

Canaport LNG Project

Canaport Community Environmental Liaison Committee (CCELC)

Minutes of Meeting CCELC # 43
Monday 9 June 2008
Red Head United Church Hall, Saint John, N.B.
Meeting 6:05 pm – 9:05 pm

APPROVED AS AMMENDED

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
- MacKinnon, Claude ACAP Representative
- Perry, Yvonne Member

Committee Absent:

- Court, Ivan Mayor of Saint John
- Hunter, Roger Resident
- Johnston, Jan Resident
- McNeill, Pam Resident
- Melvin, Keith Enterprise Saint John
- Rogers, Kathy Member
- Smith, Elsie Resident
- Thompson, David Member
- Turner, Rick Saint John Board of Trade

Resources:

- Azcarraga, Adolfo Canaport LNG
- Caines, Crystal Fundy Engineering
- Doucet, Bernie NBDENV
- Hogsden, Kristy Fundy Engineering
- O'Brien, Kevin City of Saint John
- Ryan, Tim Fundy Engineering
- Van der Veen, Carolyn Canaport LNG

- Walker, Carolyn

NBDENV

Note: A total of 10 non-committee members were in attendance at the meeting.

Opening Remarks:

The meeting commenced at 6:05 pm with Fraser Forsythe welcoming everyone to the meeting. Fraser Forsythe introduced Adolfo Azcarraga, Bernie Doucet, and Tim Ryan as guests at the meeting. He also reminded members that the meeting was open to the public for the project modification presentation on the flare. Members of the public were welcome to ask questions throughout the meeting. He asked members to review the agenda and asked for any additional items to be brought forward.

Review & Approval of minutes from May 13th meeting:

The minutes of meeting #42 on 13 May 2008 were approved with the following changes:

Page 2- Gordon Dalzell's comment on a new air quality contaminant list was changed to "*new federal air quality contaminant list and regulations*".

Page 8 – Gordon Dalzell's comment on the distribution of LNG brochures was changed from kids to "*school children*".

Page 8 – Yvonne Perry's question regarding where full time employees will live was changed to reflect her interest in knowing if they will live and pay taxes in Saint John.

The minutes were approved as amended motioned by Gordon Dalzell. Alice Brown seconded the motion. Approved minutes will be posted to the Canaport LNG website (www.canaportlng.com) and the Fundy Engineering website (www.fundyeng.com).

Presentation on Canaport LNG Facility Modification

David Thompson from the Conservation Council of New Brunswick requested that everyone at the meeting introduce themselves. Fraser Forsythe indicated that he would give the presentation on the facility modification and a question and answer period would follow.

Q1: (Teresa Debly) Is this an open house?

A1: (Fraser Forsythe) Yes.

Q2: (David Thompson) How was the meeting advertised? Public participation in an EIA is important.

A2: (Fraser Forsythe) Public notices were placed in the Telegraph Journal on 30 May and 31 May 2008 as required by the NBDENV. The facility modification was introduced to the CCELC at last month's meeting. Since then a newsletter was hand delivered to 650 people and also mailed out to others. The newsletter

provided information on the flare and whom to contact for additional information and questions, but did not have the date of the meeting.

Q3: (Teresa Debly) Does the newsletter mention the 43 m flare?

A3: (Fraser Forsythe) Yes.

David Thompson filed a complaint with the New Brunswick Department of Environment about public notification for this meeting. He stated that the public involvement process should not be limited.

Q4: (Teresa Debly) What is the rationale of the number of newsletters hand delivered (650)?

A4: (Carolyn Van der Veen) There are 650 residents within this [Red Head] postal area.

Q5: (Teresa Debly) Won't people on the west side be concerned?

A5: (Carolyn Van der Veen) 650 newsletters were hand delivered and over 2300 were mailed out to other people in the city.

Q6: (Carolyn Van der Veen) Was Canaport required to send out newsletters to the whole city?

A6: (Bernie Doucet) No. The Department of Environment approved Canaport's public involvement plan for the communication of this proposed modification. The plan included written communication, public notice in the newspaper, and a presentation at the CCELC meeting which was open to the public.

Q7: (Teresa Debly) Was there any discussion at the Department of Environment about using other media for providing information to the public?

A7: (Bernie Doucet) The Department of Environment approved the public involvement plan for this modification that was submitted by Canaport LNG. Some people do not read certain newspapers and others do not listen to certain radio stations. The Department of Environment requested public notification in the newspaper.

Glen Griffin commented that there should have been a better effort made for advertising the meeting. David Thompson stated that he looks forward to how the Department of Environment follows up on these concerns about public involvement. Bernie Doucet will bring these concerns to his superiors at the Department of Environment and will see if they require any changes.

Tim Ryan commented that part of the responsibility of CCELC committee members is to communicate this information to other residents and the public. Teresa Debly asked Tim Ryan if he thinks it is her responsibility to be on the phone every night to inform people about issues such as this. Carol Armstrong commented that she had to become a member of the CCELC to get information as other committee members did not pass on information.

Fraser Forsythe presented information on the Facility Modification [A copy of this presentation is included with the minutes].

Q8: (Teresa Debly) Why is releasing CO₂ better than CH₄?

A8: (Fraser Forsythe) Greenhouse gas emissions are expressed as CO₂ equivalents so they can be compared. Methane (CH₄) has a global warming potential that is 21 times greater than carbon dioxide (CO₂). This means that methane is more potent than carbon dioxide as a greenhouse gas in the atmosphere [See EPA Emissions Fact Sheet included with minutes]. In 2001, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change increased the global warming potential of methane to 23 times greater than carbon dioxide.

Q9: (Gordon Dalzell) What were the predicted CO₂ emissions in the original EIA?

A9: (Fraser Forsythe) 384, 000 tonnes annually with all 8 submerged combustion vapourizers (SCVs) running at full capacity.

Q10: (Gordon Dalzell) What is the difference in emissions by having a flare?

A10: (Fraser Forsythe) It is a small change; a few thousand tones annually.

Q11: (Gordon Dalzell) Is this a significant change in terms of greenhouse gases?

A11: (Fraser Forsythe) No.

Q12: (Glenn Griffin) Will the emissions create ground level ozone?

A12: (Fraser Forsythe) Not sure.

A12: (Gordon Dalzell) Any use of fossil fuels can increase ground level ozone. Nitrogen oxides and volatile organic compounds combined with sun and particulates create ground level ozone.

Q13: (Glenn Griffin) How far is the flare from the SCVs?

A13: (Adolfo Azcarraga) The distance is more than 120 m.

Joan Pearce, a resident of Saint John, expressed her concern about pollution in the city. Ms. Pearce has looked into environmental law in Canada and has found that New Brunswick has the worst regulations in Canada. Joan Pearce expressed her concerns about what comes out of refineries and commented that methane can be recovered from landfill sites.

Q14: (Joan Pearce) Is there a recovery technology for excess natural gas? If so, why is it not being used here?

A14: (Adolfo Azcarraga) I am not aware of this technology at this time. The flare and cold vent technology are common.

Q15: (Horst Sauerteig) It is feasible to use a compressor to recover gas and put it back in the process. Why do you have the line to the flare?

A15: (Adolfo Azcarraga) The line to the flare is a pressure safety release line from pressure safety valves. Safety release valves must be open-ended for

safety. The flare will be constantly lit with small amount of purge gas so that air cannot enter the system. Canaport is interested in recovering all LNG vapours. Currently, Canaport has three cryogenic compressors to recover boil off gas vapours from the process.

Q16: (Horst Sauerteig) Will the flare be used during start up and emergencies?

A16: (Adolfo Azcarraga) Yes, the flare will be used during commissioning, operation, and during unplanned events.

Q17: (Horst Sauerteig) What changed between 2001 and 2004 for the project?

A17: (Fraser Forsythe) The project was registered in 2001.

A17: (Bernie Doucet) The project EIA was approved on 6 August 2004.

Q18: (Horst Sauerteig) When was the pipeline to the refinery dropped?

A18: (Fraser Forsythe) A pipeline to the existing refinery is still part of the approved project.

Q19: (Horst Sauerteig) Prior to this change, were you going to vent methane?

A19: (Fraser Forsythe) Yes.

Q20: (Horst Sauerteig) Why was this approved (venting methane)?

A20: (Bernie Doucet) It was reviewed by the Technical Review Committee and approved at that time.

Gordon Dalzell commented that there were public objections to venting methane at that time.

Q21: (Teresa Debly) What has the vent changed to now?

A21: (Fraser Forsythe) The cold vent is proposed to be changed to a flare.

Dennis Griffin stated that the vent has changed from a low cold vent stack to a high cold vent stack and now to a high flare stack. He commented that other changes to the Project have included tank containment and the number of tanks. Dennis Griffin stated that Repsol wants unlimited import of natural gas and has to change the vent to a flare to handle the volume of gas being pumped through the system.

Bernie Doucet commented that the Department of Environment is present to ensure the public involvement process is followed.

David Thompson stated that people were not properly notified about the flare or the meeting tonight. He asked why there were not independent resources taking notes and an audio recording device to capture minutes of the meeting. He commented that the public involvement process is flawed. He stated that methane is a potent greenhouse gas and that the Department of Environment approved the venting of methane in the original EIA for Canaport. He commented

that there is a visual impact of the tanks from Mispic Beach and that the noise levels are upsetting the health of local residents. David Thompson also indicated that this is a major change to the project (flare modification) and it is going through without proper public involvement. He expressed objection to the Project modification on behalf of the Conservation Council of New Brunswick. He commented that the structure of the CCELC meetings should be changed to have an independent chairman and independent note takers. Dennis Griffin added that the CCELC has been an Irving Oil / Canaport LNG dominated committee since it began.

Bernie Doucet stated that these were all valid points. The Department of Environment prescribed that Canaport LNG chairs the CCELC. He also commented that this is the forum to submit concerns to the Proponent about the project modification.

Q22: (Teresa Debly) If the methane was known to be 21 times worse than carbon dioxide in 1996 and 23 times worse in 2001, why was this not considered in the original application?

A22: (Fraser Forsythe) I don't know.

Q23: (Teresa Debly) Which costs more, the vent or the flare?

A23: (Fraser Forsythe) The flare costs marginally more than the cold vent.

Q24: (Yvonne Perry) There will be a 43m flare at start up for 10 days. Who will see it?

A24: (Fraser Forsythe) The west side and Lorneville may see it.

Q24: (Yvonne Perry) Was the literature sent to people in the north end and the west side of Saint John?

A24: (Carolyn Van der Veen) It will be mailed to over 2300 people in the area. There were two mailings of the newsletter and the second one has not gone out yet.

Fraser Forsythe commented the Yvonne Perry had made a good point about public notification during facility start up at last month's meeting. Yvonne Perry stated that it is not her job to inform people about what goes on at the CCELC meetings and that not everyone receives the newspaper.

Adolfo Azcarraga provided the following information about the process and flare during start up (also called commissioning) phase:

- The process of cooling down the tanks varies in length of time required
- Initially the tanks will be filled with nitrogen gas but as liquefied natural gas is pumped into the tanks it will create a vapour that will mix with the nitrogen

- The flare will initially be small but will increase as the proportion of methane vapour increases in the tanks
- Start up will be a maximum of ten days for each tank. Schedule times will be approximate as follows:
 - Tank # 1 – 10 days in December 2008
 - Tank # 2 – 10 days in February 2009
 - Tank # 3 – 10 days in January 2010

Yvonne Perry stated that Canaport has a responsibility to inform the people about the flare. Fraser Forsythe agreed with her. Glenn Griffin commented that the greater Saint John area will see the flare during start up. He mentioned the propane valve failure at the refinery that occurred a few years ago and that the flares at that time were visible in Grand Bay. Glenn Griffin requested information on the noise the flare will cause and stated that a neighbour has been hospitalized due to noise from activities in the area. Adolfo Azcarraga stated that Canaport will remain compliant with noise conditions as regulated by the Department of Environment.

Q25: (Teresa Debly) Can you control the noise?

A25: (Adolfo Azacarraga) We can calculate the noise levels depending on flow.

Q26: (Teresa Debly) What flow gives a sound level of 65 dBA?

A26: (Adolfo Azcarraga) I will check and provide that information to the CCELC. At any expected flow, the expected dBA levels will be below requirements from the EIA and EIS.

ACTION 43-1: Canaport LNG to verify the flow levels to maintain a maximum sound level of 65 dBA.

Carolyn Walker stated there are no noise issues from the Canaport site. She believes the recent noise problems are related to the pipeline activity in the area. She also informed the committee that the pipeline does not have any commitments for sound levels. Dennis Griffin commented that there would be no pipeline if there was no Canaport LNG.

Q27: (Tom Inkpen) What is the consultation process about? What is the value of my comments?

A27: (Bernie Doucet) The Department of Environment are looking for significant concerns about environmental impacts. If a concern is significant, we will ask the Proponent how they will respond to the concern.

Q28: (Tom Inkpen) Can my comments change the flare from being a flare?

A28: (Bernie Doucet) This is a consultation process. The Department of Environment reviews environmental impacts as described by the professional environmental consultants and from public input. It is important to inform people

of project related environmental concerns and the Proponent must address these concerns.

Q29: (Tom Inkpen) Can I make a comment that would change this?

A29: (Bernie Doucet) We are looking for environmental related concerns for the project modification. The Canaport project was approved on the basis of a cold vent. Canaport LNG is proposing this change and hired an environmental consultant to study and report on predicted environmental impacts. Public input is considered as well.

A29: (Adolfo Azcarraga) We have looked at all environmental impacts and believe the flare is the best option.

David Thompson commented that a neighbour in the area was hospitalized and asked if the Department of Environment was aware of this matter. Carolyn Walker stated this was the first she had heard about someone going to the hospital but does not think it is related to the Canaport Project as noise levels from the site are below required criteria.

Q30: (David Thompson) Were there exceedences on the monitor at Carol Armstrong's house?

A30: (Carolyn Walker) Yes, but not at the monitor on the LNG site.

Q31: (David Thompson) Were these noise levels reported to the pipeline or the National Energy Board?

A31: (Carolyn Walker) No. I will look into the process in reporting the sound levels.

ACTION 43-2: Carolyn Walker to forward sound level exceedences to the Brunswick Pipeline and / or National Energy Board.

Q32: (David Thompson) What is the height of the flare at the refinery during normal operation?

A32: (Fraser Forsythe) I don't know.

Dennis Griffin stated that with the flare stack at 64 m (209 ft) and the flare at 43 m (141 ft) together will be ~ 107 m (350 ft) tall. Fraser Forsythe stated that it will not be taller than Red Head Mountain.

Q33: (Teresa Debly) Were aesthetics not considered upon making the proposed flare change?

A33: (Fraser Forsythe) Visual impact is part of the Land Use VEC.

Q34: (David Thompson) Can we have big flares at anytime during re-start up? Will the tanks be closed down for maintenance?

A34: (Adolfo Azcarraga) The tanks will be maintained cold after the initial start up. The tanks will not be closed for maintenance. The flare will continue during operation.

Q35: (David Thompson) Won't the tanks be shut down for maintenance?

A35: (Adolfo Azcarraga) The tanks will not be decommissioned during the life of the project.

Q36: (David Thompson) What if there is a crack in the tank?

A36: (Adolfo Azcarraga) We will address it at that time. If a crack occurs in the tank it will be on the first day.

Q37: (David Thompson) People have already expressed concern about light from the site. What impact will the light have on the species during the night?

A37: (Fraser Forsythe) We have made casual observations during construction. Surveys were completed on species and their abundances in the area during the EIA.

Q38:(David Thompson) Has any work been done since? Is light from the site affecting the species?

A38: (Fraser Forsythe) We have done surveys on migratory birds and compared our results with the Point Lepreau Bird Observatory.

Q39: (David Thompson) Are lights, blasting, or sound affecting species? The Harlequin duck has not been seen in this area since the project began.

A39: (Bernie Doucet) The Technical Review Committee (TRC) did not request further mitigation from Canaport with respect to migratory birds.

David Thompson stated that there is an important challenge to keep the coastline along the Bay of Fundy in darkness for the species. He restated that endangered species have not been seen in the area since the project began. He added that the Project is in mid-stream and no other federal authorities were participating in the meeting about the proposed modification. David Thompson asked all CCELC members if they were interested in a having a proper meeting. All members in attendance responded yes to his question.

Q40: (Horst Sauerteig) Will gas from the tanks go to the flare?

A40: (Adolfo Azcarraga) No. Compressors will be working during operation to reduce gas going to the flare. During start up compressors will not be in service and we will flare gas.

Q41: (Horst Sauerteig) You will flare gas at low pressure?

A41: (Adolfo Azcarraga) Yes.

Q42: (Horst Sauerteig) Will crosswinds cause the flare to move?

A42: (Adolfo Azcarraga) Yes.

Q43: (Horst Sauerteig) With the 43m flare, how long will the plume be?

A43: (Adolfo Azcarraga) The flare will blow with the wind.

Q44: (Horst Sauerteig) How hot will the flare be?

A44: (Adolfo Azcarraga) It is designed so that a person can stand at the bottom of the stack and not be affected by the flare.

Q45: (Horst Sauerteig) What will happen as you draw LNG out of the tank and regassify it?

A45: (Adolfo Azcarraga) A balance will be maintained within the tank between liquid and vapour. During operation vapour will go to the BOG compressors and re-circulate into the process.

Q46: (Horst Sauerteig) Where does the purge gas come from?

A46: (Adolfo Azcarraga) It comes from the process and is conducted directly to the flare.

Q47: (Horst Sauerteig) How do you know the flame won't go back into the flare stack?

A47: (Adolfo Azcarraga) The pressure coming out of the flare will be above atmospheric pressure. The flow coming out will ensure the flare does not go back in.

Q48: (Horst Sauerteig) Is there a seal on the flare?

A48: (Adolfo Azcarraga) Yes, there is a molecular seal on the top of the flare but not on the purge line.

Q49: (Dennis Griffin) Is there a possibility of blow back?

A49: (Adolfo Azcarraga) No. The pressure is calculated to ensure that does not occur. There are four pilots on the flare. All four produce a positive pressure to ensure that the flare is always lit.

A49: (Fraser Forsythe) This is proven technology and is designed by Hamworthy Combustion Engineering which is an internationally recognized company for this technology.

Q50: (Dennis Griffin) Once you have built the plant, have a source of LNG to import, and have a pipeline, do you need a license to be certified to operate?

A50: (Bernie Doucet) The facility will require an Approval to Operate and all 24 conditions of the EIA must be met.

Q51: (Joan Pearce) What comes from a cold vent compared to a flare?

A51: (Fraser Forsythe) Methane comes from a cold vent compared to carbon dioxide and trace amounts of carbon monoxide and nitrous oxides.

Q52: (Joan Pearce) What are the health effects of these contaminants as written in the Jacques Whitford report?

A52: (Fraser Forsythe) I do not have it in front of me but I will find out for you.

Action 43-3: Canaport LNG to determine the health effects as identified within the Jacques Whitford's report on the proposed flare modification.

Gordon Dalzell stated that it is important to consider psycho-social health in addition to physical, mental, and emotional health.

Bernie Doucet said that Canaport LNG will have to receive approvals for all air emissions. Joan Pearce commented that she believes the Department of Environment do not consider cumulative effects. Bernie Doucet responded that this was a good point; at the approvals stage cumulative effects are not considered but cumulative effects are considered at the EIA stage. Joan Pearce stated that Jacques Whitford says that cumulative effects are almost always negligible. Bernie Doucet stated that the TRC includes Health Canada and Environment Canada. Joan Pearce said that the health effects of flaring have been documented in Nigeria but in New Brunswick there are no studies to prove this.

Q53:(Joan Pearce) What is the TRC? Do they ever meet? No – they are specialists from different organizations.

A53: (Bernie Doucet) The TRC is the Technical Review Committee and each specialist has to speak to their own mandate. There is a central coordinator.

Joan Pearce commented that neighbours should call and complain to the Attorney General about noise problems and work your way down.

Q54: (Teresa Debly) What date did the proposal go to the Department of Environment?

A54: (Fraser Forsythe) We first brought the proposed modification to the attention of the Department of Environment last September but the document was presented on January 17th 2008. Teresa Debly and other members noted as of 9 June that evening, the proposed flare document still had not been provided to committee members.

Q55: (Teresa Debly) Is there an EIS?

A55: (Fraser Forsythe) No. The modification did not need to be registered as determined by the Department of Environment.

A55: (Bernie Doucet) The Department of Environment determines this based on whether the modification provides an equal or greater level of environmental protection.

Q56: (Teresa Debly) When did you tell them that the public needed to be notified?

A56: (Bernie Doucet) February.

Gordon Dalzell commented that we know that the flare will reinforce the industrialization of the Mispec and Red Head areas. He stated that psycho-social

health includes fear, anxiety, and stress. He suggested that giving people a lot of information helps in dealing with psycho-social health issues. He said that he has lived beside the Irving Refinery for 30 years and it is stressful when the flares are going. Gordon Dalzell stated that we need to acknowledge that the flare will aggravate physical, social, and emotional health. In addition, Gordon Dalzell stated that public notice about the flare has been inadequate and the Department of Environment has been made aware of that. Gordon Dalzell commented that the Canaport project will not go through the public involvement process for approvals because of its class; he believes this is wrong.

Q57: (Gordon Dalzell) What are the expected upset potentials for the flare for this project? In the 1990s upset conditions at the refinery created massive flares.

A57: Adolfo Azcarraga stated that a flare and a cold vent is a safety device. When gas is vented from a cold vent you do not see it but when it is flared, it is visible. There have been no problems with flares in the past 30 years of operation at the LNG terminals in Spain.

Q58: (David Thompson) What is a Class A facility?

A58: (Gordon Dalzell) A major output of emissions, such as Coleson Cove.

A58: (Bernie Doucet) Canaport LNG is not a Class 1 Facility. Air quality engineers have established this prescribed legislation.

Q59: (Gordon Dalzell) Do you consult with Transport Canada?

A59: (Bernie Doucet) They are part of the TRC.

Q60: (Gordon Dalzell) The flare is in the flight line for planes.

A60: (Bernie Doucet) The appropriate people from Transport Canada have reviewed this document and the Proponent has been requested to speak directly to officials at the airport.

David Thompson commented that it is hard to come to public meeting without information and be able to ask technical questions. Bernie Doucet suggested that he get a copy of the document. David Thompson requested a copy of the document on behalf of the Conservation Council of New Brunswick. He also requested a copy of the meeting minutes.

David Thompson read a paragraph from a letter addressed to CCELC Co-chairs Mr. F. Forsythe and Mr. S. Armstrong from the Minister of the Environment, Mr. R. Hache about public participation in the CCELC. [This letter was Action Item 38.3 and a copy was mailed out to CCELC members). David Thompson said he was informed by members of the committee that the public was not allowed to speak at meetings. David Thompson stated that the Department of Environment should reconsider how the CCELC functions and that control should not be with the Proponent. Fraser Forsythe stated that there is no such restriction on non-members speaking at the meetings but they must put their questions or comments through a member.

Gordon Dalzell stated that carbon dioxide emissions are regulated federally. Bernie Doucet agreed with that statement and said that the federal environmental agency was on the TRC. He also stated that this modification does not include a significant change in carbon dioxide emissions so the federal government is not involved at this point.

Q61: (Glenn Griffin) Are they going to expand to five tanks?

A61: (Bernie Doucet) An expansion would be considered a significant change to the project.

Glenn Griffin commented that he is not comfortable with grounding and lightning protection at the site. Fraser Forsythe said that they can provide more information about that to the CCELC at another meeting.

Action 43-4: Canaport LNG to provide additional information regarding grounding and lightning protection at the site.

Q62: (Dennis Griffin) How do you know that lighting on site will not affect migratory birds or other species?

A62: (Bernie Doucet) We have specialists who have reviewed and agreed with the predictions regarding the significance of this impact and mitigation.

Dennis Griffin stated that the quality of life will change in the area due to the extra light. Fraser Forsythe responded that light is required for security and is also necessary to monitor the process in certain areas to ensure proper functioning of equipment. Canaport LNG has maintained a treed buffer and the elevation of the site in relation to the surroundings also helps mitigate the impact of light from the site.

Q63: (Dennis Griffin) Are you going to turn them (lights) off?

A63: (Fraser Forsythe) We will operate as bright as necessary to ensure security and safe operation.

Gordon Dalzell stated that there will be a significant effect of light from this project. He said that the EIS was wrong when it predicted that there would be no aesthetic impact of the Project on the area. Gordon Dalzell indicated that he was going to review the EIA and see how many predicted outcomes for the project were incorrect.

Q64: (Andy Young) When did Irving Oil and Repsol get together?

A64: (Fraser Forsythe) Before the proposal for the cold vent..

Andy Young commented that from an aesthetic point of view, he prefers a cold vent.

Q65: (Andy Young) Who produces Canaport Connections? Why wasn't the date of the meeting included?

A65: (Fraser Forsythe) Canaport LNG.

A65: (Carolyn Van der Veen) We would have included the date. Date was published in public notice in the newspaper as required.

David Thompson stated that a federal government representative should have been present at the meeting to speak to the effects on species and health. He stated that the public was not allowed to be involved as they should have been and that this modification will go through the approval process easily. Gordon Dalzell thanked David Thompson and other members of the public for attending the meeting and their issues raised at that meeting.

Adjourned:

9:05 pm

Submitted by: Fundy Engineering

Next Meeting Date:

Monday 15 July 2008

Attachments:

NBDENV Monthly Status Report – May 2008

Facility Modification Presentation

EPA Emissions Fact Sheet

Table of Outstanding Action Items

Table of Actions/Responsibilities –June 2008

Action #	Action	Responsible Party	Due Date
43-1	<i>Canaport LNG to verify the flow levels to maintain a maximum sound level of 65 dBA</i>	<i>Canaport LNG</i>	<i>15 July</i>
43-2	<i>Carolyn Walker to forward sound level exceedences to the Brunswick Pipeline and / or National Energy Board</i>	<i>Carolyn Walker</i>	<i>15 July</i>
43-3	<i>Canaport LNG to determine the health effects as identified within the Jacques Whitfor's report on the proposed flare modification.</i>	<i>Canaport LNG</i>	<i>15 July</i>
43-4	<i>Canaport LNG to provide additional information regarding grounding and lightning protection at the site</i>	<i>Canaport LNG</i>	<i>15 July</i>