have used and abused the gifts from the Earth in a disrespectful manner and it is slowly turning against us. Our relationship with Nature should and could be symbiotic however we are overstepping the boundaries with projects of this nature. I do not support greed. I do support bartering with Nature however are are taking more than giving in return. What can the future generation look forward to? Mother Nature Earth is the best bank if we take care of it. <strong>NO to the LNG project.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The main reason that I am against the Woodfibre LNG plan is, exporting gas to foreign countries for little or no benefit to the average citizen while enriching multinational corporations is wrong, especially if you introduce significant risk. British Columbia betting it's future on LNG export is like a high-schooler planning to wind up working at a gas station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I hope that council and the province will not be disproportionately influenced by Knee jerk reactions from people who are convinced the sky is falling and that they invented squamish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td><strong>No LNG. Renewables are the future</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Working in the industry in Alberta i saw the harsh effects it had on the environment, i chose to find a better way to make a living. So i sure don’t want to live in this environment. we have a young and innovative community full of leaders in their industries and should not accept this for this beautiful place we all call home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>There are far too many negatives and risks for very few benefits. The project seems to primarily favour an overseas proponent at the expense of Squamish. Do we really want to invite someone with the dubious environmental and human rights record of Sukanto Tanoto into our town? Squamish shouldn't take just any offer just because it's the only offer on the table. Let's hold out for something better. No relationship is better than a bad relationship. In life as it is in business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I don't want to beat a dead horse. Most of my concerns were stated within the questionairre. But I guess I can leave you with this. This town crumbled when the woodfibre pulp mill shut down. Since then Squamish and its economy has started to boom. All without the addition of big industry. It’s become a town where people stop not just drive through. I fear that with the addition of this plant Squamish will be again viewed as an industrial town and lose a lot if not all the momentum it has gained in the past decade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I just think that if a company doesn’t pay there taxes and doesn’t seem to care about the environment then what they say should be nil and void. If I didn’t pay my taxes and had environmental lawsuits that I couldn’t keep up with I would be laughed out of council i.e being elected onto council but some reason we sit back and listen to a corporation that is in the courts for both not paying taxes and not being environmentally conscious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>This project has innumerable environmental issues which have been discussed by many sources. I see only negative impact regarding the local economy. If heavy polluting industry is here, many other companies will consequently NOT be here. Yes the district need revenue. Yes we need jobs. There are better ways to do so.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This project has divided this town.

It has pitted neighbour against neighbour and it's going to destroy Squamish as we know it. No industry is worth that. No amount of tax is worth that. There are other industries and businesses that will also see benefit in what we have to offer. Let's seek them out. Let's bring Squamish back together before it's too late and we've become just like every other crappy little town that didn't stand up in a bid to be something better.

| 19 | My concern is that the loud few who are against it will derail what Squamish needs. Tax revenue. I'd like to know if these are the same people who were against the gondola. We need natural gas to heat our homes, and I'm willing to put it in my backyard to get the financial benefits. |
| 6. | Please know that our family are a firm NO to this develop on so many levels. |
| 19 | Thank you. |
| 8. | I love you all but Doug. Please think about the future .... If evolution is outlawed only outlaws will evolve..Harper what have you done to Canada. We need passionate leaders not hungry wolves. |
| 19 | My concerns are that Squamish won't be invited to the table and we will miss valuable opportunities. There are many ways to lower our carbon foot print, this includes helping a large population get off of coal and oil. |
| 20 | Thank you for taking the time to read and consider my feedback. I greatly appreciate the transparency of this process and the opportunity residents have been given to provide constructive feedback, and most of all for our feedback to have been taken into consideration. I also recognize why this location has been considered for Woodfibre LNG. The site has been utilized by industry in the past and some of the infrastructure is already in place. I have been in contact with members of Woodfibre LNG and greatly appreciated their receptivity and genuine consideration of my suggestion to install an extensive green roof system in the event that the plant is approved. I have also felt very conflicted in this process, as I have very dear friends that have been and/or are currently employed by Woodfibre LNG. However, despite the fact that it may mean higher taxes, less jobs, more roommates and the potential necessity of moving out of my home for months at a time in order to rent out my room in order to pay for the increased taxes, I can't help but think about the porpoise swimming on its side at the bow of my boat, gazing up at me with silent, inquisitive, intelligence or to think about the serenity of paddle boarding through the estuary while listening to the sound of the birds singing to know that at the end of the day it doesn't matter how many jobs that Woodfibre LNG (or any non-sustainable corporation anywhere) provides or how much money they are willing to invest into a community. At the end of the day you can't eat, drink, breathe or swim in money. There will come a time when government comes to this realization as well and I sincerely hope, for all of our sakes, that it isn't too late. |
| 20 | Whomever you are, you are doing a great job at spreading intelligent and accurate information. Please keep it up!|
| 20 | The overall environmental costs of this project do not outweigh the social benefits (jobs) to the community. I've worked in Indonesia since 2009 and I've seen the incredible destruction that has been done on Java, Borneo and Sumatra and now we are allowing these individuals to make money from destroying our environment? It just doesn't make any sense. |
| 20 | I hope city council and beyond are able to STOP this LNG project. I believe we have an opportunity to explicitly and energetically invite creative investment in this community from folks who cherish the spectacular beauty and health we are so fortunate to be presently surrounded by! |
| 20 | At a larger scale the amount of tax breaks the lng industry is getting at a provincial and federal level. From what i have read the tax breaks are far more then squamish will ever see in tax income. Renewable resources and energy is where squamish should focus and yes that includes forestry. |
| 20 | I really don't feel due diligence was done beforehand. Although I understand the possible benefits financially yo the community, I'm not convinced that it will have a great impact. I do, however see the possibility for disaster and just don’t feel the benefits outweigh the risks. |
| 20 | Loss of future investments in Squamish due to the environmental damage to the sound and potential for disaster at the...
6. Fortis BC Compressor station.
   Loss of population and lower house values due to young people/families losing faith and leaving town.
   Massive loss of tourism due to the environmental impact (loss of marine life) and the change of the stunning views to include tankers and emissions from the site.
   Permanent, ongoing environmental impact to the marine life/wildlife of the sound and surrounding areas.
   Potential for major accidents/explosions from the gas pipeline and the LNG facility
   Major accidents in the sound from the tankers.

7. I have not gone into the issue of safety because it is the human species that would be likely affected by any LNG catastrophe. The risk of catastrophic events cannot be completely eliminated but it is possible to ensure that the public can be kept out of range of any great explosion, and this should be done.

8. Please do not support the WLNG and demand further more detailed studies before we make any commitments. There is so much we do not know and so many empty promises that are muddying the waters. This is a major decision and one that will affect the future of Squamish. You are in a position to really shape what Squamish will look like in years to come. Please make the correct choice!

9. While I live in North Vancouver, I own property on Gambier Island, and 2 of our daughters families live in Whistler. I have 40 years of dealing with ships, a past director of, and still belong to the Chamber of Shipping of British Columbia, and have attended a number of recent seminars on with the current state of LNG ships including safety, and environmental issues. Many steps have been taken in recent years to upgrade the science, technology and handling of LNG ships and plants, etc. and as a stake holder in Howe Sound, I do not believe the presence of LNG ships and the proposed LNG Plant at Woodfibre will result in a safety or environmental disaster. I do believe it would provide a valuable asset to not only Squamish but the Western Canadian infrastructure and in particular the West coast of British Columbia and Canada.

10. Squamish and Industry can work together but it has to be the right industry. I have concerns about the affect of the quality of life and impacts to the local environment. On a broader scale, I believe that approving this project also says a lot about what we think of the greater environment. Do we support Fracking? Do we support increased emissions? Do we encourage global warming? It's not just a case of "not in my backyard" but also question about overall long-term consequences of the project.

11. Please, not here. WE need government and industry to focus on renewable power sources, not gas & oil extraction.

12. This project going in would be a major step backwards for our town and environment. When it's all running fine with no accidents it will be a source of pollution (locally, upstream and downstream). When the inevitable accidents happen we'll lose even more of this jewel I'm proud to call home. I think it's extremely naive and short-sighted to support this project.

13. I do not support the project...I feel the risks, the potential for environmental disasters and the air quality, noise, pollution from this plant would be detrimental for Squamish..the outdoor recreation capital of Canada? I want to keep it that way.

14. I do not want this plant in my town. I don't trust big business and I don't think they have the best interests of Squamish on their mind. I think they are here to make money and nothing else. I don't think any benefits that the plant will bring to Squamish will be worth the social, environmental impacts and safety risks.

15. BOTTOM LINE: Investing billions of dollars in new shale gas infrastructure for domestic
5. Use is, at best, of limited value for a short period of time if we put in place both a CO2 price and regulations to minimize methane leakage. Exporting gas vitiated even that limited value and so investing billions in LNG infrastructure is, at best, a waste of resources better utilized for deploying truly low-carbon energy. At worst, it helps accelerate the world past the 2°C warming threshold into Terra incognita — a planet of amplifying feedbacks and multiple simultaneous catastrophic impacts.

Very concerned about the bribery, buy-outs, lack of transparency, working with a crook such as Sukanto Tanoto,

And the environment... well I already said that. I want a clean world. I speak for the animals that have no voices. They too want the same...

21

6. I am concerned that Squamish Council is thinking about economic benefit from polluting industry again!

I will first draw on the expertise of others:

1. SAFETY: Siting an LNG facility in Howe Sound violates international safety standards and practices, putting Howe Sound residents at risk

As LNG tankers transit Howe Sound, there is a high-danger zone for 1,600 metres (1-mile) on either side of the LNG tanker. If an accident happens, people within this zone risk death by asphyxiation, or death/injury by fire or explosion. Every time a tanker travels through Howe Sound (approximately 6-8 transits a month according to Woodfibre LNG) several Howe Sound communities will be in that high-danger zone, including: Bowen Island, Bowyer Island, Anvil Island, Passage Island, Porteau Cove, West Vancouver, and parts of the Sea to Sky highway. The Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) LNG Terminal Siting Standards states that LNG terminals should not be located in narrow, inland waterways with dense local populations and significant commercial, recreational, and ferry traffic. Why would that guideline not apply to Howe Sound? The proposed siting of the Woodfibre LNG terminal and associated transit of LNG tankers through Howe Sound poses an unacceptable risk to safety of people in communities along the shores of Howe Sound.

Sources: Sandia Report, 2004 and SIGTTO LNG Terminal Siting Standards

2. ENVIRONMENT: The once-through seawater cooling system proposed by Woodfibre LNG is outdated

Woodfibre LNG is proposing an outdated and damaging cooling method to help cool the LNG facility. They propose to extract 17,000 tonnes (= 3.7 million gallons, or 7 Olympic-sized 50-meter swimming pools) of seawater from Howe Sound, chlorinate it, heat it, and then spit it back out into the sound every hour of every day for the next 25 years. This method has been banned in California and several other places as it is very damaging to marine life such as juvenile salmon, herring, and plankton which are the building blocks for all other life in Howe Sound. If the herring are impacted, the dolphins, orcas, and humpbacks are also impacted as they no longer have a food supply. The impacts of increased water temperatures and the addition of chlorinated seawater will likely reverse the recent revival of marine life in Howe Sound, which is just now recovering from the toxic legacies of previous industries. This is unacceptable.

3. HEALTH: Social costs and health impacts of air pollution
Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Emissions of NOx and SO2 interact with other compounds to form fine particles, which can affect both the lungs and the heart. Exposure to these particles is linked to increased risk of respiratory symptoms, such as irritation of the airways, coughing, or difficulty breathing; decreased lung function; aggravated asthma; onset of chronic bronchitis; irregular heartbeat; nonfatal heart attacks; and premature death in people with heart or lung disease. A new study published in the scientific journal, Climatic Change, estimates the true social costs of air pollution that aren’t accounted for in the cost of fossil fuels and other pollutants. Social costs include the health impacts of air pollution as well as impacts from climate change. The study found that sulfur dioxide costs $42,000 per tonne, and nitrous oxides cost $67,000 per tonne. Sources:


4. SITE SUITABILITY: The Woodfibre site is not a safe location for a hazardous LNG facility

On February 15th, 2015, a 3.4 magnitude earthquake hit Vancouver’s coast that was felt throughout Howe Sound. The Woodfibre LNG proposal is located within this zone of moderate to high earthquake risk, on two known thrust faults. The Woodfibre site also has a history of slope failure. In 1955 a wharf and three warehouses collapsed into Howe Sound at the Woodfibre site, causing $500,000 – $750,000 in damages (Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4). A recent, but unreleased, geotechnical study by Knight Piesold identifies that approximately 46% of the study area was mapped as having rapid mass movement. This means landslides and slope slumpage... including existing natural landslide hazards as well as terrain where construction activity may increase landslide initiation. Why hasn’t the geotechnical study by Knight Piesold been released?

Sources:


Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4

B.C. Ministry of Energy and Mines

5. ECONOMY: The requested socio-economic study has not been provided

During construction, only 4.3% of jobs (=38.5 out of 895) will be for locals living in the Squamish/Whistler corridor (See Table 6.2-8 of the Labour Market section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application). Why are there so few jobs predicted to be filled by workers in the Squamish/SLRD area? The EA application is also very unclear about how many of the 100 full-time jobs will be filled by residents of Howe Sound once the LNG terminal is operational. What are the benefits to Squamish? What are the costs? There is still no clarity around how much in municipal taxes will be paid to the District of Squamish. How will this project impact existing small businesses and existing industries in Howe Sound?

6. CLIMATE CHANGE: 142 thousand tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions is unacceptable

Woodfibre LNG is now estimating greenhouse gas emissions to be 142 thousand tonnes of CO2 equivalent every year. These annual emissions of CO2 equivalent from Woodfibre LNG is equal to adding over 18,000 cars to the highway, driving to Vancouver and back, every day. This is more than six times greater than current highway traffic. It is irresponsible to approve this kind of polluting industry at a time when we need to transition away from fossil fuels to
mitigate the risks associated with climate change, and to reduce the economic and health impacts of air pollution in general.

7. GOVERNMENT REGULATION: Inability of government to monitor, enforce, and respond to issues

There are no regulations adopted to regulate this LNG industry from a technical standpoint. Any of the current standards are not applicable to the LNG industry. Do the regulators have the knowledge and the expertise and the capacity to oversee this industry or will they be relying on the proponent to monitor themselves and report to the regulator? Self-monitoring industries have created several examples of accidents with resulting environmental destruction in recent years, including the Lac Megantic rail disaster and the Mt Polley tailing pond spill.

8. ENVIRONMENT: Removal of water from Mill Creek unsustainable for fish life

Woodfibre LNG has secured the water license to extract water from Mill Creek, which flows through the Woodfibre site. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans has objected to this because the amount of water that WLNG is proposing to remove will reduce water levels in Mill Creek to levels that will no longer support fish life, especially in the summer months. Woodfibre LNG needs to source water for this project from somewhere else to protect this important stream habitat which is home to several native fish species.

9. ENVIRONMENT: Missing baseline studies

The following baseline studies are either missing or are inadequate as they do not conform to any recognized scientific standards: fish, birds, marine mammals, air quality, shipping, water quality, marine sound, and atmospheric sound, marine life near the Woodfibre site, and the cumulative impact assessment. Proper studies need to be completed before any decisions can be made regarding this project.

10. VIEWSCAPES: BC Hydro clearcut of two 64 metre swaths of forest at the Woodfibre site will impact viewscapes from the Sea to Sky highway and the gondola

BC Hydro is proposing to clearcut two 64 metre swaths of forest at the Woodfibre site which will create visible scars in the Howe Sound viewscapes which will be very visible from the highway and the gondola. This information was only made available during the recent BC Hydro open house held on 19th March, near the end of the public comment period. This information is not included in the cumulative impact assessment of the Woodfibre application and it should be. This late release of information pertinent to this project and the timing of the BC Hydro open houses is unsatisfactory.

11. ENVIRONMENT: 9000 year old glass sponge reefs endangered by tanker traffic

LNG tankers do not have enough clearance to get over the 9000 year old reef if they go off course. These 9000 year old glass sponge reefs have been called "Living Fossils" by National Geographic as until recently this species was thought to have gone extinct over 60 million years ago. MLA Jordan Sturdy recently made a statement in the House about the importance of this discovery in Halkett Bay near Gambier Island, and to support the proposal to expand the Provincial Park Protected Area to ensure these reefs are protected.

Sources:
12. ENVIRONMENT: Will there be smog? Will there be a smell?

Woodfibre LNG is estimating air pollution emissions of 295.7 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and 43.8 tonnes of sulfur dioxide (SO2) every year (See Table 5.2-14 of the Air Quality Section of Woodfibre LNG’s environmental assessment application).

Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2) is a reddish-brown gas with a pungent, irritating odour. It absorbs light and leads to the yellow-brown “smog” pollution haze seen hanging over cities. It is known to irritate the lungs and increase susceptibility to respiratory infections. In combination with either ozone (O3) or sulphur dioxide (SO2), nitrogen dioxide may cause injury at even lower concentration levels.

Sulphur Dioxide (SO2) is a toxic gas with a pungent, irritating, and rotten smell. Current scientific evidence links short-term exposures to SO2, ranging from 5 minutes to 24 hours, with an array of adverse respiratory effects including bronchoconstriction and increased asthma symptoms. These effects are particularly important for asthmatics at elevated ventilation rates (e.g., while exercising or playing). Studies also show a connection between short-term exposure and increased visits to emergency departments and hospital admissions for respiratory illnesses, particularly in at-risk populations including children, the elderly, and asthmatics. The addition of these air pollutants in Howe Sound is of particular concern as recent research by MSc student Annie Seagram (studying under Professor Douw Steyn, Department of Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Sciences at the University of British Columbia) has shown that the Howe Sound airshed and Lower Fraser Valley airshed are connected. Emissions from Woodfibre LNG will add to the pollution in Howe Sound, exacerbating the existing air quality conditions, particularly in the Squamish-Brackendale corridor.

Note that Metro Vancouver annually issues several Air Quality Advisories due to high concentrations of ground-level ozone. This pollution also impacts the Howe Sound and Squamish, and exposure to these pollutants are of particular concern for infants, the elderly, and is directly linked to health issues such as lung or heart disease and asthma.

In addition: the BC government needs to ensure the protection of the 9000 year old glass sponge reef at Halkett Bay off Gambier Island.

About Glass Sponge Reefs: http://www.eao.gov.bc.ca/pcp/forms/Woodfibre_LNG_form.html

Glass Sponge Reefs in Halkett Bay off of Gambier Island

MLA Jordan Sturdy spoke in Legislature about the glass sponge reef at Halkett Bay off Gambier Island.
http://jordansturdymla.ca/bcltv_videos/mla-sturdy-halkett-bays-glass-sponges/

Tankers do not have enough clearance to get over the 9000 year old reef if any off course action happens.

Transport Canada Dangerous Goods Dept. is not at all ready for LNG. In fact they now have a task force for rail and road.

I have been a member of 2 Stakeholder Teams focused on the protection and restoration of salmon habitat. I include information and links for your convenience and ask that a similar project be implemented for the WLNG and Fortis BC
applications.

2005 SALMON RECOVERY PLAN
Entire Salmon Life Cycle
$250,000 Pacific Salmon Foundation

$2 million
5 year plan
Cheakamus Salmon Recovery
Squamish Nation and Stakeholders

CERT C
Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Technical Committee

The Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Technical Committee (CERTC) website, provides information on Cheakamus ecosystem restoration activities.

CERTC was formed in August 2005 in response to a train derailment and subsequent spill of sodium hydroxide into the Cheakamus River. CERTC’s mandate is to understand ecosystem-level impacts and develop restoration and monitoring strategies for affected species to accelerate the return of the Cheakamus ecosystem to a pre-spill state as quickly as reasonably possible. CERTC Terms of Reference (pdf).

CERTC recommends programs for implementation to the Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Steering Committee based on input from experienced professionals, external specialists, interested parties and the public.

Both committees include representatives of:
CN
District of Squamish
Fisheries and Oceans Canada
BC Ministry of Environment
Squamish Nation

Thank you for your interest in Cheakamus ecosystem restoration.
Comments can be made to CERTC at comments@certc.ca

Fish Assessment

Following the spill, B.C. Ministry of Environment (MoE) fisheries biologists, technicians and contracted staff documented fish survival and compared fish density information to available previous data.

Fish mortalities were collected from the Cheakamus River downstream of the spill, with activities including:
Recording mortalities by species and location;
Collecting length data to determine age classes of impacted fish; Collecting scale samples to further supplement brood year identification; and, freezing and storing of samples for further examination, if required.

Fish Impact Assessment (MoE and DFO) (pdf)

MoE Estimated Impacts on Salmon and Trout Populations:

Chinook
- 25% of juveniles from 2004 spawning population
- 50% of 2005 spawning population

Chum
- juveniles not affected
- 2005 spawning population not affected

Coho
- 50% of juveniles from 2004 spawners
- 2005 spawning population not affected

Pink
- juveniles not affected
- between 3 - 10% of 2005 spawning population

Steelhead
- 90% of mainstem juveniles from 2003 to 2005 spawners
- 2006 and 2007 steelhead spawning populations not affected

Estimated Impacts on Other Fish

Ninety percent of resident fish in the mainstem Cheakamus River may have been affected by the spill including:
Dolly Varden/Bull Trout
Rainbow Trout
Lamprey (2 species)
Sculpins (bullheads - 2 species)
Sticklebacks
Juveniles rearing in tributary streams at the time of the spill were not affected.

Benthos Recovery Presentation - Triton Environmental, 2008 (pdf). New!
Appendices (pdf) New!

Ecological Assessment

A screening level qualitative assessment of ecological effects has been conducted for CN to understand the potential effect the spill could have had on receptors other than fish in order to identify and target the need for ecosystem restoration activities.

Given the broad scope of the project and the limited amount of available data (i.e., exposure data, such as concentration of NaOH in environmental media, NaOH ecotoxicity toward specific species) it is not possible to conduct a comprehensive ecological risk assessment for each species present in the ecosystem. The screening level assessment focused on the functions of populations and communities within the ecosystem. This recognizes populations are less
sensitive than their most sensitive individual member and some effects may be observed at the population level without impairing the functions of the ecosystem as a whole.

Qualitative methods using subjective ecological effects ranking categories, such as high, medium and low, were used to describe the likelihood of adverse effects rather than providing a numerical estimate of effects. To minimize subjective influence, the interpretation of ecological effects contain a clear explanation of the lines of evidence leading to the conclusions, including a description of the uncertainties and assumptions used. Additionally, matrices were used to provide a structured framework for the characterization of ecological effects. The assessment used existing information from baseline and monitoring reports and from previous scientific literature.

This screening level assessment of ecological effects consists of three main steps: problem formulation, analysis and characterization of the likelihood of adverse ecological effects. Results from the ecological effects assessment will be used to determine the direction of future recovery efforts for other components of the Cheakamus River ecosystem.

For more details, view the
Ecological Final Report (pdf) New!
Amphibian Assessment – October 2007 (pdf) New!
Study Design: Screening Level Assessment of Ecological Effects (pdf)

Water Quality

River Sampling

Water quality professionals tested and monitored the following:
Water quality in the Cheakamus and Squamish Rivers, August 5 - 8, 2005
Water quality in the Cheakamus during site remediation activities, August 10 - 26, 2005
Water quality in the Cheakamus after rainfall events, August 17 - October 28, 2005
Monitoring was conducted over a variety of meteorological conditions and river levels. The parameters monitored included: pH and conductivity, sodium, total dissolved and total suspended solids, total and dissolved organic carbon.

Results

The Cheakamus River was cleared for recreation after 24 hours by Vancouver Coastal Health on August 6, 2005. Water quality downstream of the derailment site was determined to be similar to that upstream.

Well Sampling
Forty-eight wells within 100 metres of the Cheakamus River were sampled on August 6 and 7, 2005. The parameters monitored included pH and conductivity, sodium, total dissolved and total suspended solids.

The sampling was coordinated by Environment Canada, Vancouver Coastal Health Authority, Triton Environmental Consultants Ltd., and Quantum Environmental Services.

Drinking water from wells was cleared for drinking by the Vancouver Coastal Health Authority after 48 hours on August 8, 2005.

No additional detailed water quality sampling is required.

Water Quality Report – September 2007 (pdf)
Water Quality Report Appendices – September 2007 (pdf)
http://certc.ca/recovery_fund.shtml

CERT C Stakeholder Team

The Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Stakeholder Team (Stakeholder Team), established by CERTC, is a public advisory group comprised of representatives from interested organizations and individuals with local knowledge of and experience with the Cheakamus River.

Meeting Notes

September 30, 2010 (pdf) New!
June 24, 2010 (pdf)
March 25, 2010 (pdf)
October 29, 2009 (pdf)
June 17, 2009 (pdf)
March 5, 2009 (pdf)
November 27, 2008 (pdf)
September 25, 2008 (pdf)
May 27, 2008 (pdf)
March 27, 2008 (pdf)
January 24, 2008 (pdf)
December 6th, 2007 (pdf)
September 27, 2007 (pdf)
June 21st, 2007 (pdf)
April 25th, 2007 (pdf)
February 28th, 2007 (pdf)
December 6th, 2006 (pdf)
July 6th, 2006 (pdf)
May 25th, 2006 (pdf)
Overview of the Cheakamus River Large Woody Debris Stream bank Protection and fish habitat development project, June 2011 (pdf) New!
Update on Cheakamus River recovery strategies and monitoring programs, March 2009 (pdf) New!
Update on Cheakamus River recovery strategies and monitoring programs, January 2012 (pdf) New!
Cheakamus River Sculpin Recovery Presentation to CERST - Fall 2010 (pdf)
Adult Wild-and Hatchery-Origin Steelhead Returns to the Cheakamus River in 2009(pdf)
Cheakamus River Bull Trout Radiotelemetry and Enumeration Program, 2007-2009(pdf)
Cheakamus River Side Channel Re-watering Projects, March 2010 (pdf)

Role
The Stakeholder Team provides input into the development and implementation of monitoring and restoration programs for the Cheakamus ecosystem.
The Team helps coordinate and communicate comments and recommendations from interested parties to CERTC, and also receives updates on CERTC activities, as the information becomes available. All input from the Stakeholder Team is considered advisory in nature and final decisions regarding monitoring and restoration programs rests with CERTC and the Cheakamus Ecosystem Restoration Steering Committee.

CERTC Communication to the Stakeholder Team

CERTC Responses to Dec 6 2006 Stakeholder Team Questions (pdf)
http://certc.ca/public_events.shtml Events and Brochures.
http://certc.ca/monitoring_programs.shtml
http://certc.ca/recovery_plan.shtml to 2012

SQUAMISH ESTUARY MANAGEMENT PLAN

[PDF] Skwelwil’em Squamish Estuary Wildlife Management Plan
PDF] View the 1999 Squamish Estuary Management Plan
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT WORK GROUP MEMBERS
Squamish Estuary Nature Centre ad hoc Committee
Squamish Council
1999
SEMP
https://squamish.civicweb.net/document/10318/February%202,%201999

Page 19 Signatures to 1999 SEMP


1982 TO 1992
SEMP!

Howe Sound has also been improved because the Fraser Basin Council has successfully restored the waters at Britannia Beach on Howe Sound BC.
http://www.fraserbasin.bc.ca/about_britannia.html
Clean up after industry pollutes is never complete and restoration actually takes centuries.

The economy here in Howe Sound no longer depends on big polluting industry. What is evolving is self-employment in businesses that depend on "the scenery". Like the film industry. Also tourist activities because HOWE SOUND NOW HAS WHALES! DOLPHINS! HERRING!

Eagles and salmon have always drawn the public to the wilds of Howe Sound. People stay to live in a healthy environment and to co-exist with nature. There are economic benefits to all aspects from the sea, keeping the wild fishing industry to the sky where Whistler/Blackcomb are world class ski resorts with a growing population in what was once a village. Our proximity to Vancouver BC, also a source of employment, allows those who live in the Howe Sound area to park the car and enjoy recreating without it when not commuting to work elsewhere.

The LNG Project needs to be assessed as a having a negative impact on a recovering Howe Sound.

Many have written who have been able to study and report on the negative impact of the WLNG project, the Fortis BC pipeline and the gigantic tankers.

For me this is a forced endeavor. I feel quite intimidated by the fact that the WLNG company can afford $250 million dollar fines for environmental atrocities elsewhere.

It brings to mind that Woodfibre had 600 pollution violations that could have been charged against the owners and the government would not allow that to happen in 1983.

When in 2005 Woodfibre was closed, there was a statement from the government that the Woodfibre site would never again be used for industry. The re-zoning never took place and now this is a legal application with deadly consequences. Global warming could have been avoided had alternative energies been used these last 40 plus years.

I have lived here since 1977 and I have enjoyed the transition to a Howe Sound that is recovering. Those moving to Squamish now, afford to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars to buy a small accommodation here. This isn't so as to return to dirty industry and the putrid polluted smell of money when industry has an "accident".

Sincerely

XXXXX

21. The polarization of our community is of significant concern. There are many people supportive of this project or on the fence, who are afraid to speak given the many personal attacks by anti-LNG group. Council and groups such as the Squamish Chamber needs to have a strong voice.

22. I am greatly concerned by the proposal and concur with many of the concerns raised over the past few months. i.e. Effects on fish and marine mammals. Effects of the ocean water cooling technology. Noise from the compressors. Fracking. The pipeline and associates impacts. Socio economic negative impacts.

Yes, I wish more people would stand up for their health and environment. The trees, air, ocean, and land are screaming to
2. be saved, but only the caring humans can hear.

3. I am concerned about the morality of our town if this goes ahead — half of our community or more will be angry and disgusted and will no longer believe in our town as a beautiful place to live and raise families.

I am concerned about site suitability and earthquakes:

(The Woodfibre site is not a safe location for a hazardous LNG facility.

On February 15th, 2015, a 3.4 magnitude earthquake hit Vancouver's coast that was felt throughout Howe Sound. The Woodfibre proposal is located within this zone of moderate to high earthquake risk, on two known thrust faults. The Woodfibre site also has a history of slope failure. In 1955 a wharf and three warehouses collapsed into Howe Sound at the Woodfibre site, causing $500,000 – $750,000 in damages (Bornhold, B.D., 1983, Fiords, GEOS, no. 1, p 1-4). A recent, but unreleased, geotechnical study by Knight Piesold identifies that approximately 46% of the study area was mapped as having rapid mass movement. This means landslides and slope slumpage... including existing natural landslide hazards as well as terrain where construction activity may increase landslide initiation. Why hasn't the geotechnical study by Knight Piesold been released?

Source: B.C. ministry of Energy and Mines)

I am concerned about regulation - whose to say they won't expand and expand and expand? Inability of government to monitor, enforce, and respond to issues

There are no regulations adopted to regulate this LNG industry from a technical standpoint. Any of the current standards are not applicable to the LNG industry. Do the regulators have the knowledge and the expertise and the capacity to oversee this industry or will they be relying on the proponent to monitor themselves and report to the regulator? Self-monitoring industries have created several examples of accidents with resulting environmental destruction in recent years, including the Lac Megantic rail disaster and the Mt Polley tailing pond spill.

4. The whole project is a concern, maybe it's safe for Squamish but the fracking sure isn't elsewhere. Invest in green energy sources, wind and solar power!

5. Let's bring some tax base to Squamish! Significant taxes will help out in the bigger picture

6. Just like the logging industry corporations left very little to show for all the value it took out of this area, the oil and gas industry is even more subject to establishing methods to pay as little tax as possible to governments. Have you ever read an investment pitch sheet from an oil or gas company? One of the sales pitches they use is disclosing how many years they have before they will have to pay taxes. Example:


7. I have major concerns on how this will effect other industries and the general livability of Squamish.

8. I am utterly concerned that our resources will be sold to a multinational that will take profits out of the country leaving slightly more than minimum wage jobs.

9. Really dislike the change this could bring to our town - currently so proud of the healthy, environmental, nature loving, outdoor playground vibe of this mountain town and this project seems detrimental to that beauty/focus

10. No matter what is promised or intended, this project will change Squamish and in my opinion, change it for the worse. People who value the outdoors, recreation, tourism and who have chosen to bring their families here for this reason will not want to live here with LNG.

11. Woodfibre LNG has secured the water license to extract water from Mill Creek, which flows through the Woodfibre site. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans has objected to this because the amount of water that WLNG is proposing to remove will reduce water levels in Mill Creek to levels that will no longer support fish life, especially in the summer
months. Woodfibre LNG needs to source water for this project from somewhere else to protect this important stream habitat which is home to several native fish species.

How will glass sponge reefs be protected?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Health and safety for humans, animals, and environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I'm concerned that the provincial government is pursuing LNG development with blinders on, without weighing the full environmental, social, and economic costs of these projects. Heavy industry in Howe Sound has left us a legacy of environmental issues: heavy metals at Britannia; mercury from Nexen; creosote pilings, landfill etc. at old Woodfibre pulp mill site. Let's not continue down that road and allow new impacts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The Marine Life and air quality which is returning to Squamish after Decades?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The multi-million dollar tourism money that people spend in local shops in the summer? These things will dwindle with a new LNG plant. Health risks and environmental risks hardly seem worth it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Just the way the Lng people argue with the other sides makes you wonder why they can not use scientific data and have to resort to arguments like &quot;these people that complain about LNG drive cars and SUV's&quot; and &quot;people in BC get caught for Fraud and tax evasion too, why don't they complain about them&quot; (in regards to one of the plants backers). It boggles the mind that this proposal has made it this far. It seems like a lot of money greasing the wheels and the residents of Squamish getting burned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Polarization of community. We must aim for a diversified economy that includes industry. Council should focus efforts on ensuring proponent builds a world-class facility.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>You have an entire community and population nationally and globally willing and excited to back you with a NO decision. Fear, uncertainty and financial insecurity (to name a few) will be side effects yes- but we all must be willing to adapt in order to be the change. If not, change will come upon us (climate change) and the decisions will not then be a choice. We still (barely) have a choice- make the right one!!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I am concerned about how divisive this proposed project has been for our community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Climate change. increased GHG gas emissions with this project. air quality health concerns. hidden and increased social costs due to health issues / environmental issues. uncertain markets, and inevitable switch to renewables make this a short term project. project may in fact decrease the general livability / desirability of Squamish.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I would love for our town to be the first along this westcoast to be a heritage site for unesco., I would love to see council stand up for what we are so passionate about being squamptonites Let's keep it the outdoor capital of Canada and work on the things that aspire and inspire . I would have to move if lng came here. I would need to stay true to what I believe. This would make me sad as I love the climbing, hiking and biking. I truly hope that council can operate from a state of conciousness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Here is my complete letter of concern to you all. We can be leaders, or we can be followers. I oppose this project greatly because it is simply not a smart choice. Please read below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Here is my complete letter of concern to you all. We can be leaders, or we can be followers. I oppose this project greatly because it is simply not a smart choice. Please read below.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Here is my complete letter of concern to you all. We can be leaders, or we can be followers. I oppose this project greatly because it is simply not a smart choice. Please read below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi, I’m voicing my opposition to WLNG in Howe Sound. I’m a resident of Squamish and my concerns lie in across all sectors that will be impacted including economic, environmental, and social.

To begin with the most glaring issue, Howe Sound was industrialized for over 50 years, maybe longer, which saw a decay of its environment. Species of all marine life disappeared, fish stocks dropped, and the industry which we relied upon dried up. Efforts were made to bring back Howe Sound environment to a state where marine life has started to come back, orcas, dolphins, humpback and grey whales, herring as we as salmon have rebounded. It has taken considerable effort, so why take steps back. This relates directly to not only the polluting nature of the WLNG facility, but also the LNG tankers, which are significantly large than shipping tankers. The frequency of these tankers and the noise and disruption which this will cause has not been proven to be negligible, and therefore WLNG cannot go ahead until it can be shown without a doubt that the thousands of species will not be affected by the tankers. This is an aside to the dangerous nature of having these tankers travel up and down Howe Sound, disrupting recreational boating (because of the huge right of way) and creating a horrid eyesore for all visitors and residents. I bought a house in Squamish and the last thing I want to see is my and other’s property value affected by an industrial export facility in our waters. We bought into a community without this, and this is how it should stay.

The biggest environmental problem with WLNG is the plant itself (and at this point I’m including compressors located offsite or on site, as well as the pipeline delivering the gas). You cannot view all pieces of the puzzle as separate entities. WLNG cooling system has been described as state of the art, but many parts of the world have banned it, here is why: it is a system that slowly sterilizes everything is Howe Sound. The system intakes everything from below the water’s surface and the “screens out” larger objects. However, everything 4mm and under gets killed. That’s right. Take a look at the schematic drawings. The screen through which objects pass has 4mm diameter holes. Plankton, salmon and fish eggs, small fish, microbes, fish fry, essentially a world of species that feeds other species gets heated to 18 degrees Celsius (killed), and pumped back out at a temperature of 18 degrees. Now WLNG will tell you that it's a lower temperature within 10 meters – that doesn’t matter. What are you heating the water to? 18. That’s what’s going out. “Sometimes” or more likely often, pipes will be flushed with chemicals to prevent algae growth in the cooling system. While the chlorine is removed from the water, no one knows if this is actual the case, and whether other chemicals are also used in the treatment, and then released in to Howe Sound. This right here is the biggest problem – it’s a killing machine of all species in the water by raising our ocean water temperature. And I don’t need to tell you that this is bad. You already know this.

Finally I want to touch on a qualitative topic, which doesn’t get discussed much. The world of feedback is generally a quantitative one, but here’s the thing. Squamish isn’t what it used to be. People say that Woodfibre pulp mill paid their bills, that logging paid their bills, well sorry to say, but whaling used to pay bills, and worst things such as slavery used to pay bills. Doesn’t mean we have to go back and relive those atrocities. In Squamish, polluting industries are a thing of the past. The 100 jobs that WLNG guarantees are a drop in the bucket (and they aren’t obviously guaranteed for Squamish.) A few small local companies can easily provide those jobs LOCALLY, not to outsourced labour that provides nothing for Squamish. But I digress. My point is that thousands of people have bought property in Squamish, thousands more live here, companies including tech are investing here, recreation and the film industry are looking up here because it’s frigging beautiful and without an eyesore on the water. People want to maintain their property values. The questions of safety with respect to compressor stations, pipelines, ships, and the WLNG terminal, are too great, and will inevitably drive our property values down, and when that happens, people leave and the town itself dies. And that is when we take another steps 50 years back.

I oppose WLNG and the Fortis Pipeline.

XXXXXX
Squamish Resident
2. I am concerned that Industry and Government are not disclosing the damaging effects of the this project. We have seen much of this manipulation in the news, commercials, the "Science Fair" in Squamish, CBC interview with Byng Giraud, Fortis and WLNG open houses. I have witnessed a refusal to really address the ill effects of the proposal from Industry and Government. Jordan Sturdy said that is was the Liberal Governments promise to bring LNG to the Province. I feel that important decisions are being made at the Provincial level with debate and scrutiny. I am extremely thankful that Squamish Council is giving us a voice so thank Mayor and Councillors.

3. Fracking.

Fracking.

3. Very uncertain tax revenue for Squamish, particularly given falling oil prices; potentially short lifetime for the project.

Whales and dolphins are making a comeback - WLNG will most definitely not encourage this or the tourism dollars that come with them. I’d like to see Squamish lead the world in a tourism-based industry instead.

WLNG is owned by a company with a dubious environmental history that has no interest in our community or environment.

4. I do not have any concerns about this project going forward. I think it should

5. This is a terrible location for an LNG export facility. Squamish has other natural assets and industry and WLNG will damage that. We have a responsibility to protect Howe Sound, marine environment, our air shed, our economy, our people and our culture and heritage. There will be nothing but costs associated with this project to our community, and it's crazy that there hasn't been a calculation of net economic returns. What's the point of doing this if all that we end up with is irreversible costs to our community? The Council should protect our estuary and environment, this will not sacrifice our economy, it will build it stronger and more resilient.

6. LNG and Fortis Bc pipeline projects are all about money. There is no other benefit besides possible financial gain. It is a shame that we risk potential health, environmental and overall safety for the chance of financial gain. When will our society take a stand for what is really important? My 7 year old says it beautifully...”what good is money, if people aren't healthy enough to enjoy it”

Very concerned about the many, many possible risks to safety of these 2 projects. I say we ask the people if they want these projects, the locals. It is easy for people who aren't directly affected by the projects to support them. If they actually lived in the sea to sky corridor, my guess is they would take a different stand. This is our community, our home...we need to protect it and advocate for it. Our children deserve to have a health environment to grow up in. Please say NO to these projects and let's build a profitable, strong, health, safe Squamish for this and future generations.

7. 1. How will this project impact the housing situation in Squamish? There is zero rental inventory at this time. Any large influx of temporary workers will have a direct effect on this and likely cause rents to soar higher, if the workers are even able to find housing.

2. Social issues. What is the residual impact on the current residents should this project proceed? It is not even an approved project and already families, friends and neighbour relationships have experienced irreparable damage due to conflict over this highly contentious project. Who will stay and who will leave? How would this continue to impact the social well-being of the population?

3. What is the impact on other industries? (Tourism, Recreation Technology, light manufacturing, Food and Beverage...all of them) Many very prominent, desirable and progressive businesses have chosen to headquarter in Squamish BECAUSE of the elimination of industries such as the proposed Woodfibre LNG.

8. Too many people in this town have just given up, because it's so clear that the BC Liberals will make this happen anyway. I think the response would be so much more strongly negative if people thought it would make any difference at all. It is a very very sad day for Squamish.

9. The town has a terrible history. We must judge by actions and his past tax evasion rain forest destruction having a large stack burning 24 hrs will ruin the natural impression we want to make and also not have an extra 80 tons of emission to breath.gir do little money and jobs.
I have a huge problem with the fact that the owner of WLNG is a criminal. How could we enable him to make even more money while devastating our environment.

It will be regulated by Provincial and Federal controls and should go ahead safely.

Missing baseline studies, birds, marine mammals, air quality shipping, water quality, marine sound, atmosphere sound, marine life near Woodfibre site and cumulative impact assessment. I want to maintain the beauty, health and safety of my community and the proposed LNG project leaves many unanswered questions in these areas.

The environment impacts, safety hazards, questionable financial return, lack of local benefits make no case for adding WLNG to our community.

The air, sound and visual pollution will be enhanced as to become unhealthy, noisy and generally unpleasant to anyone including residents and tourists.

We read in the Vancouver Sun in several articles that the Woodfibre LNG is a done deal, along with two other plants in BC. Is this true?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>None. This project is a step backwards for Squamish and BC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>There is no upside for Squamish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Any benefit listed in this survey was not based on known facts, it sounded like it was right out of the WLGN propaganda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tax revenue is needed as well as any construction jobs in Squamish. Tourism jobs do not pay the bills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The economic benefits are much needed for our community. The need for good-paying local jobs and beginning to eliminate the need for people to commute to Fort MacMurray is huge. I really do hope we can create a healthy community where tourism and industry can work together for all members of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>We do not live in isolation anymore or in fact anywhere. The world is connected for better or worse more then it ever has been. The economy is truly global. Climate change is global. Therefore it makes sense that in order to reduce green house gas and replace it with cleaner alternatives we all need to participate. We send cleaner fuel to places that depend now on less clean fuels. And we improve the economy as a result.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nothing in life comes without risk. Separating fact from hearsay and hype from deliberate thought will be a challenge. Hype after all is part of the problem not part of the solution.

I am always mystified by those who would like to participate in the benefits of a global economy without taking part in any of the byproduct of said economy. Minimizing that risk is the key.

From an environmental and economic standpoint this project makes sense.

The local and provincial taxation benefits are of tremendous value to us all and must be paramount, while recognizing the other three sustainable pillars.
8. Clean up an industrial site, provide jobs, financial benefit for the community, new recreational opportunities become available. Win Win

9. zero

10. If they were to finally go ahead with this project maybe we would be looked upon as a community open for business. I know Squamish has a bad reputation in the way they deal with developers and business that try and come to town. The gondola was under a huge amount of scrutiny until it came and now that it has put Squamish on the map it is a great success. I ran a business in this town and I can't say that I would ever do so again but I do love living here.

11. There are no benefits that could even come close to offsetting the damages.

12. Minimal if any.

13. This is a small project in the LNG field. Taxes are likely only sustained benefit. If you can create some legacy that demonstrates leadership in Howe Sound but also within industry that would be a good benefit

14. I really do not think LNG is the answer. I vote no to this project. And I have heard no shortage of experts in CBC weigh in.

15. Honestly, I see no benefits from this project.

16. There is not 1 benefit that I can think of that is worth mentioning.

17. Zero net benefits. Our overall losses will far exceed any micro benefits. This project will certainly hurt us in the long term. This is short term, low end thinking to allow this sort of thing in Squamish.

18. No benefits outweigh the outlined concerns

19. Absolutely No benefits on this project of death!

20. None

21. positive feedback for future developments

22. The benefit of the proposal for the project has offered an opportunity for Squamish to exercise her voice, citizens to learn more and to reflect on what we value and want to protect.

23. LNG is only one of the many businesses that Squamish can grow into. I think, in order to get to the kind of city we would like with good services, facilities and infrastructure we need to grow in all areas of our economy.

24. Tax revenues

25. Jobs but for how long and for how many people. Are the current residents of Squamish trained in this areas or do outside residents move here for these jobs. I don’t see the benefit at that point. I’m assuming that both LNG and Fortis will give a lot of money back to the community which is a benefit but when there is an accident or malfunction will that have been worth it?

26. NONE

27. None, absolutely no benefits that could outweigh the negative impacts this project will have on our community.

28. The benefit this proposal has brought to Squamish is the realization it is at a crossroads. Does the town follow old 20th century thinking or does it dare to leap onto 21st century realities. Good Luck.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Benefits far outweigh any potential negative effect. WP ran a pulp mill for almost 100 years on the site with minor impact on Squamish environment. LNG plan is much more benign, and we need industrial jobs and tax revenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>We can't survive on tourism. Not when it doesn't help our tax base. I am a residential property owner, and a small business owner. We are being taxed to death! And I see no improvements for those taxes. Policing and fire rescue is important in our community to keep it safe but it's always being cut. We need a new arena. We need additional playing fields, we need to be able to fund senior programs better. We need a new sewage treatment plant. Our roads are ridiculous. Have you seen the parking lot at Brennan park and the massive holes in it. These things are an embarrassment. Let's get some money. Let's get some private funding. And let's get on with it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>As I said previously, more and more people are moving to Squamish and the majority of them are commuting to the city. Over the next 10 or 20 years, if this trend continues, the air quality here will diminish. We need good-paying, local jobs to keep the air quality we enjoy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>The biggest benefits that I see, beyond the simple financial one of being a large taxpayer that doesn't actually use and resources, is the opportunity to become an education and training centre. Having a real world facility so close to a major population base with world class educational institutions separated us from anywhere else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I also see the opportunity for WLNG to be an incubator for other industries that can utilize the waste CO2 and heat that this facility will produce. CO2 is now a commodity and can be put to a variety of uses such as agriculture and algal biofuel production. Waste heat can be used in a myriad of different ways to enhance aquaculture, agriculture and many other industries that could be set up on the land not used by the plant. The opportunities are only limited by our imagination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodfiber is currently an underutilized polluted industrial site. Cleaning up the land and foreshore are tangible benefits to the area that are already happening. Saying no will stop this work completely and result in no improvements at all for the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Globally I do think there is a benefit to the reduction of the use of coal as an energy source. Just because we were born in a resource rich first world country doesn't mean that we should get to hoard our resources. Resources belong to the world, not just us. It is our responsibility to provide these resources to developing economies and allow them to grow, and develop as we have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What separates the first world and the third world is access to energy. We as the first world should be developing the expensive technologies (solar, wind, geothermal, etc.), while we provide the cheaper energy sources (gas, and oil) to the poorer countries. It is silver spoon environmentalism to say to these developing economies that they must figure out how to bring themselves up on their own and they can't have the resources we have enjoyed in abundance. We are a global economy and community and should act as one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Great for Squamish!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>This is a project that would have minimal air pollution, no water pollution provide direct jobs, indirect jobs and property taxes which we badly need. I hope the province establishes a training centre here for the LNG industry in conjunction with universities or colleges from the lower mainland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>People who say Squamish is just coming out of being under the &quot;stigma of being an industrial town&quot; or that Squamish is now &quot;young and educated&quot; are ignorant. Just because you are a labourer or a mill worker or an LNG plant operator does not mean you are uneducated. I worked with many brilliant people at the pulpmill. This town needs a populace comprised of a cross-section of society, not just those who can afford to pay astronomical property taxes, not just those who want this as their playground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>There will be NO benefits to the community. Promised of jobs are falsified. Alleged 'safety' and environmental concern is all complete propaganda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>It will take some tax burden off existing businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>WLNG affords Squamish the opportunity to show the world industry and tourism can work together in a modern world. One doesn’t have to happen with the exclusion of the other. In the grand scheme of things this is a small project. After 20 years of leaching of God knows what I to Howe Sound the site will be cleaned up. That's a good thing. A new and improved more environmentally sound industry will reappear bringing higher than average paying jobs. Another good thing. Resource industries have taken a back seat in Squamish for some time. With modern technology that doesn't have to be the case anymore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Economic, but they don't out way the cons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Sure, it has highlighted the need for us to review and tighten out OCP and zoning with more specific parameters for industry. It has also made us all aware how important good, inclusive, equitable and collaborative public processes are. Next time engagement will start sooner and that's a benefit to us all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>I do not feel this project will bring any long term benefits for Squamish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>More well paying jobs in our community is a Huge benefit. I believe being open to all potential revenue streams wether it be through tourism or industry should be considered. I don't believe though that the majority of tourism jobs pay for a family. I look around our town and see out aging infrastructure, a fire hall that if we get hit by a major earthquake will be the first building to go. Who will rescue you if the firefighters and equipment are buried? A ice arena that should have been upgraded and twinned years ago. A municipal hall that is growing so quickly that the library had to be relocated, and the hall is now spilling out into portables. How do we deal with these issues when tax payers get upset every year with tax increases just to maintain the bare minimum? The community needs to figure something out to bring in the tax dollars, I believe tourism is a partial answer, but not the be all answer. There is no way we can be a Whistler.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>I see no benefits that this project would bring to Squamish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>tax breaks for residential and business owners. more money for handouts. think about it dumbasses. stupid **** idiots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Squamish needs more industry. This industry will have very little negative impact on our community. This site needs to be cleaned up and this project will get it there. Take the taxes, and the cleanup, and be proud to support a new industry that fits ideally in this site. Please don't let this prime location develop the same history as the oceanfront lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>NONE!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>I believe that Squamish has the potential to be a leader setting the standard that allows tourism and industry to coexist in a way that protects the environment and delivers economic benefits to the community. It is time to grow up!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>more long shore workers will be employed more tax's from woodfibre more people living and working in Squamish and buying staples here.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 51. | No Benefits that would 'outweight' the Protection of our Land & Water base. nothing...
'Stop LNG'.... |
| 52. | Old blue-collar workers from the "old" squamish will fondly remember the days when "outsiders" didn't stop for long in this town. I guess that's a positive thing in some people's eyes? The kind of people who liked this town when it was ugly and smelled bad. |
| 53. | I strongly do not believe that there are any benefits to Squamish worth considering about this project. What may look like benefits are merely appeasements. |
| 54. | I have done the math. There is none. They do not employee enough people long term to consider valuable. They are a polluting industry and we don’t know the effects to Tourism and Property Values as they are refusing to do the necessary studies as they don't think this is important. NO BENEFITS. |
| 55. | We need the industry tax base that LNG can bring to our community and BC. Natural Gas is the cleanest energy. It should be used effectively. |
| 56. | The only benefit I can see is that people of all walks of life are uniting to defend what we love ... the environment. |

"There are other weak and defenceless beings who are frequently at the mercy of economic interests or indiscriminate exploitation. I am speaking of creation as a whole. We human beings are not only the beneficiaries but also the stewards of other creatures... all of us are called to watch over and protect the fragile world in which we live, and all its peoples."

Pope Francis
Evangelii Gaudium, #215 |
| 57. | Good paying jobs and additional business opportunities for Squamish residents. |
| 58. | Our school parks are in dismay. Facilities and other infrastructure old and in need of updating. local amenities have been suggested. put those promising steps on paper. So the developers intentions are clear. |
| 59. | Petrochemical industrial development brings no benefits to Squamish whatsoever. None. |
| 60. | I live here because of the natural environment. Not for the potential of industrial jobs. |
| 61. | I don't see any benefits. |
| 62. | minor benefits, major negative effects on tourism and livablility of Squamish |
| 63. | Any industrial development also brings spinoff jobs to trades and suppliers. The total economic benefit to Squamish extends far beyond direct jobs and taxation. |
| 64. | The benefits completely outweigh the concerns. The benefits are guaranteed, the concerns are worst case scenarios, they aren't definite. We should be more concerned with the amount of people commuting on the Sea to Sky highway everyday than about this project yet no one is putting a blockade on that. Ill take the tax benefits and jobs with a industry that has a near perfect track record. Enough with the complaining and coming up with excuse after excuse as to why we
shouldn't have this project and just get on with it already. Educate yourselves and please lets not do a repeat of the Fortis Proposal you only further dissolved your credibility as educated council members and assured me as to why I didn't vote for the council members who used their emotions to vote. Lets try working with WLNG to get the best possible outcome for Squamish instead of meeting them ready for war. The more you fight the more they won't care about our town, which is understandable.

<p>| 65. | Maybe 50 jobs if your lucky. Thats it. |
| 66. | As previously noted, job creation, short and long term. An industry so that school kids have a chance of staying in their home town. At present their are so few well paying jobs in town that kids are forced to live elsewhere. |
| 67. | Maybe some hotels and escort services will do better during construction. |
| 68. | Bases on ethics, environment and long term planning... none. Zip, zero, zilch. |
| 69. | Good jobs and security for the people of squamish. |
| 70. | Additional tax revenue; a large employer in town; a larger sense of community; lower taxes (therefore helping with small business owners and the homeowners); the ability to balance the budget, more citizens working locally - providing more business, more volunteers, more active members of the community; provide our children an example of heavy industry - technology at their fingertips, leaders to look up to (they can discover what an LNG plant does, what are engineers, that they can be an engineer and live and work in Squamish); Squamish would be connected globally not only on the tourism industry - bring diversity in different ways; clean up the old site; get the contaminants managed in the landfills and the other environmentally adverse items; keep the tradition of Woodfibre going in a new modern way; assist local organizations and First Nations in all the ways that are possible - bringing benefits. Bring a new sustained breath of life into this town! There is a lot of hope for entrepreneurs right now; however, with the tax rates and rising, very few of those businesses will last... this project will help them succeed and many other groups and residents etc. - a new life! |
| 71. | Short term gain for the few, mostly from out of town. Not a good deal for those invested in the current economy. |
| 72. | Absolutely NONE. It is the wish of Premier Clark, who exuberantly claims that LNG is the future of our province. |
| 73. | None! |
| 74. | Zero in my eyes it is a negative project for our community. |
| 75. | I can see no benefits to the project. Promises do not make up for the potential damage this project could have. |
| 76. | This project will NOT bring long-term benefits, or even short-term benefits to Squamish. It is a backwards, regressive project that will negate all that Squamish has already achieved, and what Squamish is attempting to achieve for the future. |
| 77. | these projects will lead to the sustainability of squamish by providing a diverse economy that supports its needs for revenue. |
| 78. | Tax revenue, economic growth, diversified economy, demonstrate how industry and recreation can co-exist and leverage each other (workers want to live in Squamish because of the lifestyle, economic opportunities allow the community to work in town and not travel up North or along Hwy 99 for work everyday). |
| 79. | None in the long term! |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>DUE PROCESS. WFLNG are following the guidelines and rules set before them by the Government and the EA Process. This may make you feel safe but the old Pulp mill and Chemical Plant followed government guidelines and destroyed Howe Sound. It's taken decades and millions in clean-up efforts and we're only recently seeing herring numbers rebound, and the whales have followed after a 50 year absence from Howe Sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>The only benefit is of a doubt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>a positive future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>There are undoubtedly benefits, but in this case they do not outweigh the (potential) cons. Let's hold out for a few more years and see this town shine without this embarrassing antiquated project! The old boys club is gone from government, and the town is filling up with 30 something well to do and well educated people that will help it reach its potential!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>Squamish has a history of rec, tech, and industry. It can be good to have a mix of all. For every job created on site there is a spinoff of many other jobs as a result. (eg. transport to and from site.) Some of our Councillors may learn a new found appreciation of just what there role is or should be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>I fully support the LNG plant coming to Squamish/Woodfibre. I think there are risks, but there are risks with everything. Fortis has been doing this for a long time and wouldn't want to be a part of something that would tarnish their reputation. There are a lot of benefits and spinoff a that come with industry as can be seen from 'the hay days' of Squamish. As long as it is done responsibly, this WILL be a good thing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>None worth the negative impact of Woodfiber LNG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>There are none as far as I'm concerned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>Cumulative economic benefits and significant tax revenues are the tipping points for me. While I do have some concerns i believe it's a win overall for Squamish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>The only benefit of this project is the grass roots uprising of citizens opposing the status quo and moribund LNG energy agenda of Clark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>Can't see any and I've been reading and researching everything at every turn. Lots of promises but I see the amazing industrial site at Woodfibre being completely absorbed by the worst possible industry instead of an industry that would actually contribute to the DOS tax base, provide viable jobs for the local community, would enhance our cultural and heritage values, would be aligned to First Nations goals (not just a few corrupt Chiefs) and would provide an attraction for years to come.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Those of you on Council today may not remember taking the ferry across to Woodfibre and touring around the facility. This was one of the many reasons I moved to Squamish in the 1990s. Woodfibre was part of the fabric of Squamish and while it did generate pollution it also generated a sense of pride in our community. Can you say the same for the proposed WLNG?!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>This project will bring jobs and tax revenue that is much needed. It will require hiring people from outside Squamish, but so will virtually all other major projects. The recent Run of River projects are perfect examples. If we can balance environmental impact with investment in remediation and environmental improvement, it will be a net benefit. If it can open access to more adventure tourism, it will be a net benefit. If it can help Asia replace coal fired electricity with gas, it will be a net benefit for the planet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>None. Only LNG will benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>Economic benefits are great lower our taxes hopefully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>I cannot see any benefits to Squamish of this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>The only benefit is that LNG sponsors many events in town (even though I disagree with LNG) and <em>if</em> LNG went through, there should be better amenities for our children/community in town. Upgrades to schooling, Brennan Park, etc. I really don't see any other benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>I see no benefits from this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>When compared to the negatives, any benefits of jobs and tax revenues are dwarfed by the black eye we are going to get if they punch this thing in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>jobs will not be as plentiful and taxes will go to other countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>I see no long term benefits to Squamish or Howe Sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>None. The whole plan reeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.</td>
<td>I'll just reiterate the importance of jobs and an increased tax base in this town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.</td>
<td>I believe that the key word here is balance. We need a tax base that is diversified and this industry will provide jobs for at least some people that are not in the low paying tourist industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.</td>
<td>Though I realize there could be tax benefits for the municipality, why not focus on developing tech industry or expanding the hospital?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.</td>
<td>Maybe a few jobs in the short and long term. Increased tax revenue and possibly some funding for environmental research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.</td>
<td>The biggest Benefit to saying no to WLNG and Fortis BC is enough is enough. Diversify the energy portfolio, we can have a little of it all and BE HEALTHIER.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.</td>
<td>The only two benefits I've heard anyone speak of with regards to the project are jobs and taxes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The few jobs will be a small benefit in the short term, although my belief is that we'll end up with a larger number of better jobs from other employees if we pass on WLNG. A small tax bump will be nice, but it won't solve our real problem which is ever-increasing spending. If we solve the spending problem (which we need to solve anyway) then the WLNG tax-bump isn't really worth what I believe we will lose in other lost opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So in my estimation, the benefits are few, small, and greatly outweighed by the costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.</td>
<td>I do not see any benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.</td>
<td>Zero - Nada - Niente. This project will continue to ruin our global reputation. Putting corporate interests ahead of our future...I just can't type anymore without exploding. Stupidity, Greed, lack of foresight.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.</td>
<td>Maybe a small amount of tax revenue, but hardly worth it except to the provincial leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td>Squamish may get lots of news coverage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td>No Benefits!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td>some financial benefits but does not justify the known negative impacts, nor the potential risks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td>Potential and unspecified benefits are not worthy of realistic risks and negative impact on health, environment, wildlife, culture, and tourism-related economic growth of Squamish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td>The flow of benefits socially resulting from extra income earned and being spent and kept within the community will make a difference for everyone who lives here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.</td>
<td>Helped us stand for our future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.</td>
<td>No benefits to the human species and every ecosystem on this planet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.</td>
<td>Zero benefits. Other energy plans make jobs too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.</td>
<td>The water taxi service facilities that would be installed to serve WLNG can also be utilized for marine tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td>Absolutely no benefit in the long term. In my eyes only harm can come from this project. I do understand there are people who want jobs. There are other industries that can safely provide a livelihood for people that are not based in destroying the environment. The financial gain from this project is not coming from a place of community integrity, instead it is based on linear thinking and scarcity. There are other creative ways and potential industries that would allow people to work and support their families in a way that is harmonious with our natural surroundings. I do not buy the story that we have to choose destruction of our environment in order to survive. There is so much irony in that sentiment it is astounding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td>Adding 100 jobs to the community does not change Squamish to be an Industry town. We have industrial jobs at the port, in forestry, and other support industries. We have 100 jobs at Quest, yet we are not a university town. We need balance, and adding another larger employer in the community will only strengthen our economy through diversification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.</td>
<td>Little benefit - same # of long term jobs as the Squamish Gondola - and little money gained. Due to many LNG subsidies both provincially and federally, we will be almost giving the natural gas away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.</td>
<td>As stated earlier, Squamish needs the tax revenue, and Asia needs more gas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td>I see very little benefit. A few people will make money and the rest will pay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.</td>
<td>A few jobs but over time less jobs more automated is it worth the risk to the environment? Wood fibre ruined the sound for years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.</td>
<td>Too numerous to mention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.</td>
<td>The benefits fall far short of the risks. BC is not ready to start a LNG industry and Howe Sound is not a suitable location - Howe Sound should be a UNESCO site - not an industrial park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.</td>
<td>Council needs to focus on capturing as many benefits (long-term, short-term, direct, indirect) as possible instead of searching for reasons to oppose the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131.</td>
<td>The ones put forward by the proponents fail to reach the threshold to be considered &quot;benefits&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132.</td>
<td>The only benefit I can think of is that LNG at this site would prevent other dirty industries from existing on that site (such as incinerators). The LNG facility would only bring short term gain to few with costs (in terms of environment, health and aesthetics) that are far too great. Thank you for the opportunity to give feedback on this facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133.</td>
<td>• Real estate sales and rentals • Employment opportunities - residents need to work nearby • Tax and other revenue which can be used to improve local social conditions - we need the money</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- increased use of local businesses - they need the business
- environmental protection (the land/site) could be used for worse things - clear cuts come to mind
- better use of the sound which is empty most of the time and large enough for nature and industry
- the cleaning up environmentally of the site and other areas impacted by past industry
- an opportunity for Squamish to lead the way:
  - in working in partnership with First Nations
  - as exemplars of how industry can work with us to protect and enhance the environment
- Is the glass half empty or full? It is all a matter of perspective and leadership!

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>134.</td>
<td>NONE!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135.</td>
<td>I support the tax revenue, jobs and standards of industrial development the LNG facility would provide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.</td>
<td>I guess a few tax dollars. Not enough to convince me that this is right for this town. I would rather have a little less for the community, or pay a little more tax, then accept their polluting tax dollars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.</td>
<td>None in the long term!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.</td>
<td>None whatsoever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.</td>
<td>It will keep those pesky dolphins, salmon, and orcas away and revert howe sound to its former glory as the most polluted waterway in north america</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.</td>
<td>The benefit is that it has brought local individuals and groups together to voice our dislike of this project and has shown us we have more in common with First Nations etc than some thought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141.</td>
<td>No benefits at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.</td>
<td>Council needs to recognize the economic benefits of this project, looking out for the communities safety and infrastructure, as opposed to looking out for their own self interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.</td>
<td>We all need gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144.</td>
<td>I fully support the project and think there will be a net benefit to Squamish. I think Squamish should have a balance of industries and that we CANNOT just rely or cater to tourism. I have worked in both tourism and resource industries and in my experience tourism usually does not provide a living wage whereas resource industries do. I have also experienced rigorous attention to the environment in resource-based activities as is seen with the Woodfibre and pipeline project. Tourism has environmental impact as as well that seems rarely scrutinized. I would like to see a balance of industries in Squamish that includes resource-based industries. I am confident in the provincial and federal environmental assessment process. I hope council will stop stalling the estuary drilling and let the companies do their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.</td>
<td>we need WLNG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146.</td>
<td>I believe squamish needs a clean industry that can coexist with sport and tourism to balance community employment, business, and future infrastructure upgrades or other community investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147.</td>
<td>Any benefits are far outweighed by the significant impacts to our health, our safety, and our sense of community which is intrinsically tied to the health of our environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is no benefit that can possibly justify the negative effects this project will bring to Squamish. Other than the tax revenue, which seems low, I don't see a need for this here. We are riding a rectech and tourism wave, bringing passionate and intelligent people here for both work and play. That will bring much more tax revenue than this project will over the long term, and is much more sustainable in all aspects.

Jobs, diversity, taxes, community amenities that the council will not be able to afford

None

More Jobs, more Revenue, more exposure to the world as a first class town that thinks long term not just as the so called outdoor capital of Canada. We can all work together to bring LNG to Squamish and still protect the environment.

Good jobs and increased tax base with minimal impacts to the residents of Squamish

None.

I believe that this project is truly in the best interests of our community based upon the environmental, economic, social, heritage and health benefits the project will offer.

Environmental

This project has already had a positive impact on the local environment with the environmental remediation from past industrial activates as stipulated in the proponent’s purchase agreement with Western Forest Products. The proponent will also use substantially less of the site than what was passed used. This will allow the environment to benefit by returning parts of the site to nature.

Many other parts of the world will also greatly benefit from access to this significantly cleaner energy alternative. While this project alone will not be able to eradicate coal usage in China, it is certainly part of the solution. This project also has the ability to reduce emissions from residents who commute. This project will inevitably be able to reduce trips to by those who commute to Vancouver by car or those who board a plane to work in remote camp settings like Fort McMurray.

Project Opponents are quick to point out that this project may lead to an increase in hydraulic fracturing, but this is an unrelated issue, as the proponent has no upstream operations. I am frankly appalled by the hypocrisy of many opponents considering that this project will use the same sources of natural gas that they use in their own homes.

This project will result in very modest emissions, equating to less than 9,000 car trips from Vancouver to Squamish each day (according to project opponents). I feel that these emissions are minimal and will have little to no impact on air quality. I am basing my opinion on the fact that, according to the Ministry of Transportation, there are over 13,000 daily average trips made on the Sea to Sky highway. These trips result in more emissions than Woodfibre LNG ever would and have yet to yield any air quality issues.
The environmental issues of this project are negligible and are greatly outweighed by the benefits. I feel this is resulting from the efforts the proponents to listen to the community (e.g. choosing electric drive and placing the plant on land).

Economic

The economical benefits from this project run deep in the community, from construction to operation. Some local businesses, such as water taxi operators, have already benefited. In a community the size of Squamish, 100 family-supporting jobs are indeed significant.

The generous tax proposal from the proponent will positively impact all those in the community by offsetting the need to increase residential property tax rates. This will have the largest impact on the low-income members of the community, as they are most affected by increasing property taxes and stand to benefit most from increased community amenities.

In contrast to the views of many opponents, I believe that this project will have little or no impact on tourism. From a visual impact perspective, the plant will be an improvement on the current site, which currently resembles a vacant parking lot. The minimal ship traffic will likely have no impact on recreational users. The City and District of North Vancouver are excellent examples of industrial and tourism related business thriving together. This project will create a more balanced local economy, and help to insulate from the cyclical nature of the tourism industry.

Social

The proponent has already proven to be a good member of the community. The company has listened to the concerns of many and made decisions with the community in mind. The company has gone out of their way to inform and seek meaningful consultation of the community.

Woodfibre LNG has already sponsored several community organizations, notably several youth sporting events. By choosing to invest in the community early on, Woodfibre LNG has already demonstrated that they are committed to the betterment of society.

The proposed project will also provide stable employment for many in our community. These well paying, family supporting industrial jobs is the kind of jobs that anchor families to communities, building strong healthy communities. The project will provide a sense of purpose for our community—many generations will be proud to help create a better world by providing a cleaner energy alternative.

Heritage
As a community that has deep routes to industry, this project will connect the community with it's proud past of producing sustainable products for export around the world by continuing to do so. The proponents have honored the past of Woodfibre by adopting the name as their own.

Woodfibre LNG has shown a great commitment to working with the historical society to preserve the history of the site and the memories of the community. The proponent has also indicated openness to allowing recreational users the opportunity to access the surrounding backcountry through their site.

Health

By operating a large semi remote facility, the proponents will need to have their own rescue capabilities. These capabilities will provide northern Howe Sound and surrounding area with increased emergency services. This will benefit the community by helping the preserve the scarce emergency resources the community has as its disposal. The community also benefits greatly from the health impacts of a cleaner global environment resulting from a decrease in coal usage.

<p>| 158. Help with tax base |
| 159. Any benefits are far outweighed by the negative impacts, and potential negative impacts. |
| 160. none |
| 161. I truly believe that this project will be of overall benefit and will also be of global significance. |
| 162. I believe that this project will not only benefit our community but will have a positive effect on countries who presently use dirty fuels for heat, industry and power. |
| 163. Tremendous benefits from having a stable industry - relatively clean - helping the worlds environment and providing well paying jobs locally. |
| 164. There are a lot of Benefits to our community when someone wants to spend that kind of money in our community. |
| 165. None |
| 166. The controversy has put Squaish on the map. |
| 167. There are no measurable benefits to Squamish in this project. The measly proposed annual tax of 2 million is laughable. Who is it in Squamish that thinks this is a good amount of money? First of all LNG hasn't actually committed to anything, it could end up being less. Secondly, the pulp mill paying around that annually 10 years ago. Thirdly, that's about the value of 2 high end homes in Squamish, and probably a fraction of the value of any of LNG chair peoples homes, most of whom live overseas. Chairman Andrew Gould alone is one of the top 20 CEO windfalls according to CNN. That doesn't happen by putting money into the many communities his affiliated companies work in, it comes from putting it in his pocket. |
| 168. None except divide us and make the old school Squamish people hate us new schools even more. |
| 169. I have yet to see any compelling EVIDENCE that would speak to long-term lasting benefits from this |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>170.</td>
<td>There are none.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171.</td>
<td>I believe this will benefit Squamish, through employment, and business opportunities. Council needs to encourage development in Squamish. If you want to lower green house gases start providing more jobs in Squamish so less people have to drive to Vancouver in order to pay their bills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172.</td>
<td>Zero.....unless you like haze and poor air quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173.</td>
<td>Again i see no real benefit the wlng project will bring to the community. Anything brought up about potential jobs can be done through proper investment in other less enviromently impacting industry's.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174.</td>
<td>im uncertain and unconvined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175.</td>
<td>I am sorry but I see none. And in looking at other countries that are ahead of us in this LNG game, they are losing money like crazy and have destroyed their environment at the same time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176.</td>
<td>The Woodfibre site has a great deal of potential for some sort of industrial development. Some projects that have been rejected include a co-generation plant and an incinerator project. Woodfibre has excellent water resources and this water is very potable, it is in fact some of the best water that can be found anywhere, being as free of contamination as any. (The use of this water for drinking water might not be eliminated by the LNG project.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177.</td>
<td>I have yet to see any benefits of the WLNG for economy, environment, health, culture, or our community. Lots and lots of bribes though!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 178.   | 1. It would provide more jobs  
2. A wider tax base for more amenities for those living in Squamish (medical, roads, infrastructure, education, libraries, etc.  
3. It would go a long way to mending the broken fences between British Columbia and Alberta. The recent blocking of LNG has significantly disappointed many Albertans and Canadians, and in turn many British Columbians. |
| 179.   | LNG will bring diversity to the local economy and community. |
| 180.   | A few short-term construction jobs. |
| 181.   | none |
| 182.   | I believe that this project is of benefit to Squamish and look forward to welcoming WLNG |
| 183.   | Job's, Tax revenue...Job's business opportunity. |
| 184.   | THERE ARE NONE. Absolutely NONE. Any jobs you try to mimic as being advantageous could easily be created in a greener more sustainable method. solar, water, air... WAKE UP! |
| 185.   | there can also be an economic impact from the ship's crew coming into squamish and spending money while the refuelling occurs |
| 186.   | Yes, we are being repetitive for a reason...Council needs to lobby that this project is developed as a best-in-class facility, which will support a diverse economy and thriving community. |
187. There are no long term benefits with oil based products.

188. The benefits are minimal when compared to the risks. Fracking is terrible for our environment, H2O, and it makes no sense when this project risks the future vision of Squamish with limited growth for jobs, a terrible economic state for LNG, and significantly less provincial revenue than the liberals have claimed.

189. The benefits are minimal and the risk is HUGE - this is a mistake for our community.

190. None.

191. the only benefit I see is the tax that Squamish may get from it. I think if it actually gets approved there should be some sort of mandatory equivalent investment into alternative energy technology. (maybe wind? Isn't Squamish one of the windiest places??)

192. The benefits will not outlay the risks no matter how you add it up. Don't be greedy council look at the big picture, I want clean air and water for my kids!

193. Construction Industry feeds my family!

194. hmmmnnnnn.......... 

195. Honestly I think that the meager $3 million tax revenue is not enough to trade for accelerated climate change, and future health risks. Let's switch to renewables. NOW.

196. The proposed and potential benefits are not worth the pollution and community impacts.

197. None that benefit Squamish. We can build other ways for income that fits with our vision and lifestyle that keeps our families safe.

198. Possible tax revenue.

199. When the Foreign owner LNG plant goes bust, as it will in time, just as does with any commodity based industry. We can put back up the "Say no to METH" sign in Valley Cliff, just as we did after Woodfibre shutdown and the economic depression od Squamish began.

200. Aside from the few pockets that seem to be lined with LNG/woodfibre dollars in spreading misinformation and propaganda. There is no other apparent benefit and that itself is a dubious benefit at best.

201. If it moves forward I am hopeful it will mend fences and build bridges.


203. I see virtually no benefits to the community of Squamish with this project.

204. Taxes and 40 jobs being negligible, the only benefit is long term ecological monitoring and possibly a Howe sound management plan.

205. None

206. My submission could not be sent so sent to

207. The career benefits to a few individuals in the town do not justify the negatives. The tax money would be beneficial as any monies towards the District have an obvious benefit but if the cost of that money does not align with the majority of the communities values then it should not be allowed. We would not drink poison for money so taking money to poison our air, water, and soil in Northern B.C. does not make sense.

208. I believe that this project will be good for Squamish and I am appalled that our council is now being take to court by Fortis BC because of Council’s actions.
There are no net benefits to this.

I see no benefit other than we have learned that we need to provide firmer guidelines in our OCP so we don't have to even consider projects like these.

None a few jobs and some spin off revenue.

I simply cannot see any benefits

Strongly increase tax benefits to Squamish
Encourage other safe industries/businesses to come to Squamish

None

The benefits will go straight to Singapore - RGE owned by a billionaire of ill repute that is good at fleeing people. Through subsidies, the people of BC will end up paying that man to take away our resources and killing a sound environment

There are NO benefits that are worth all the risks that this project entails.