

# Canaport LNG Project

## Canaport Community Environmental Liaison Committee (CCELC)

Minutes of Meeting CCELC # 57  
Monday, 14 December 2009  
Red Head United Church Hall, Saint John, NB  
Meeting 6:09 pm – 9:00 pm

### Committee Present:

- Armstrong, Carol Resident
- Armstrong, Stuart Co-chair of CCELC, Resident
- Brown, Alice Resident
- Dalzell, Gordon SJ Citizens Coalition for Clean Air
- Debly, Teresa Resident
- Forsythe, Fraser Co-Chair (Canaport LNG)
- Garnett, Vern SJ Citizens Coalition for Clean Air
- McNeill, Pam Resident
- Smith, Elsie Resident
- Thompson, David H. Fundy Baykeeper

### Committee Absent:

- Court, Ivan Mayor of Saint John
- Griffin, Dennis Resident
- Griffin, Glenn Resident
- Hunter, Roger Resident
- Johnston, Jan Resident
- MacKinnon, Claude ACAP Representative
- Melvin, Keith Department of Energy
- Perry, Yvonne Member
- Rogers, Kathy Member
- Thompson, David Member
- Turner, Rick Saint John Board of Trade

### Resources:

- Forsythe, Joel Fundy Engineering
- O'Brien, Kevin City of Saint John
- Peterson, David Department of the Environment
- Waugh, Graham Fundy Engineering

### Observers:

- 2

## **(1) OPENING REMARKS:**

The meeting commenced at 6:09 pm with Fraser Forsythe welcoming everyone. The agenda was approved.

### **Review & Approval of Minutes from Meeting #56 (2 November 2009):**

The minutes of meeting #56 on 2 November 2009 were approved, motioned by Gordon Dalzell and seconded by Vern Garnett with the following amendments:

On page one in the observers section it should show two observers at the meeting.

On page two, action item 55-2 the second sentence reads “Mr. Thompson” and should read Mr. Peterson. This will be changed to read Mr. Peterson.

On page four in paragraph four in Gordon Dalzell’s comments the term “psychosocial issues” will be changed to “psychosocial health effects”.

On page seven, question 24, in David Thompson’s comments regarding the Flare it was incorrectly recorded that he [Mr. Thompson] was onsite on 24 October 2009. This will be changed to read Mispic Beach.

Approved minutes will be posted to the Canaport LNG website ([www.canaportlng.com](http://www.canaportlng.com)) and the Fundy Engineering website ([www.fundyeng.com](http://www.fundyeng.com)).

Q1: (Gordon Dalzell) I was wondering about my question with respect to the possible reimbursement of travel costs for CCELC members. I have not seen any disposition on this item. Will something be done about this?

A1: (Fraser Forsythe) Jorge has not had an opportunity to look at this; however, we will take it as an Action Item to track.

*Action 57-1: Canaport LNG to discuss and explore feasibility of reimbursement to CCELC members for costs incurred for travel to and from meetings.*

Q2: (Gordon Dalzell) With regard to question 37 from meeting 56; was your recorded response the final one for that matter?

A2: (Fraser Forsythe) I would have to check with our financial management in order to determine how the proposed sale of NB Power may affect Canaport LNG.

Gordon Dalzell noted that Mr. Gary Prosser, a community member asked if he may be permitted to speak at the next meeting in January 2010. Mr. Dalzell requested that Mr. Prosser be added to the agenda for the next meeting so that he may bring some issues forward to the committee. Fraser Forsythe stated that he saw no reason why Mr. Prosser could not speak

## **(2) BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETING**

### **No Action Items were created during the 2 November 2009 meeting**

David Thompson noted that with respect to travel expenses that there are other committees similar to the CCELC such as the Coleson Cove committee and the Coleson Cove committee reimburses its members in attendance for costs associated with travel to the meetings. Mr. Thompson noted that it had been the practice from 'Day 1' with that committee and that if the CCELC were to adopt this practice they would merely be following the same standard used by others.

Gordon Dalzell added that the Brunswick Pipeline liaison committee would offer an honorarium of \$250 and members could designate a charity of their choice for the money to be given to.

Fraser Forsythe responded that an action item for this was created and that it would be tracked and he would discuss it with Canaport LNG management.

## **(3) CANAPORT LNG PRESENTATIONS:**

### **Approval to Operate Monitoring Presentation**

Fraser Forsythe gave a presentation on the monitoring practices at Canaport LNG associated with the Approval to Operate. The following questions / comments were made during the presentation:

Q3: (David Thompson) Looking at the ATO emissions targets; could your emissions be very high for a short period but average out ok?

A3: (Fraser Forsythe) No because the emissions targets that we report to are not averages they are cumulative values for the entire year.

Q4: (David Thompson) When you mention pH; what from the plant would influence the water pH?

A4: (Fraser Forsythe) We have a caustic soda dosing system that controls the pH of the condensate water from the SCVs. It is possible with such a system to get elevated pH values if it were to malfunction so we conduct monitoring of the discharge water.

David Thompson noted that when looking at particulate matter emissions that it would seem more appropriate to address these on an episodic basis rather than yearly.

Q5: (Gordon Dalzell) Looking at upset conditions you could have a large release over a short period of time that would be very detrimental but could still fall within your limits?

- A5: (Stuart Armstrong) As I understand this we are talking about limits set by the Department of the Environment that Canaport LNG must follow. I don't think this is open for debate.
- Q6: (Vern Garnett) Without the 10 October flaring incident would your SO<sub>2</sub> emissions be lower?
- A6: (Fraser Forsythe) Yes most likely they would be; however, Terminal SO<sub>2</sub> emissions are very low at anytime from the Terminal as there is almost no sulphur in the LNG .
- Q7: (David Thompson) What VOCs would you have?
- A7: (Fraser Forsythe) For us the only VOC we have is methane, but we combust this so we don't release any. Our goal is zero VOC emissions.
- Q8: (Gordon Dalzell) The real emissions that are most important are CO<sub>2</sub>, but DENV does not require this to be monitored?
- A8: (Fraser Forsythe) We would likely emit about 384 000 tonnes·year<sup>-1</sup> of CO<sub>2</sub>, when the Terminal is running at full send out which is not as high as other industries in Saint John.
- Q9: (Gordon Dalzell) With the new federal government regulations is CLNG looking at greenhouse gas emission reductions?
- A9: (Fraser Forsythe) With this terminal we track and report our emissions to Repsol YPF. They track their worldwide emissions for all their facilities and I'm not certain if they study these for reduction strategies.
- Q10: (Gordon Dalzell) How do you think the new federal regulations will affect Canaport LNG?
- A109: (Fraser Forsythe) We are not sure yet it is too soon for us to contemplate.
- Q11: (Teresa Debly) You mentioned that the terminal was not at full capacity; what capacity is the terminal currently operating at?
- A11: (Fraser Forsythe) At present we are operating with a send out of 350 mmscfd or approximately 35 % capacity.
- Q12: (Gordon Dalzell) In the paper it was mentioned that the large LNG ship was not able to berth because of weather conditions. Is this a surprise?
- A12: (Fraser Forsythe) No it isn't surprising, but disappointing. We did get the ship within 13.29 metres of the pier on the Friday but we abandoned the effort due to wave conditions. On Saturday and Sunday the weather was not favourable to

bring in the larger ship so on Sunday we brought in the Bilbao-Knutsen. On Tuesday we brought in the larger Q-Flex ship.

Q13: (Gordon Dalzell) This is interesting because one of the big concerns of the EIA was the weather conditions in the area.

A13: (Fraser Forsythe) This circumstance resulted because we have greater restrictions while we are in our early operational stages. For this stage we are restricted to berthing in daylight and at high tide. After six months Transport Canada will re-evaluate the early operational limits.

Q14: (Gordon Dalzell) What is the cost to keep a ship on standby at anchor?

A14: (Fraser Forsythe) I don't know for certain but I have heard figures of \$95 000 per day for a Q-Flex vessel.

Q15: (Teresa Debly) I heard that there was some trouble with the elevator gangway that connects to the ship; can you comment?

A15: (Fraser Forsythe) I'm not aware of any problems. We do have a gangway and the raising and lowering all went fine..

Q16: (Vern Garnett) I'm wondering why the flare looks more like what you would see at the refinery?

A16: (Fraser Forsythe) It does look like that and we are uncertain why. It does, however, look like the flare at the Cartagena LNG terminal that I have seen from pictures of the Terminal.

Q17: (David Thompson) How do you handle the lines for the LNG ships?

A17: (Fraser Forsythe) The ship will toss us a messenger line, which is a small diameter line with a monkey's fist knot in the end, and then we attach our larger diameter messenger line to it and the ship pulls it back. The ship will then attach their large diameter mooring line to our messenger and we then winch it back to the pier.

Q18: (Gordon Dalzell) Could the ship damage the pier while it is there?

A18: (Fraser Forsythe) No the ship couldn't but it could exceed the breaking strength of the docking lines. To prevent this we monitor the load on all the lines with load cells.

Q19: (Carol Armstrong) After the fire in the flare stack did you have to replace parts?

A19: (Fraser Forsythe) No we didn't, but we did have it inspected. This is very difficult to do because you have to extinguish the pilot flames and then inspect the flare.

We had a specialist from Hamworthy Combustion Engineering, the flare manufacturer completed the inspection and they found that everything was ok.

Q20: (Carol Armstrong) What happened to the top of the flare stack? Usually I can see the top of the flare but now I can't, seems like it is missing parts.

A20: (Fraser Forsythe) Nothing has happened to the flare stack. There has been no damage to it whatsoever.

### **10 October Flaring Incident Presentation**

Fraser Forsythe gave a presentation on the 10 October 2009 flaring incident at Canaport LNG. The following questions / comments were made during the presentation:

Q21: (Gordon Dalzell) This is a new plant. To what degree do you think the incident was related to this being a new plant?

A21: (Fraser Forsythe) This was mostly because the plant was new. We had never attempted this type of shutdown and bypass configuration before and no one anticipated the alternate direction that the liquid could flow through. We have since done this type of shutdown/bypass two times with no incidents because we have changed our procedures to account for the earlier oversight.

Q22: (Gordon Dalzell) Is this sort of incident unheard for an LNG terminal?

A22: (Fraser Forsythe) No it isn't and I have read about a similar incident that happened in Barcelona.

Q23: (Vern Garnett) What diameter is the bypass line to the flare?

A23: (Fraser Forsythe) It is a 20 inch bypass of the recondenser..

Q24: (Gordon Dalzell) Are there safety features built in to the terminal to keep the plant safe even if there were operator error?

A24: (Fraser Forsythe) Yes absolutely.

### **UPDATES:**

#### **NBDENV Monthly Status Report**

David Peterson provided an environmental update for the Terminal. Mr. Peterson stated that there were no significant environmental events. Mr. Peterson stated that there was a meeting with DENV, Work Safe NB and Canaport LNG on 24 November 2009 to discuss the flaring incident. Mr. Peterson stated that there were two small reported spills of oil the first being 200 ml and the second being 1 L.

The following questions / comments were made during the status report updates:

Q25: (Gordon Dalzell) Are the minutes of that meeting available to the public through the right to information act?

A25: (David Peterson) No minutes were taken for the meeting, we don't usually record minutes.

Q25: (Carol Armstrong) Do you have any information about a leak at the Mercaptan Injection System?

A25: (David Peterson) No, I have no new information regarding this. My recollection is that the repair was made in October and there have been no complaints since.

Q26: (Carol Armstrong) On 15 November we had a terrible smell in our house from it. Brunswick Pipeline came down and checked and found that 1 L of mercaptan had leaked from the system. I spoke to someone at DENV about it but I can't remember their name and I also spoke to Brunswick Pipeline and they said it was just odorant not gas, some kind of problem with a pump?

A26: (David Peterson) I will have to check on that.

Q27: (Gordon Dalzell) Could we ask Brunswick Pipeline for information on this?

A27: (Fraser Forsythe) I would prefer if you could ask Brunswick Pipeline directly rather than put it through the CCELC.

Gordon Dalzell responded that he would ask Brunswick Pipeline for details on the leak that Carol Armstrong cited and bring information to the committee.

Q28: (Gordon Dalzell) Was any information regarding the earthquakes mentioned in previous meetings found?

A28: (David Peterson) Yes I was able to find information from NRCAN on this.

Mr Peterson showed some map images and records from the NRCAN webpage detailing recent earthquake activity in New Brunswick. The links to the webpages shown are provided below.

[http://earthquakescanada.nrcan.gc.ca/recent/maps-cartes/index-eng.php?maptype=5y&tpl\\_region=nb](http://earthquakescanada.nrcan.gc.ca/recent/maps-cartes/index-eng.php?maptype=5y&tpl_region=nb)

[http://earthquakescanada.nrcan.gc.ca/index-eng.php?tpl\\_region=nb](http://earthquakescanada.nrcan.gc.ca/index-eng.php?tpl_region=nb)

[http://earthquakescanada.nrcan.gc.ca/recent\\_eq/2009/20091122.2300/index-eng.php](http://earthquakescanada.nrcan.gc.ca/recent_eq/2009/20091122.2300/index-eng.php)

### **Request for Meeting Frequency Change**

Fraser Forsythe stated to the committee that Canaport LNG had written a letter to Paul Vanderlaan with the Department of the Environment requesting that the CCELC meeting frequency be changed to a quarterly schedule. David Peterson recommended

that if the community would like to communicate its position on the matter that they contact DENV. A letter written on behalf of the committee requesting that the monthly meeting frequency be maintained was circulated to the committee under the signatures of the CCELC co-chairs.

Q29: (Stuart Armstrong) Is this letter being sent under our [Stuart Armstrong and Fraser Forsythe] signatures?

A29: (Fraser Forsythe) I will not sign the committee letter as a co-chair as it is a conflict of interest situation..

Stuart Armstrong stated that he would be prepared to sign the letter if there were a paragraph added that explained that the views expressed within the letter were not those of the CCELC co-chairs.

Q30: (Gordon Dalzell) Has the other letter been sent to DENV?

A30: (Fraser Forsythe) I have sent a letter to Paul Vanderlaan regarding the requested quarterly meeting frequency, a name change, and to no longer have Canaport LNG as a chair. The scope of the interests and concerns of the group is larger than just Canaport LNG. This is a conflict of interest for me to sign both letters and I would like my signature removed from the CCELCs letter.

David Thompson stated that situations similar to these happen within the Conservation Council and the chairperson must sign the letter even if they disapprove. Mr. Thompson suggested that perhaps someone else could sign the letter on behalf of the committee. Gordon Dalzell agreed that this seemed a good idea. David Thompson added that this could be done and that David Peterson would be present to witness for DENV and that the acting chair could take the position for a short period of about 15 minutes.

Q31: (Carol Armstrong) Could you explain what the changes to the committee would be?

A31: (Fraser Forsythe) I would like to make the proponent a resource to the committee.

Q32: (Gordon Dalzell) Canaport LNG has said how important the community involvement is and the communications strategy is very clear about involvement. I don't think reducing the meetings would fit with the strategy. I believe that reducing the meetings is premature, even tonight we have heard lots of important information.

A32: (Fraser Forsythe) I don't feel that moving to quarterly meetings will reduce our involvement. We have come to a stage in the project when a quarterly frequency will still allow us to deal with all of the issues that present themselves.

Q33: (Gordon Dalzell) Could we discuss David Thompsons suggestion about a temporary chair?

A33: (David Thompson) This method would require that the co-chairs temporarily relinquish their positions to an acting chair nominated by the committee. I would suggest that Carol Armstrong be appointed as the acting chair.

At 8:25 PM the co-chairs relinquished their positions to avoid a conflict of interest to facilitate the committee to appoint an acting chairperson. Carol Armstrong was appointed as the acting chairperson and was authorized to sign the committee's letter requesting monthly meetings. At 8:30 PM the chair position was returned to the Co-Chairs Stuart Armstrong and Fraser Forsythe.

David Peterson raised three points with respect to the letter from Canaport LNG. The first point was, Mr. Peterson stated, that it is normal practice for meetings to go to a quarterly schedule and this has been done in other groups. The second point was that some committees have been named after their communities while others are named after the company who is the proponent of the project. The third point was with regard to the chairmanship and typically the proponent of the project chairs the committee, because they are covering all of the cost associated with the committee. Mr. Peterson noted that in the case of this community there were other issues than just Canaport LNG like the Brunswick Pipeline and the Crude Terminal.

Gordon Dalzell stated that other community groups carry the corporate name of the proponent and that he had trouble with the suggestion to remove Canaport LNGs name from the committee. Fraser Forsythe suggested that it would be best to let DENV arbitrate and decide on the request. Gordon Dalzell suggested that all committee members who wish to continue monthly meetings write to David Peterson to request this. David Peterson replied that anyone wishing to do so was more than welcome.

David Thompson suggested that it would be better if Canaport LNG did not have a co-chair position within the committee and have Canaport LNG simply in attendance to provide information to the committee. Mr. Thompson stated that he thought it was a mistake that the proponent would chair the committee. Mr. Thompson noted that it puts Canaport LNG in a hard position to be the chair of the committee. Mr. Thompson suggested that the committee could hire a 3<sup>rd</sup> party to chair the meetings or elect someone from the membership to be the chair.

Q34: (David Thompson) Will the letter that was sent by Canaport LNG be circulated to the committee?

A34: (Fraser Forsythe) Yes this will be circulated.

## **2008 Yearly Report**

Copies of the 2008 Yearly report were circulated to the committee members.

Vern Garnett commented that he was a committee member since 2007 and his name was not in the 2008 membership list. Joel Forsythe replied that Mr. Garnett's name would be added to the report.

Copies of the Yearly Report are included with the minute's package and any comments will be taken at the 11 January meeting.

### **Canaport LNG Site Update**

14 ship cycles have been completed. Tank 3 is almost mechanically complete and the TAHK and Integral Energy employees are beginning to pack up. All field welds will be insulated then a pressure tests be completed. Once the pressure test is complete there will be a 1 month drying period. The tank commissioning is expected at the end of the first quarter of 2010. Mr. Jorge Ciacciarelli will be leaving Canaport LNG for a position in Bolivia and Mr. Adolfo Azcàrraga will be the new general manager.

### **(4) MEMBER UPDATES**

Stuart Armstrong announced that he would submit his resignation as co-chair at the January 2010 meeting. Mr. Armstrong stated that he joined at meeting 9 and committed to the co-chair position while the Terminal was in the construction phase. Mr. Armstrong stated that he has fulfilled is commitment and cited that additionally some health related issues will mean he will be absent from at least two meetings if the frequency were changed to quarterly and that this is a logical time to step down.

Gordon Dalzell thanked Mr. Armstrong for his service to the committee and the community.

### **(5) NEW BUSINESS**

The 2008 Draft Yearly report was distributed and members were asked to review and provide comments at the next meeting in January 2010.

Gordon Dalzell mentioned that the Church Hall has been used for this meeting for many years and that other proponents such as Brunswick Pipeline have made donations to Rockwood Park and the City of Saint John. Mr. Dalzell suggested that perhaps Canaport LNG could look at the possibility of assisting the community by way of an upgrade to the church hall. Fraser Forsythe stated that this would be looked into and taken as an action item.

*Action 57-2: Canaport LNG to explore possibility of providing an upgrade to the Red Head United Church Hall.*

Bruce Ingersoll was present at the end of the meeting and added that if there were any issues or problems noted with the facility that he could be contacted directly to deal with these.

**ADJOURNED:**

9:00 pm

Submitted by: Fundy Engineering

**NEXT MEETING DATE:**

Monday, 11 January 2010 at 6:00 pm

Red Head United Church

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Table of Outstanding Action Items

**Table of Actions/Responsibilities – 14 December 2009**

<b>Action #</b>	<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>	<b>Due Date</b>
57-1	Discuss and explore feasibility of reimbursement to CCELC members for costs incurred for travel to and from meetings.	Canaport LNG	11 January 2010
57-2	Explore possibility of provided funding to complete an update of the Red Head United Church Hall	Canaport LNG	11 January 2010