

# Canaport LNG Project

## Canaport Community Environmental Liaison Committee (CCELC)

Minutes of Meeting CCELC # 44  
Tuesday 15 July 2008  
Red Head United Church Hall, Saint John, N.B.  
Meeting 6:00 pm – 8:25 pm  
Approved as Amended

### Committee Present:

- Armstrong, Carol Resident
- Armstrong, Stu 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 Resident
- Griffin, Dennis Resident
- Griffin, Glenn Resident
- Hunter, Roger Resident
- Johnston, Jan Resident
- MacKinnon, Claude ACAP Representative
- McNeill, Pam Resident
- Melvin, Keith Enterprise Saint John
- Rogers, Kathy Member
- Smith, Elsie Resident

### Committee Absent:

- Court, Ivan Mayor of Saint John
- Perry, Yvonne Member
- Thompson, David Member
- Turner, Rick Saint John Board of Trade

### Resources:

- Caines, Crystal Fundy Engineering
- O'Brien, Kevin City of Saint John
- Van der Veen, Carolyn Canaport LNG
- Walker, Carolyn NBDENV

Note: A total of 3 non-committee members were in attendance at the meeting.

### Opening Remarks:

The meeting commenced at 6:00 pm with Fraser Forsythe welcoming everyone

to the meeting. He asked members to review the agenda; no additional items were brought forward.

**Review & Approval of minutes from June 9<sup>th</sup> meeting:**

The minutes of meeting #43 on 9 June 2008 were approved with the following changes:

- Page 1 – Ivan Court’s title was changed to reflect the Mayor of Saint John;*
- Page 1 – Carolyn Walker’s name was corrected;*
- Page 11 – Teresa Debly added the following comment to Q54: “Teresa Debly and other members noted as of 9 June that evening, the flare document still had not been provided to committee members”;*
- Page 11 – ‘enforced’ was changed to ‘reinforce’ as per Gordon Dalzell; and*
- Page 14 – last paragraph, the following was added to the end of the sentence as per Gordon Dalzell “and their issues raised at that meeting”.*

The minutes were approved as amended motioned by Claude McKinnon. Gordon Dalzell seconded the motion. 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)).

**Business Arising from Previous Meeting  
(Action Items – May 2008)**

42-1: Fraser Forsythe delivered the meeting minutes to Ms. Armstrong.  
42-2: (Fraser Forsythe) The near miss accidents reported on site are comparable to other construction sites. There is a process to assess near misses. Canaport LNG through the Project EPC contractor track and analyze all near misses, take corrective actions, and document results.

Q1: (Teresa Debly) Does the government get a copy of the near misses?  
A1: (Fraser Forsythe) No. Workers Health and Compensation could request, but they generally are concerned with accidents resulting from a lost time injury.

43-3: Carolyn Walker passed the sound complaints along to David Peterson within the Department of the Environment, who has communicated the information to Charlotte Haines of the National Energy Board.

Gordon Dalzell commented on an outstanding action item (42-5) in regards to having the Harbour Master come speak to the committee. Fraser Forsythe indicated that he had invited Mr. McCann to the meeting tonight; however, Mr. McCann was unsure of his ability to attend as he had other commitments. Mr. Forsythe indicated that he will reschedule with Mr. McCann.

43-4: Canaport LNG are continually communicating with Brunswick Pipeline, and have notified them of the residents’ complaints.

Q2: (Carol Armstrong) Will there be more blasting on the pipeline?

A2: (Fraser Forsythe) I was advised they had completed the blasting; however, there is always a possibility they may find additional areas that require blasting.

43-5: Gordon Dalzell indicated that the NEB was looking at an alternate route. Carolyn Van der Veen indicated the alternate route was approved last week.

Q3: (Stu Armstrong) What is the status of the pipeline in regards to schedule?

A3: (Fraser Forsythe) We have not heard that it is not on schedule; therefore, are assuming it's on schedule.

42-6: Carolyn Van der Veen spoke to Irving Oil Limited, Brunswick Pipeline, and Jacques Whitford in regards to being on Carol Armstrong's property. To their knowledge, none of their employees would have any reason to be on Ms. Armstrong's property.

42-7: Ms. McNeill's mailing address was confirmed. There were no issues with receiving the last CCELC package.

42-8: (Fraser Forsythe) In February, CLNG began their hiring process operating technical employees. Twenty-seven individuals have been hired, and since then, they have been going through an extensive training program consisting of training by manufacturer of the process equipment, familiarization training at other LNG terminals, fire fighting training, on site training, training related to operations manuals, and system operations procedures. In addition, these individuals will use computer based operating simulator for operational training (via computer simulations). Training will be continuing throughout the year.

**(Action Items – June 2008)**

43-1: The flow levels to maintain a sound level of 66 dBa at the base of the stack is limited to 33.2 tonnes / hour.

43-2: This has been completed as reported in action item 43-3 above.

43-3: Fraser Forsythe presented two slides demonstrating the flare emissions during commissioning and compared them to the NBDENV standards and other industries. Overall, the contaminant levels are very low in comparison to both the NBDENV standards and the emissions resulting from other industries. The emissions discussed were only pertaining to the flare, and not the overall emissions of the LNG facility.

Q4: Denis Griffin requested the logic behind having a LNG containment sump pit close to the flare (85 m). Mr. Griffin expressed his concern that the LNG will vapourize following a spill, and the flare would be an ignition source. In his opinion, the spill pit and flare are too close together. Why couldn't the flare have been located further away from the sump pit?

A4: (Fraser Forsythe) The LNG containment sump pits on site have been designed to meet the appropriate standards, which state a minimum distance of

15 m is provided an ignition source. In this scenario, the LNG containment sump is 20 m away.

Q5: (Denis Griffin) When NBDENV approved it; did they know the location of the LNG containment sump?

A5: Carolyn Walker stated that NBDENV do not approve designs, as this would fall under the Department of Safety.

Denis Griffin questioned how many LNG facilities the Department of Safety have been to, and referenced the 1944 LNG incident.

Fraser Forsythe suggested to the committee that no comparison can be made with the Canaport LNG facility and the 1944 spill. The 1944 spill was a single containment tank made of normal carbon steel that fractured, spilled into the sewer (confined space), found an ignition source and then exploded. Mr. Forsythe indicated that this can not be compared to the Canaport LNG facility. Mr. Forsythe also commented that there are many other single containment tanks that are being built, and have been in operation for over 20 years in other populated areas and this is not a concern.

Denis Griffin made a comment that he does not want to see Red Head become another statistic, and claims the LNG plant is not as safe as the committee is led to believe.

Q6: (Glen Griffin) If an LNG spill goes into the LNG containment sump, then vapourizes, under what conditions would the gas ignite?

A6: (Fraser Forsythe) There would have to be a 5 – 15 % air / gas mixture for ignition to occur. Analysis software for gas dispersion in air, was used to assess worst case scenarios. Based on analysis the time it takes the LNG to vapourize and reach the flare tip, indicates it would be outside of the air / gas ratio for ignition. There are several techniques to respond to a spill, including foam suppression system that would automatically cover the spilled LNG to reduce contact with air and slow the vapourization rate of the spilled LNG.

43-4 The grounding system is equipped with underground copper wire grid that connects all metallic structures. NB Power measures it to confirm that it is within their standards. There is discussion on installing sea electrodes to provide a lower resistivity contact point on site. The site is mainly solid rock, which is a poor conductor leading to higher ground resistivity.

There was considerable discussion on the grounding and electrical systems, and concerns presented on structures and systems on site that do not meet code. Mr. Forsythe attempted to bring the committee back on track, and move forward. Ms. Deby commented that these are the concerns of the committee members and therefore should be addressed.

Glen Griffin stated that he thought the safety, training and certification of the site should be as strict as it is at Point Lepreau as an accident is an accident.

Gordon Dalzell commented on action item 43-3 in regards to health effects. Mr. Dalzell indicated that health effects should include mental, emotional, physical, psycho social, and that these are often neglected. (Gordon Dalzell) There are psycho social impacts when living near a facility such as an LNG facility, and we have seen many examples of mental impacts on lives as a result of living next to a project. Gordon Dalzell wished to express on record that the proponent and the government failed to consider these issues.

Q7: (Teresa Debly) How many LNG terminals in Canada?

A7: (Fraser Forsythe) There are a couple of small regassification / liquefaction storage plans in Ontario.

Q8: (Teresa Debly) The standards you reference are then 'pilot' standards? There is no LNG terminal in Canada; therefore, there is nothing to compare it to.

A8: (Fraser Forsythe), The standards are from refining industries, and use existing standards within LNG industries in the US. The CSA standards were developed over eight editions beginning in 1972, with the design standard for the Terminal implemented in 2001 (CSA Z276-01). The standards have since been reviewed in 2005, and came into effect in 2007.

Gordon Dalzell informed the committee that New Brunswick is looking at particulate and ground level ozone to improve their current standard in regards to these contaminants. These standards will be reviewed in 2010, and will likely be much more stringent. The province is accepting public input on how one feels NB is doing in respect to air quality efforts. For more information, please visit the Environment Canada or NBDENV website under Canada Wide Standards.

#### **NBDENV Monthly Status Reports:**

Carolyn Walker provided a copy of the Monthly Status Report to members, and requested any questions be directed to her. There was no discussion on this report as Ms. Walker had to leave early due to other commitments.

#### **Canaport Site Update:**

Fraser Forsythe provided an update on construction activities offshore and onshore. Offshore they are working to complete their deficiency list (i.e., touch up painting, and miscellaneous items), which includes the last 1% of the work. They expect to be completed by the end of the month, at which time KWS the offshore contractor will demobilize from the site. There is a lot of electrical work going on onshore, including work on security systems. This has resulted in an increased number of electricians on site. In addition to the electrical work, there is also piping on site to be installed for the submerged combustion vapourizers in the process area. The tanks will begin hydro testing at the end of the month.

Q9: (Glen Griffin) How does the hydro testing work? How long is water in the tank?

A9: (Fraser Forsythe) Sea water is pumped using the firewater system on site, into the tanks. The tanks are filled up to 26m to 30 m, and are inspected to measure settlement, deflections, leaks, etc. Water is approximately twice the density of LNG. It will take approximately 1 week or more to fill the tank, after which time the water will be discharged into the sedimentation basin and back to the Bay. If timing allows, we may transfer water from one tank to the other to begin the hydro testing on the second tank. The water will be in the tank for about 1 week, as all the water has to be pumped in and pumped out, because the tanks have no openings in the bottom or sides.

Q10: (Glen Griffin) Will there be contaminants in the water?

A10: (Fraser Forsythe) We will test the water coming in and going out to confirm the water is not negatively impacted prior to release to the Bay. We don't expect any significant amount of contaminants, but may have to worry about the suspended solids.

Q11: (Gordon Dalzell) What happens if a leak is detected?

A11: (Fraser Forsythe) The area would be marked, and we would repair the weld.

Q12: (Carol Armstrong) Will I be able to hear the portable pumps?

A12: (Fraser Forsythe) The pumps will be run using generators. The generators will be in their own enclosure down on the jetty; however, you may hear them on a quiet night. We will continue to monitor sound to ensure we are within our criteria.

Gordon Dalzell suggested this is a milestone event, and suggested CLNG release the hydro testing results and conclusions publicly.

Q13: (Jan Johnston) Will the salt water affect the tanks?

A13: (Fraser Forsythe) We will wash the tanks down with freshwater upon completion of the hydro test.

Q14: (Jan Johnston) Will the pumping be on a 24 hour continual basis?

A14: (Fraser Forsythe) Yes.

Q15: (Carol Armstrong) Can I have your phone number?

A16: (Fraser Forsythe) 639-6200 is my cell, 658-6250 ext 7105 is my office, and my home number is in the phone book.

Q16: (Gordon Dalzell) Will there be steam venting?

A16: (Fraser Forsythe) No. The only safety vents associated with the submerged combustion vapourizers will vent methane.

Q17: (Glen Griffin) Can I get a copy of the code book from you?

A17: (Fraser Forsythe) No, I cannot make copies as it is a copyrighted document.

Denis Griffin expressed his concern again on some of the electrical codes, and how they are not being followed at the site. Mr. Griffin also commented that you would have to be an engineer to know where to go and look for the proper codes and standards.

Kathy Rogers suggested Denis Griffin bring up the issues (not meeting electrical codes) to his supervisor. Denis Griffin indicated that he has done this, and he was told to continue working or leave. Glen Griffin agreed with Denis Griffin in that the supervisors weren't supportive in this regards. Kathy Rogers indicated that this was never her experience, and once brought to a supervisor, a problem presented would be rectified.

There was considerable discussion on items of concern that do not (in Mr. Griffin's opinion) meet the standard. Stu Armstrong suggested that CLNG bring these issues back with them, and address the issues at the next meeting. The specific issues were identified as follows:

- 1 – Issues on the junction box on unloading arm not meeting electrical code;
- 2 – Issues on the grounding field and connections;
- 3 - Issues surrounding the lack of "CAD" welding method for fastening connections on site;
- 4 – Issues surrounding the lightning and grounding using the same field where these should be segregated; and
- 5 – Issues with the supervisor who is not taking corrective action.

*Action 44-1: Canaport LNG to report back to the committee on the specific issues identified above, relating to the some of the member's electrical concerns*

Kathy Rogers informed the committee for the record that an independent engineering firm reviewed all offshore components, and have reported that they were exceeding their potential in many areas. Ms. Rogers indicated that the document can be found on the Conquest website.

Q18: (Teresa Debly) Now that the offshore is almost finished, did it affect the fishermen's season?

A18: (Fraser Forsythe) There was an exclusion zone; however, the fishermen were still fishing along shore and in behind the pier during the latter period of the season. Compensation has been settled with the fishermen. Roger later commented that the compensation agreement was settled in April.

**Members Statement:**

Glen Griffin commented on the open house that occurred on 25 June, and expressed his disappointment at the 'rush' that CLNG were under once 7:00 pm

hit to end the open house. He commented that he thought it was very unprofessional, and was very disappointed in this reaction.

**New Business:**

Gordon Dalzell requested clarification on the Picnic and Planting memo that was emailed to some of the committee members. With the help of CLNG, the park at Ocean Drive was repaired 1 ½ years ago and was recently inspected and wasn't in good condition. CLNG are planning a "Picnic and Planting" event on Friday July 18 for their employees, and others interested to help improve the park's appearance.

Q19: (Teresa Debly) Have you considered removing the CLNG logo from the park?

A19: (Carolyn Van der Veen) We have not had any complaints to date. We have had people from the area call and thank us for removing unsafe equipment, and providing a safe place for their children to play.

Gordon Dalzell commented that young children are susceptible to branding. Kathy Rogers reminded the committee that CLNG gave a 4.4 million gift to Lily Lake Pavilion and there is no signage or logos there.

Teresa made a motion to remove the CLNG logo from the park. Stu Armstrong indicated the park is owned by the city, and the city is making its best effort to develop partnerships and find assistance for these projects.

The motion was placed on the floor to remove the CLNG logo from the park: nine members were in favour, while 4 were opposed. The four opposed are as follows: Kathy Rogers; Roger Hunter; Claude McKinnon; and Vern Garnett. The motion was passed.

*Action 44-2: Fraser Forsythe to bring the motion to remove the Canaport LNG logo from the Ocean Park playground back to CLNG, and report back to the committee*

Q20: (Carol Armstrong) At one of the site BBQ's, it was indicated to the residents that a walking trail could be a possibility?

A20: (Fraser Forsythe) It would not be possible to construct a walking trail on Canaport LNG property due to the site security requirements. I have no knowledge of other discussions of construction a walking trail within the vicinity.

Elsie Smith also commented that the pond was taken away from the residents. Fraser Forsythe indicated that although the pond was removed, CLNG are required to compensate for the removal of the pond. Glen Griffin suggested the compensation should be in the Red Head Area. Fraser Forsythe reminded the committee that a letter was sent on behalf of the committee to encourage NBDENV to consider projects in their local area.

A brief update on the construction status of the Red Head Road was given by Kevin O'Brien. The road is scheduled to open 1 August.

Carol Armstrong commented that there is still truck traffic on the Red Head Road. Fraser Forsythe indicated that although they try to get all trucks to use the RHSAR, there are still going to be some trucks, especially out of province, which will use the Red Head Road.

Teresa Deby suggested replacing the sign prior to Hewitt Drive with a larger, more visible sign.

Action 44-3: Replace the Canaport LNG traffic sign, located prior to Hewitt Drive, with a larger, more visible sign

Vern Garnett indicated the workers in their personal vehicles (mostly with out-of-province license plates) driving to and from the site are driving recklessly and should be approached.

Action 44-4: Canaport LNG to report and follow up on reckless driving issues

Q21: (Denis Griffin) Are there any updates on the compensation proposal with DFO? Does the credit of \$771,750 still stand?

A21: (Fraser Forsythe) We have looked at several options for offshore compensation including the creation of lobster reefs, etc. We are currently looking at a plan to find and retrieve lost lobster traps, using local fishermen and their boats. All plans must be acceptable to DFO.

**Adjourned:**

8:25 pm

Submitted by: Fundy Engineering

**Next Meeting Date:**

A **site tour** will be held in place of a meeting in August. We will meet at the Red Head Church on Monday, August 11 at 6:00pm, and should return between 7:00 – 7:30 pm.

**Attachments:**

NBDENV Monthly Status Report – June 2008  
Summary of Air Quality Emissions (flare stack)  
Table of Outstanding Action Items

## Table of Actions/Responsibilities –July 2008

Action #	Action	Responsible Party	Due Date
44-1	Canaport LNG to report back to the committee on the specific issues identified above, relating to the committee's electrical concerns	Fraser Forsythe	September Meeting
44-2	Fraser Forsythe to bring the motion to remove the Canaport LNG logo from the Ocean Park playground back to CLNG, and report back to the committee	Fraser Forsythe	September Meeting
44-3	Replace the Canaport LNG traffic sign, located prior to Hewitt Drive, with a larger, more visible sign	Fraser Forsythe	As soon as possible.
44-4	Canaport LNG to report and follow up on reckless driving issues	Fraser Forsythe / Carolyn Van der Veen	As soon as possible.