

Canaport LNG Project

Canaport Community Environmental Liaison Committee (CCELC)

Minutes of Meeting CCELC # 34
Monday, 11 June 2007
Red Head United Church Hall, Saint John, N.B.
Meeting 6:10pm - 9:48pm

Approved as Amended

Committee Present:

- Armstrong, Carol Resident
- Armstrong, Stu Co-chair of CCELC, Resident
- Roy, Beth Resident
- Dalzell, Gordon SJ Citizens Coalition for Clean Air
- Debly, Teresa Resident
- Forsythe, Fraser Co-Chair (Canaport LNG)
- Griffin, Dennis Resident
- Griffin, Glenn Resident
- Johnston, Jan Resident
- Malcharek, Rainer Bayside Power
- MacKinnon, Claude ACAP Representative
- Sherman, Peter Resident
- Thompson, David Member
- Thompson, Jean Resident

Committee Absent:

- Bruce, Patrick Member
- Court, Ivan City of Saint John Councilor
- Lyttle, Dwain Resident
- Melvin, Keith Enterprise Saint John
- Quinn, Kevin Bay Pilots & Marine Consultants
- Turner, Rick Saint John Board of Trade
- Brown, Alice Resident
- Hunter, Roger Resident
- Perry, Yvonne Resident
- Rogers, Kathy Member
- Smith, Elsie Resident

Resources:

- Hogsden, Kristy Fundy Engineering
- Forsythe, Joel Fundy Engineering

- Van der Veen, Carolyn Canaport LNG
- Peterson, David NBDENV
- Kierstead, Jim DFO – Saint John
- Paul Groody City of Saint John

Opening Remarks:

The meeting commenced at 6:10 pm with Fraser Forsythe opening the meeting and welcoming all returning members and resource attendees. David Peterson was welcomed to the meeting in lieu of Carolyn Walker and will be presenting the monthly NBDENV status report. Jim Kierstead was welcomed from DFO Saint John, to speak about Action Item 33-3.

Review & Approval of minutes from May 14th meeting:

The minutes of meeting #33 on 14 May 2007, were revised to include the following changes:

- *Question 34 (page 8) was revised to show that the question was asked by David Thompson.*
- *Question 37 (page 9) was revised to include Pierre Boilard's answer "I don't know. I wasn't there at the time of the blast".*

The minutes were approved with the above changes; motioned by Claude MacKinnon and seconded by Gordon Dalzell. This motion was approved. Approved minutes with changes will be posted to the Canaport LNG website (www.canaportlng.com) and the Fundy Engineering website (www.fundyeng.com).

Gordon Dalzell brought a recent newspaper article to the attention of the committee regarding a large truck delivering materials to the LNG site. The truck was stopped because it was operating on a city street with an extra wide/long load. He requested that there be an update on this in the meeting. Fraser Forsythe indicated that an update would be given tonight.

Beth Roy explained that a resident who was an observer had presented her a list of questions. She asked when it would be appropriate to raise the questions. Fraser Forsythe responded that the questions could be raised when the topic arose in the meeting.

Gordon Dalzell requested that the Offshore & Onshore updates be moved so that they are given earlier in the meeting. This was motioned by Claude MacKinnon and seconded by Gordon Dalzell. The motion was approved and the Onshore & Offshore updates will be moved to be given earlier in subsequent meetings.

Beth Roy indicated that the Canaport LNG webpage did not have up to date meeting minutes posted. She also indicated that some of the links were not operating. Carolyn Van der Veen responded that the webpage was updated that

morning. Fraser Forsythe added that the webpage would be checked to ensure proper operation.

Report on Action Items from May 14th meeting:

33-1: No Kiewit spokesperson will be coming to the meetings. Fraser Forsythe will deliver the updates. This is not a contract requirement for KWS and therefore they will not be present.

33-2: Fraser Forsythe indicated that a letter was sent on 25 May and that the presentation was forthcoming. He also stated that Dale Ross from Department of Public Safety would be asked to speak to their role in ensuring that the plant is built to Canadian Standards

33-3: Fraser Forsythe noted that Jim Kierstead from DFO Saint John was present to speak to this item.

33-4: Fraser Forsythe explained the Action Item to Jim Kierstead and asked if he would be the requested DFO resource. Fraser Forsythe added that it may be convenient for Jim Kierstead to attend if he is based in Saint John. Jim Kierstead responded that he would take the committee's request to Jeff Cline and Steve Harvey.

Jim Kierstead spoke to Action item #33-3 and stated the following points regarding the nearshore blasts that occurred last fall:

- Spoke with Ted Currie and local fisherman on this issue
- Supervisor as of September 2006 was Jim Shute
- Fisherman reported a large amount of rock was blasted into the bay. I received this information this past winter from David Thompson and Roger Hunter
- Reviewed issue with Jim Shute, there was no violation or investigation report done because there was no evidence that a significant amount of rock had entered the bay from the blasting activities on the site.
- Jim Shute and Crystal Caines walked the shoreline at low tide and saw no evidence that would require an investigation
- Crystal Caines notified DFO prior to the blasts
- Jim Kierstead observed one blast and saw 1 boulder roll down to the edge of the cliff
- DFO has been informed as required of all blasts that may affect fish habitat.
- After the blast in question DFO advised Crystal Caines that DFO would not be present for all blasts
- Spoke with Ted Currie and reiterated that there was no evidence of a large amount of debris entering the Bay of Fundy

Q1. (Teresa Debly) What was the date of the first blast? Sept 21, Sept 27 or Nov 1? Which blast did you attend?

A1. (Jim Kierstead) Nov 1 blast

Q2. (Teresa Debly) When did you start here?

A2. (Jim Kierstead) I have been here in Saint John area since 1983.

Q3. (Teresa Debly) When did you become supervisor? Before or after the blast?

A3. (Jim Kierstead) I started back in the beginning of October. Jim Shute was the acting supervisor at the time of the blast.

Q4. (Teresa Debly) How do you define significant?

A4. (Jim Kierstead) Jim Shute said a "few boulders". This is consistent with my before and after inspection. Observed that 1 boulder of 3m diameter had rolled down the cliff.

Q5. (Teresa Debly) So you go by the area between high and low water? Not the seafloor?

A5. (Jim Kierstead) That is not my area of expertise that would be Ted Currie's.

Q6. (Teresa Debly) If there had been 20 rocks would that be considered significant?

A6. (Jim Kierstead) Large rocks? I would report that rock had been moved. We have spoken with Ted Currie (Habitat Specialist). The blast was contained and there were no significant signs of blast debris at the site.

Q7. (Teresa Debly) Did you ask about the amount of explosives used on 1 Nov compared to 27 Sept?

A7. (Jim Kierstead) I have no information regarding the blast explosives.

Q8. (David Thompson) I'm just in off the water. I would like DFO to acknowledge that there was an incident. What point of discussion are we at?

A8. (Jim Kierstead) I have spoken with Jim Shute and Ted Currie. There was no investigation report because following an inspection with Crystal Caines Jim did not feel an investigation was required. Jim Shute was not concerned that there was a habitat issue.

Q9. (David Thompson) Onshore there is strict environmental reporting (TSS, blasts, etc.) but there was no reporting of this issue. This issue does exist. Fraser Forsythe confirmed that some rock did go out. This should have triggered an environmental report. What I want is acknowledgment that this did occur. There is an island called Davidson Island it appears it was in filled. As you sail by the site you can see an aluminum barricade then about 100 feet along the shore towards Mispic Point there is loose rock. The rock is filled in behind Davidson island. Is that where the settling basin will be?

A9. (Fraser Forsythe) That is where an impoundment basin is installed and the, area where blasting mats were lost onto the littoral shoreline. It was necessary for the mats to remain where they had fallen until the area could be prepared for a crane to retrieve the mats safely. All of the mats have now been recovered.

Q10. (David Thompson) Why was this incident not recognized did DFO know about the blast mats?

A10. (Fraser Forsythe) Yes because DFO was onsite with me that day and inspected the area.

Q11. (David Thompson) Do you acknowledge the area behind Davidson Island was filled in?

A11. (Fraser Forsythe) Some rock did fall in during that blast because of the design of the blast in order to protect the workers and the site infrastructure. (Jim Kierstead) I was not aware of this.

Q12. (David Thompson) Is there a framework for reporting? The incident occurred on the 27th and no one was notified. What triggers DFO to acknowledge an incident?

A12. (Jim Kierstead) I have an email from Ted Currie. Monitoring requirements are dredge footprint which kicks in as a result of the Project's HADD. Fundy Engineering is responsible for notifying DFO.

Q13. (David Thompson) In our annual status report it wasn't reported. There is good history on the onshore work. How do we get triggers for offshore?

A13. (Fraser Forsythe) DFO was notified before any blasting occurred within the guideline requirements for blasting within 50 metres of the shore. They were notified that blast mats fell onto the littoral shoreline and okayed that Canaport LNG would remove them later. (Jim Kierstead) If it is the same blast Crystal Caines informed me that some blast mats fell in and could not be retrieved at the time.

Q14. (David Thompson) If you drive by the site on the water you see seaweed then a big pile of blasted rock next to the seaweed. Isn't that an incident?

A14. (Fraser Forsythe) We informed DFO of the blasts, they are not required to be there. When I found out about the blast mats went over the side I instructed Crystal Caines to call DFO.

Q15. (Teresa Debly) Do you agree that the committee should know about this?

A15. (Fraser Forsythe) This was not a significant event on the job site. We knew what to do to mitigate it.

Q16. (Glen Griffin) Is it a violation of the fisheries act to infill with in the Bay?

A16. (Jim Kierstead) It could be. There are hundreds of boulders along the shoreline that water can pass by. You've never spoken to this before and my experience would not have called this an island.

Q17. (Glen Griffin) Is this a violation?

A17. (Jim Kierstead) It could be. Permitting has looked after much of the impacts to the ocean floor (HADD's). We can have an expert come out and look at this and the amount.

Q18. (Glen Griffin) Is there a permit to infill to Davidson Island?

A18. (Fraser Forsythe) We have a HADD authorization.

Q19. (Glen Griffin) Does it include the infilling of the island?

A19. (Fraser Forsythe) No, it wouldn't because this would not have known about it at the time the permit was prepared and was issued.

Q20. (Teresa Debly) What is the impounding basin?

A20. (Fraser Forsythe) Location is indicated on the map. We are drilling and blasting here to create a bench on which to build the impounding basin as required for an LNG re-gasification terminal per safety standard CSA Z276. It must be physically down gradient from the area/equipment it serves to protect and close to the work area.

Q21. (David Thompson) Is someone from KWS making a presentation tonight? I asked for information on the HADD.

A21. (Fraser Forsythe) The HADD is a public document you can see it at anytime.

Q22. (David Thompson) Jackets 1&2 infill – what is the difference in material that had to be moved?

A22. (Fraser Forsythe) That info has to be reported by KWS to DFO.

Q23. (David Thompson) Is this information private as indicated last month?

A23. (Fraser Forsythe) We need to report the impact area of the seafloor at the end of construction to DFO. KWS will not be presenting it.

Q24. (Glen Griffin) When will it be presented?

A24. (Fraser Forsythe) We must have a record of the surface area of the seafloor that was disturbed. That is a requirement of the Project HADD authorization.

Q26. (David Thompson) Can you report on Courtney Bay from Irving? What is KWS going to build?

A26. (Fraser Forsythe) I'm not sure.

Q27. (David Thompson) I called KWS. They have not called me back. At the end of the day will this be documented?

A27. (Fraser Forsythe) We will report to DFO and they will take necessary action. We've faithfully advised them and we are starting to get data from offshore. Sediment traps have been installed and measurements for turbidity and TSS in

the water. Other measurements will be taken to determine the area of the seafloor affected in square metres.

Q28. (David Thompson) How and when will this be reported?

A28. (Fraser Forsythe) Fundy Engineering prepares the offshore water quality reports which reported monthly.

Q29. (David Thompson) NBDENV reports only on onshore activities?

A29. (David Peterson) Yes.

Q30. (David Thompson) What if an onshore blast blasts land into the water?

A30. (David Peterson) The Approval to Construct for onshore was written stating that we will do concussion and vibration monitoring as long as the blasting continues and measure results at the nearest residence. If a blast mat gets moved then it is public safety. If rock gets blasted into the water then it is DFO responsibility.

Q31. (David Thompson) Was Carolyn Walker wrong?

A31. (David Peterson) I don't have the actual wording in front of me but my understanding is what I just described.

Q32. (Dennis Griffin) Can we get clarification on this who will report on the amount of rock?

A32. (Fraser Forsythe) There is no requirement to report on the amount of blast rock.

Q33. (David Thompson) This is big grey area. What about future projects if this issue arises again?

A33. (Fraser Forsythe) I agree this is a grey area and believe a pro-active approach by members could be helpful for future projects.

Q34. (Glen Griffin) How is this over? You are still constructing, if something significant occurs we should know about it.

A34. (Fraser Forsythe) This was not a significant safety or environmental issue.

Q35. (Glen Griffin) Could you generate a report detailing how it happened and why it happened?

A35. (Fraser Forsythe) No, this did not exceed any limits (noise or vibration) or impact our HADD authorization. Jim Kierstead added that he could look into the issue.

Q36. (Stuart Armstrong) Can you look into it and report to us?

A36. (Jim Kierstead) Some information I could, I can also tell you if a violation has occurred.

Q37. (Stuart Armstrong) I personally would be happy if DFO made these reports. Not contractors, not Canaport LNG.

A37. (Jim Kierstead) I can take that back to DFO. This is my patrol area and it would be my responsibility to investigate infilling in this area. I can only give out certain information.

Q38. (Teresa Debly) I have a friend who told me that her husband was out on a boat and saw construction activity in that area in front of the Irving Tanks.

A38. (Fraser Forsythe) There is no activity in Deep Cove that I am aware of.

Q39. (Gordon Dalzell) How do you communicate incidents?

A39. (Jim Kierstead) Call the Regional Operations Centre – Canadian Coast Guard at 1-800-565-1633. The line is open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Q40. (Gordon Dalzell) There is an exact reporting system for onshore but does the same level occur offshore?

A40. (Fraser Forsythe) The most significant answer to the HADD is the amount of seafloor impacted. It is changing and we are updating with actual measurement of disturbance area.

Q41. (Gordon Dalzell) I took family and friends to Mispic Beach. The visual impact of buildings & boat activity is significant. What about the water and the fish being impacted should reporting be increased, where do you draw the line?

A41. (Fraser Forsythe) We look at the surface area not the individual organisms. We work with DFO and fisherman to provide compensation for habitat loss.

David Thompson added that he was not aware of the amount of activity that there was going to be. He indicated that John Logan worked with the government to set up shipping lanes and that he was assured that he would not lose fishing gear. He stated that he witnessed a barge come out and not use the designated northerly route which was set up.

Q42. (Gordon Dalzell) I would like to give a message to DFO requesting that they be more pro-active in ensuring that violations do not occur.

Presentation on Offshore Work

Fraser Forsythe gave a brief presentation detailing the status and construction activities for the offshore work.

David Thompson indicated that the placement of one of the sediment traps (E-500) may not be an ideal location. He suggested that it be moved North to be closer to shore.

Q43. (Dennis Griffin) How do you deploy the traps?

A43. (Fraser Forsythe) We use GPS positioning.

Q44. (Dennis Griffin) How did you decide the positioning?

A44. (Fraser Forsythe) They are aligned with the face of the pier and placed to intercept potential sediments from our construction activities in the water.

Q45. (Dennis Griffin) Is there any harbour dredging happening now?

A45. (Fraser Forsythe) I'm not aware of any at this time.

David Thompson noted that the placement of the traps would be fine if the work was further out in the bay but because the work is on the jackets the traps should be placed further in.

Q46. (David Thompson) A control site is being used to compare results. Is that Black Rock?

A46. (Fraser Forsythe) Yes.

Q47. (David Thompson) How often do you sample? Monthly?

A47. (Fraser Forsythe) Yes we sample monthly.

Q48. (David Thompson) Would it not be better if you sampled more frequently?

A48. (Kristy Hogsden) We analyzed the sediments that were retrieved and will be supplementing the traps with Eckman Dredge samples. The DFO has approved the monthly sampling program.

Q49. (Glen Griffin) Was there an engineer on Black Rock last week?

A49. (Fraser Forsythe) Possibly, as there is a requirement to install a navigation light on or in the water adjacent the rock.

A ten minute break was taken at this point.

Fraser Forsythe introduced Mr. Paul Groody with the City of Saint John who was present as a resource to the CCELC.

30-4. Fraser Forsythe gave the presentation on the EIS commitments.

32-10. Report on the emergency response capability of Saint John with respect to Industrial facilities. Gordon Dalzell and Rainer Malcharek met separately with Yvonne Huntington and Lewis McDonald. Gordon Dalzell brought to the attention of the committee a letter which was submitted to the last meeting minutes regarding a newspaper article from March. He stated that an emergency measures review will be done and tested. He reviewed that 6 months before the LNG facility is running it an emergency operations plan must be in place. He added that the officials felt that some of the issues were not properly addressed in the letter. He believes that there is still a lot of work to do with respect to the project.

Rainer Malcharek commented on his meeting with the emergency measures group. He felt from his experience with other emergency measures organizations in Sarnia, Edmonton, and Montreal that the Saint John EMO has

pros and cons. He stated that Saint John had a well trained and equipped fire department. He indicated that Saint John had a centrally located emergency response centre which was well funded and mobile, a hazardous waste response unit and confined space rescue ability. He felt that some improvements could be made and those included an identification system to identify emergency first responders, shared inventory lists of rescue equipment and mutual aid organizations. He added that the Emergency organization appears capable and well organized.

30-4. Fraser Forsythe gave a presentation on the EIS commitments.

Q50. (Glen Griffin) Was there a scoter population check done before construction of the LNG Terminal?

A50. (Fraser Forsythe) No. We checked with the Point Lepreau Bird Observatory and did a visual count survey from Cape Spencer.

Q51. (Glen Griffin) Were scoter numbers lower this year?

A51. (Fraser Forsythe) No they were not.

Q52. (Dennis Griffin) Did you see any Harlequin Ducks? How was the Harlequin Duck survey done? Did you climb down the cliffs?

A52. (Kristy Hogsden) The survey was done from the tops of the cliffs we did not climb down. Harlequin Ducks usually do not nest along the shore; they prefer the mouths of fast flowing rivers up north. I have a video on scoter migration from the Point Lepreau Bird Observatory if anyone would like to borrow it.

Q53. (Gordon Dalzell) Harold Wright is a local historian and he has done a lot of research on the WWII bunkers in Mispec and believes there was ammunition dumped there. Has this been looked into?

A53. (Fraser Forsythe) Yes this was done in 2005 and we found no record of any munitions left. We spoke with Neil McKelvey who was an officer or commander of the base and he indicated that all munitions were removed from the site.

Gordon Dalzell added that Harold Wright was still doing research on this topic and has reason to believe that there are munitions still on the site. Gordon Dalzell added that someone may want to speak to Harold regarding this.

Teresa Debly asked if there could be a comparison made between the original traffic estimates for construction and the present real traffic values.

Action Item 34-1: Compare the estimated traffic volumes for construction given in the EIS to the present real traffic volumes.

Q54. (Glen Griffin) Why can't large trucks use the RHSAR?

A54. (Fraser Forsythe) We have repeatedly informed all drivers and their appropriate company management to use the RHSAR and will continue to do so. With respect to the issue that Gordon Dalzell mentioned earlier from the piece in

the local paper. The large truck was coming from Quebec and the trucking company and the driver were instructed to drive to Moncton first and approach Saint John from the East. The truck; however, did not and approached from Fredericton. At that point the driver was denied access to the Harbour Bridge due to his wide load and the single lane of traffic from bridge maintenance activities. He then turned around and went across the Reversing Falls bridge and subsequently drove through town to reach the site at the former dry dock. The trucking company was aware of the route the truck was supposed to take.

Q55. (Glen Griffin) At 8:30 this morning there was a truck carrying cement abutments for the pier that came down Red Head Road. Why don't they use the RHSAR?

A55. (Fraser Forsythe) There is no reason for a large truck not to use the RHSAR; however, if you will please keep letting me know I will inform the trucking companies.

Q56. (Beth Roy) I have witnessed a white waste management truck that drives down Red Head Road almost twice daily.

A56. (Fraser Forsythe) I have called their service number in Ontario but have been unable to contact their local office/management.

Q57. (Teresa Debly) Could you hire people at the gate?

A57. (Fraser Forsythe) There is presently a guard at the gate.

Q58. (Dennis Griffin) What defines large versus small vehicles?

A58. (Fraser Forsythe) A half ton or smaller are considered personal vehicles.

Q59. (Carol Armstrong) When will there be a sign added to the existing one outside Canaport saying Canaport LNG?

A59. (Fraser Forsythe) I do not know what signage will be added to the existing sign if any and at present have no schedule for placing such a sign.

Teresa Debly asked if she could have her user name and password for the Tracking Database sent to her. Fraser Forsythe responded that due to the request from other committee members to have the information again, all committee members will be emailed their usernames and passwords.

Fraser Forsythe brought to the attention of the committee the newly created CCELC library which contains several documents associated with the LNG project. He noted that this would be present at all subsequent CCELC meetings and that member's were welcome to sign out materials from the library and to return to Kristy Hogsden, Fundy Engineering or at the subsequent CCELC meeting.

Q60. (Dennis Griffin) Could we have reference documents from other projects (e.g. the Brunswick Pipeline)?

A60. (Fraser Forsythe) No, such information would be available from the individual project proponent.

Q61. (Teresa Debly) The 145 km pipeline was just approved by the NEB. What about the 9 km pipeline to the refinery?

A61. (Fraser Forsythe) That is approved in the EIA but not by the EUB it would still require EUB approval.

Gordon Dalzell added that there is a lower limit on the length of a pipeline that requires an EIA. David Peterson stated that as part of the refinery EIA there will need to be a study of pipelines because of the need to move products from the refineries to export. First will be an EIA then EUB review and approval would be triggered (depending on the length of the pipeline).

Traffic Presentation

Q62. (Teresa Debly) What was the purpose of the traffic counters?

A62. (Fraser Forsythe) To see what amount of traffic was using the RHSAR and because we no longer man the guardhouse around the clock. ADI originally did a study at the intersection of Bayside Dr. and Red Head Road and with the information from our traffic counters we will be able to deduce the Project related traffic traveling on the Red Head Road.

Q63. (Peter Sherman) Do the traffic counters weigh the vehicles?

A63. (Joel Forsythe) No they are not capable of that.

Q64. (David Thompson) Have you had any blowouts in your road tubes?

A64. (Joel Forsythe) None as of yet but we inspect them frequently.

Q65. (Carol Armstrong) Where is the picture shown on the screen taken?

A65. (Fraser Forsythe) Just inside the guardhouse on the existing Canaport Access Road.

Q66. (Teresa Debly) Would the traffic counters register ATVs?

A66. (Joel Forsythe) Yes they would likely be recorded. The machines can record vehicles down to motorcycles.

Q67. (Teresa Debly) Would they record bicycles?

A67. (Joel Forsythe) I am not sure, they might.

Q68. (Teresa Debly) How far up the RHSAR is the counter?

A68. (Joel Forsythe) The counter is placed at the top of the first hill as you enter the RHSAR from Red Head Road north bound.

Fraser Forsythe added that manual traffic monitoring had been occurring at the guardhouse but that they were unable to tell what traffic was coming from Red Head Road and what was coming from the RHSAR. Fraser Forsythe stated that

the traffic counters were set up to see how successful the RHSAR is a mitigative measure.

Q69. (Dennis Griffin) There was a letter sent on August 20 2006 from Marc Duguay stating that the RHSAR would be open to public by June 2007.

A69. (Fraser Forsythe) I think the road is to be open to public access in July. Stuart Armstrong added that in the last meeting Tom Higgins stated that the road would be open at the end of July.

Q70. (Dennis Griffin) We need a commitment from Irving Oil that the Road will be open by June.

A70. (Fraser Forsythe) Gulf Operators are the contractor and they are working to complete the road by the end of July.

Rainer Malcharek indicated that the expropriation may have delayed the road construction. Teresa Deby added that the expropriation was completed last May. Stuart Armstrong reminded the committee that they were told that completion would be by the end of July in the last meeting.

Q71. (Jean Thompson) What will be the name of the RHSAR?

A71. (Stuart Armstrong) That would be up to the city.

Q72. (Fraser Forsythe) Paul could you help with this?

A72. (Paul Groody) It will be named, I'm not sure what it will be but, it will be different from RHSAR.

NBDENV Status Report

David Peterson provided Environmental Status reports for May-June to all members in attendance. He mentioned that Carolyn Walker sends her regrets to the committee for not being present but could not attend due to a scheduling conflict. The Department continues to receive monitoring reports on a regular basis. There were no reportable incidents for the LNG site and no public inquires were made in May-June. The EPP Phase III Offshore has been distributed. The Concrete batch plant is operational and being monitored.

Q73. (Carol Armstrong) Where is all the dust coming from? Crushing rock? The cement plant?

A73. (David Peterson) I might suggest that some is seasonal, conditions in Saint John, or construction. There is no dust monitoring associated with the project. Dust monitoring is usually limited to gravel pits and approximately 100 m from quarries. Ambient monitoring is difficult to do.

Q74. (David Thompson) If you go outside when offshore and look in during construction you can see a cloud of dust.

A74. (Fraser Forsythe) Onsite we use water and lignum sulfate as dust suppressants. We are not crushing any material at present because we have

enough crushed material. The batch plant is electric and its emissions are trapped and not released into the environment.

Q75. (Beth Roy) I have a question from an observer. They spoke with Heather Erkheart regarding siltation from the connector (Alignment B) road into Bean Brook. Gulf Operators were contacted and they visited the site but they did not do anything. The NBDENV did not visit or take samples either.

A75. (David Peterson) If you call the Canadian Coast Guard after hours it gets rerouted to the NBDENV. Inspectors are on call and Heather is the Saint John Regional Officer. She visited the site, made an assessment and expressed her concerns to the proponent. The Department looks for a regular monitoring program and that sediment structures are effective. Heavy rainfall events may cause exceedances. Samples which were taken on 17 May were acceptable.

Q76. (Beth Roy) What about the 18th or 19th?

A76. (David Peterson) Samples were not taken on those days. Samples taken on the 17th looked upstream on Bean Brook (TSS 4 mg/L) and downstream (TSS 8 mg/L), these are within Project requirements. There was also a sample taken coming off a ditch which was TSS 517 mg/L this is significantly above the requirements but, it shows that the sediment control structures were working. Sediment control structures are designed to remove the heavy solid materials because they would cause the most damage. Some clay materials do not settle rapidly and give the appearance of cloudy water; however, the particles are so small that they pass through the structures.

Q78. (Teresa Debly) Wasn't that a public inquiry?

A78. (David Peterson) No because it has to do with the road.

Q79. (Peter Sherman) Were the concerns addressed?

A79. (David Peterson) My understanding is that they were addressed.

Beth Roy stated that the observer felt that the concerns were not addressed.

Q80. (Teresa Debly) Can we get a monthly status report on the RHSAR like we do for the LNG site?

A80. (David Peterson) No.

Q81. (Gordon Dalzell) There needs to be some documentation for this under a public inquiry.

A81. (David Peterson) Carolyn Walker was aware of this and did not think it was related to the RHSAR.

Teresa Debly asked if the committee could request a 1 page monthly report on the RHSAR. Gordon Dalzell also requested that this be done. Fraser Forsythe responded that the project has a dedicated NBDENV person for a Project Compliance Officer position. Gordon Dalzell motioned that all inquiries to the

NBDENV be registered and reported on a monthly basis. Beth Roy seconded the motion.

Q82. (Stuart Armstrong) Who will respond to the motion made?

A82. (David Peterson) Susan Atkinson would respond to this.

Action Item 34-2 Letter will be prepared asking that all inquiries to the NBDENV be registered and reported on a monthly basis to the CCELC.

Q83. (David Thompson) I would like it on record that the NBDENV will not report on blasts that end up in the water.

A83. (David Peterson) This is the responsibility of DFO they have a mandate to deal with this.

Update on the LNG Project (CLNG)

Fraser Forsythe gave an update on the Project to date. For the offshore portion there are three jackets for the pier structure in place. The drilling and pile driving process is ongoing to complete the installation of these jackets.

Q84. (Teresa Debly) What is weather permitting?

A84. (Fraser Forsythe) This is referring to wind and wave action.

Q85. (Teresa Debly) What about fog?

A85. (Fraser Forsythe) They rely on GPS to position the off-shore structures but some activities may be stalled due to heavy fog.

Q86. (Teresa Debly) Does a diver go down each time a jacket goes in?

A86. (Fraser Forsythe) No.

Q87. (Teresa Debly) What about before the jacket is in position?

A87. (Fraser Forsythe) Yes, they may have to send a diver down; however it is a very difficult environment for diving operations. They can only dive at slack tide which is a one hour window and the visibility is very poor at the dive locations.

Fraser Forsythe provided an update on onshore activities. The pouring for tank # 2 wall has started and approximately 9 m are complete. The administration building foundation has been constructed. The assembling of the metal roof for tank #1 has begun and the compression ring is being installed at the top of tank #1 to receive the roof. The sub base for tank # 3 is being prepared.

Q88. (Peter Sherman) Is there anything to support the centre of the roof?

A88. (Fraser Forsythe) No there is no support required when the roof assembly inside the tank is completed.

Q89. (Peter Sherman) What is the total height of the tank with the roof?

A89. (Fraser Forsythe) It is approximately 55 m.

Q90. (Teresa Debly) What is the date for pouring of the third tank?

A90. (Fraser Forsythe) The construction of the third tank is not confirmed yet. Only the sub base is being prepared.

Q91. (Teresa Debly) The design is for 2 tanks?

A91. (Fraser Forsythe) Yes but the EIA has approved a design for 3 tanks.

Q92. (Gordon Dalzell) Is the project 30% ahead of schedule?

A92. (Fraser Forsythe) The project is 30 % complete; it is on schedule but not 30% ahead.

Fraser Forsythe stated that construction is continuing on the Main Control Room.

Q93. (Jan Thompson) What are the buildings in the background of the picture?

A93. (Fraser Forsythe) Those are the temporary administration and engineering office buildings.

Q94. (Gordon Dalzell) The electrical building has steel infrastructure and girders, is it bomb proof?

A94. (Fraser Forsythe) I am not certain if it is designed to some blast proof specification.

Q95. (Peter Sherman) How many people are on site?

A95. (Fraser Forsythe) Before the pour there were 350 to 400. After the pour of the tank wall began workforce was approximately 500 during the day and about 400 to 450 at night.

Q96. (Peter Sherman) Where is the parking lot?

A96. (Fraser Forsythe) It is onsite near the tanks and can accommodate 750 cars.

Q97. (Peter Sherman) Are they paving the RHSAR from Old black River Road to Proud Road?

A97. (Fraser Forsythe) I'm not sure of the direction in which paving will proceed; however, that entire length will be paved.

Peter Sherman noted that if the road were paved people might be more inclined to drive on it.

Q98. (David Thompson) What about the request for the change in the intersection design with the RHSAR and Red Head Road? Can the city of Saint John speak to this?

A98. (Fraser Forsythe) The CCELC has made 3 requests to the City of Saint John: 1) Alignment B intersection design; 2) Resource attendee be present at CCELC meetings; and 3) The presentation of the a 7 year capital plan for the Red Head Road. The presentation will not be tonight because we did not want to

overload with the DFO presentation on offshore concerns. I'm not sure if Paul Groody is prepared to speak to this issue.

Peter Sherman suggested that Red Head Road be designated as a non trucking route and the intersection design be changed to a T. David Thompson expressed concern about the City's expropriation of private property because now truck traffic will be coming down to Red Head Road. David Thompson felt that a T-design would be suitable for local traffic. Paul Groody stated that the cities interest is to minimize traffic on Red Head Road.

David Thompson asked which section of Red Head Road the City considered Red Head Road and asked whether it was from the church to the LNG site. Peter Sherman suggested making Red Head Road all the way to the LNG site a non trucking road.

Q99. (Teresa Debly) Could the City put a hold on the permit for the bottom of Alignment B for the RHSAR?

A99. (Paul Groody) I will look into it; and could put it on hold if necessary.

Dennis Griffin stated that the residents are concerned about the industrial zone and trucking. Dennis Griffin added that this was a quality of life issue. Dennis Griffin stated that the residents wanted a redesign to the intersection to ensure the Red Head Road does not become a truck route.

Adjourned:

9:48 pm

Submitted by: Fundy Engineering

Next Meeting Date:

Monday 9 July 2007

Attachments:

Table of Outstanding Action Items- June 2007

Traffic Update- May 2007

NBDENV Monthly Status Report- May-June 2007

Table of Actions/Responsibilities – June 2007

Action #	Action	Responsible Party	Due Date
34-1	<i>Compare traffic volumes given in the EIS to the actual recorded present traffic volumes.</i>	Canaport LNG	9 July 07
34-2	<i>Prepare a letter asking that all inquires to the NBDENV be registered and reported on a monthly basis to CCELC.</i>	CCELC	9 July 07